

**APPENDIX J**

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BROAD LOCATION, WEST OF WHITWICK (C47, C77,  
C78, C86, C81)**

## RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

|                |   |   |
|----------------|---|---|
| <b>HOUSING</b> | <b>SITE NUMBER: C47, C77, C78, C86, C81</b> | <b>SITE NAME: Broad Location West of Whitwick</b> |
|----------------|---|---|

| <b>MAIN ISSUES RAISED</b>  | <b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>   | <b>ACTION</b> | <b>RESPONDENTS ID</b> | <b>RESPONDENTS NAME</b>                            |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Principal of Development</b>  |   |               |                       |  |
| Object to development on the site. No benefit to local residents and will result in the loss of open spaces and greenfields. | The Council is required to allocate sufficient sites to meet the future requirements of the district. The proposed policy for this site seeks to ensure that it is designed and developed in a way that is sympathetic to its surroundings. | No change     | 98, 122, 542          | Lindsey Sawbridge, Lisa White, Kelvin Eatherington |
| How can planning permission be granted without true firm plans?  | The Local Plan does not grant planning permission, but rather it establishes the principal of development and the factors to be taken in to account when subsequently determining any planning applications.                                | No change     | 294                   | Peter Kimber                                       |
| Green Belt should not be developed.  | There is no Green Belt within the district. In the adopted Local Plan all of the land that comprises the Broad Location is identified as countryside.   | No change     | 408                   | Michael Reid                                       |

|   |  |                  |   |   |
|---|--|------------------|---|---|
| <p>Believe there to be restrictive covenants on land behind 248 Church Lane.</p>  | <p>It appears that 248 Church Lane does not back on to this site.</p>  |                  | <p>544</p>                                  | <p>Michael Owens</p>  |
| <p>Planning permission for housing development on this site has previously been refused. Their countryside location was included as a reason for refusal. Why is this land now suitable for development? Allowing development in the countryside would set a precedent with no consideration given to long term consequences. All representations and objections to this application should be reviewed and considered as part of this consultation and proposal.</p> | <p>There is no record of any planning application for residential development on this site save for the conversion of an agricultural building to one dwelling (18/01782/PDNATR).</p> <p>Site C48 is the subject of a separate allocation.</p> <p>Only those comments submitted in response to the consultation on the Local Plan are required to be considered.</p>                     | <p>No change</p> | <p>63, 81, 297, 298, 362, 363, 615, 649</p> | <p>Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Susan Beech, John Beech, Amy Collis, Christopher Nedza</p> |
| <p>Allocation does not fall within the exceptions provided for in the adopted Policy S3 or the draft policy S5.</p>   | <p>The adopted Local Plan only covers the period to 2031. The new plan is looking ahead to 2042 and needs to identify new sites to accommodate the housing requirement which are now significantly higher than in the adopted Local Plan. Draft policy S5 would only apply to areas identified as countryside in the new plan, not areas proposed for development such as this site.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>355</p>                                  | <p>Joanne Lunn</p>  |

|   |  |                  |            |                    |
|---|--|------------------|------------|--------------------|
| <p>The allocation falls within the Urban Fringe 1 for Coalville (NWLDC Settlement Fringe Assessment 2010) and is ranked as the least suitable place for development.</p>  | <p>The Settlement Fringe Assessment is part of the evidence for the previous plan. The site has been assessed as part of a Landscape Sensitivity Study which identified the site as being of medium landscape sensitivity and high visual sensitivity.</p>   | <p>No change</p> | <p>355</p> | <p>Joanne Lunn</p> |
| <p>The allocation does not take account of Para 74 of the NPPF and the Council's quantitative assessment of the individual sites which identifies a number of constraints and serious infrastructure issues. No mitigation has been recommended to overcome these concerns.</p> | <p>Paragraph 74 of the NPPF is concerned with "new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns". The NPPF does not clarify as to what constitutes significant. Amongst the factors to be considered in identifying sites is reference to sites being of a "size and location [that] will support a sustainable community with access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself ..... or in larger towns to which there is good access". In this instance the site is located in the Principal Town in the district where there is a good range of services and facilities available, including public transport which passes directly along Brooks</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>355</p> | <p>Joanne Lunn</p> |

|   |  |           |               |  |
|---|--|-----------|---------------|--|
|   | Lane. The proposed policy sets out a number of requirements that will need to be addressed as part of future development.  |           |               |  |
| The 2021 SHELAA suggests a time framework of 11-20 for each of the individual sites. An up-to-date assessment is needed before it is included in the proposed new plan.   | The SHELAA is part of the evidence base to inform the Local Plan, but of itself it does not determine the planning status of any specific site. The SHELAA provides only an indicative timeframe for possible development. As part of the Local Plan it will be necessary to prepare a housing trajectory to show when sites are likely to be developed. | No change | 355           | Joanne Lunn                                      |
| The site is unsuitable due to the number of constraints. Considerable investment would be required and it is highly unlikely a commercial developer would take this site. The only option would be for a Housing Association to develop this site with the support of government grants. This area is already classed as deprived and further large-scale social housing would exacerbate this situation. | It is understood that the majority of the land is under option to a land promoter who is looking to address matters such as access and infrastructure requirements. There is no evidence at this time to suggest that the site would not be attractive to a commercial developer.  | No change | 599, 609, 610 | Trevor Armston, John Perry, Gail Perry           |
| It is questioned as to whether the site is deliverable or developable as required by the National Planning Policy Framework in view of the multiple ownership issues, particularly  | The majority of this site is now controlled by a Land Promoter, whilst a housing association controls most of the remaining land. Both are   | No change | 116, 182, 243 | Strategic Land Group, Redrow Homes, Avison Young |

|  |   |                  |   |  |
|--|---|------------------|---|--|
| <p>as the largest parcel is landlocked. At the very least a cautious approach should be taken in respect of likely deliverability. Consideration should be given to allocating sites elsewhere to avoid a significant risk to the plan.</p>  | <p>currently working up proposals for future development.</p>   |                  |   |  |
| <p>Gladman are promoting parcels C81 and C47 of the proposed Broad Location which provides an opportunity to develop a high quality, sustainable residential scheme that could make an important contribution to meeting housing needs as well as helping to ensure the viability of local services and facilities within Coalville. Gladman confirm that they are willing to establish a commitment to joint working alongside the various landowners and site promoters. Gladman would be happy to take a lead on the masterplanning work, supported by planning policy officers as well as the promoters/landowners of the various parcels. Following this and subject to the Council's approval, consultation can commence with the local community and key stakeholders</p> | <p>Noted. It is understood that work is taking place in respect of a variety of issues, including transport.</p>  | <p>No change</p> | <p>147</p>  | <p><b>Gladman Developments Ltd</b></p>   |
| <p><b>Development Strategy</b></p>   |   |                  |   |  |
| <p>The development of Brownfield sites, urban infill and sustainable housing initiatives would be more suitable. Including in terms of environmental and ecological impacts and infrastructure requirements.</p>   | <p>The draft Local Plan included an allowance for sites in Coalville Town Centre to deliver 200 dwellings from previously developed land. In addition, it is proposed to redevelop the former</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>81, 267, 297, 298, 407, 519, 547, 556, 572,655</p> | <p>Neil Jefferies, Iva Knapcikova, John Fleming, Angela Burr, Rhiannon Fleming</p> |

|   |   |           |          |   |
|---|---|-----------|----------|---|
| Land at the Prince of Wales, Land on High Street and the old Bakehouse sites should be considered for development before sites located within the Area of Separation. | Hermitage Leisure Centre for housing. Other previously developed land is currently being redeveloped for housing, including the former Snibston Discovery park and Workspace 17. The amount of new housing that needs to be provided for is such that it is necessary to allocate greenfield sites for development. |           |          | Maxwell Brooks, Margaret Turner, Christine Jarmin, Joyce Black, Linda Hoult |
| A number of smaller scale developments/pockets of development would be a more appropriate strategy.   | There is a significant requirement for additional housing to address future needs. This means it is inevitable that large sites/areas such as this will need to be identified for future development if the Council is to demonstrate that these requirements can be addressed.                                     | No change | 521, 654 | Gayle Baker, Neil Hoult   |
| Higher density development should be focused in Coalville.  | The draft plan included an allowance for regeneration sites in and around Coalville Town Centre. Higher density development might be appropriate in such a location. Elsewhere, the density will depend upon the individual site and locations characteristics.   | No change | 549, 550 | Pauline Price, John Price   |
| The Council should prioritise the 3,500 houses to be built at South Coalville.  | The dwelling to be provided as part of south-east   | No change | 519, 556 | Maxwell Brooks, Christine Jarmin  |

|   |  |                  |                                    |  |
|---|--|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <p>This would reduce the need for the additional housing that is being proposed.</p>  | <p>Coalville are already accounted for as commitments. When all such sites are taken into account there is still a need to find sufficient land for about 7,100 dwellings.</p>   |                  |                                    |  |
| <p>Existing empty homes will not be filled if development goes ahead.</p>   | <p>The need for new housing nationally is significant as recognised in national policy and the proposed updated standard method. For the housing market to operate effectively there always needs to be a certain amount of vacancy to allow for what is referred to as churn. As at the 2021 Census the vacancy rate was estimated to be 3.5%, compared with a national rate of 5.4%.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>588</p>                         | <p>Lisa Webster</p>  |
| <p><b>Housing Numbers and Housing Type</b></p>  |  |                  |                                    |  |
| <p>Concerns raised over the number of houses. There are currently many houses being built in the area as well as available jobs. This level of housing proposed is only to address the shortfall in housing delivery by Leicester City Council. This level of development is not needed in this district.</p> | <p>There is a significant requirement for additional housing to address future needs of the district up to 2042. This means that additional sites will need to be identified. North West Leicestershire is only taking 4% of the unmet need in Leicester City, compared to 20% + in a number of other district/boroughs. A much</p>  | <p>No change</p> | <p>267, 604, 609, 610, 654,655</p> | <p>Iva Knapcikova, Graham Hibberd, John Perry, Gail Perry, Neil Hoult, Linda Hoult</p> |



|   |   |                  |            |                       |
|---|---|------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| <p>Have residents been informed that the Council have promised to take 7000 houses from Leicester County Council?</p>   | <p>bigger driver of growth is the need to balance homes and jobs.<br/>The Council has not agreed to take 7,000 homes from Leicester. The actual amount is less than 1,000.</p>  |                  |            |                       |
| <p>Are housing figures out of date? Are they a government projected housing estimate?</p>   | <p>The housing requirement takes the governments standard method as a starting point as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. The standard method takes account of both projected household growth and any historic under-supply. Further adjustments are then made as part of a Statement of Common Ground agreed with the other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities, which includes addressing unmet need from Leicester City and, more importantly for North West Leicestershire, the need to provide a better balance jobs and households.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>588</p> | <p>Lisa Webster</p>   |
| <p>Acknowledge development would provide more affordable housing, but I would pay more for housing for a nice environment. This would be preferable to more affordable homes surrounded by houses and cars.</p> | <p>The Local Plan seeks to achieve good quality housing developments, irrespective of the housing tenure.</p>   | <p>No change</p> | <p>267</p> | <p>Iva Knapcikova</p> |

|   |   |                  |  |   |
|---|---|------------------|--|---|
| <p>Will there be any provision for social housing?</p> <p>The local community cannot afford to buy or rent houses.</p>  | <p>Other policies of the plan address the need for new housing development to make provision for affordable housing, including that provided by housing associations.</p>   | <p>No change</p> | <p>250,558</p>   | <p>Roy Williams,<br/>Lisa Webster</p>   |
| <p><b>Scale and Location of Development</b></p>   |   |                  |  |   |
| <p>Development would result in urban sprawl with Whitwick and Thringstone no longer separated from Coalville and New Swannington.</p> <p>Whitwick and Thringstone would become part of the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>The loss of separation would result in a loss of identity and individuality of the local villages, as well as a loss of belonging and community.</p> <p>Whitwick should be recognised as a Sustainable Village.</p> | <p>The Coalville Urban Area is comprised of different settlements which together function as one, with a good range of services and facilities spread throughout the urban area which meet most of the day-to-day needs of residents.</p> <p>Whitwick and Thringstone already form part of the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>There are a good range of services and facilities available within, or close to, Whitwick which mean it is much more sustainable and hence a location for new development, than Sustainable Villages, which by their nature are smaller, stand alone and with fewer facilities.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>81, 289, 297,<br/>298, 398, 399,<br/>406, 521, 522,<br/>551, 566, 570,<br/>572, 576, 577,<br/>578, 600, 608,<br/>616, 617, 620,<br/>654</p> | <p>Neil Jefferies,<br/>Swannington<br/>Parish Council,<br/>John Fleming,<br/>Rhiannon<br/>Fleming, Richard<br/>Derbyshire,<br/>Alexandra<br/>Derbyshire,<br/>Gayle Baker, Jo<br/>Straw, Howard<br/>Baker, Kenneth<br/>Neal, Emma<br/>Pearson, Gaynor<br/>Armston, Joyce<br/>Black, Kathleen<br/>Ingall, Richard<br/>Pickering,<br/>Ronald Ingall,<br/>Matthew<br/>Tredwell,<br/>David Gubb,<br/>Verity Cave,<br/>Aaron Cave,<br/>Sarah Fielding,<br/>Neil Houlton</p> |

|   |   |                  |  |  |
|---|---|------------------|--|--|
| <p>The amount and scale of housing is not appropriate and not proportionate for the area.</p> <p>This scale of development would be overbearing and out of character and scale and would dominate and overcrowd the village, which is already overdeveloped. Development would impact on the character of the area and result in loss of views.</p> | <p>There is a significant requirement for additional housing across the district to address future needs up to 2042.</p> <p>As at the 2021 census the Coalville Urban Area was home to 33% of the population, the largest settlement in the district, with a very good range of services and facilities. It is appropriate therefore, that the largest amount of development is directed there.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>63, 75, 81,298, 362, 363,366, 395, 398, 511, 514,521, 522, 529, 537, 546, 547, 548, 549,</p> <p>550, 566, 585, 603, 604, 640, 649</p> | <p>Neil Riley, Mr R &amp; Mrs J Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Rhiannon Fleming, Susan Beech, John Beech, Jennifer Smith, Duncan White, Richard Derbyshire, Nigel Chapman, Karen Harrup, Gayle Baker, Howard Baker, John Dunningcliff, Sue Clarke, Robert Ansiingh, Margaret Turner, Susan Ansigh, Pauline Price, John Price, Emma Pearson, J Lewis, Trevor McNally, Graham Hibberd, Felix Bass, Christopher Nedza</p> |
| <p>High density and overcrowded housing don't offer a good quality of life.</p>   | <p>Other policies of the Local Plan seek to ensure that new development is of high quality, and which respects the location and setting of any site.</p>  | <p>No change</p> | <p>298</p>   | <p>Rhiannon Fleming</p>  |
| <p><b>Design of Development</b></p>   |   |                  |  |  |

|   |  |                  |   |   |
|---|--|------------------|---|---|
| <p>The way that these parcels of land fall is quite extreme, and consideration would need to be taken for providing disabled access.</p>                              | <p>The issue of accessibility between new and existing development, as well as within any new development, is a matter to be addressed as part of a detailed planning application.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>362, 363</p>   | <p>Susan Beech,<br/>John Beech</p>  |
| <p>Who will ensure the homes meet the 2025 'Future Homes Standard' and new homes built after 2025 will produce 75-80% less carbon emissions. (Government Targets)</p> | <p>The issue of the Future Homes Standard will be addressed when other policies are considered in due course.</p>  | <p>No change</p> | <p>362, 363</p>   | <p>Susan Beech,<br/>John Beech</p>  |
| <p><b>Loss of Countryside/Green Space</b></p>   |  |                  |   |   |
| <p>Loss of valued countryside, including its landscape, natural beauty and scenic value as well as its tranquillity.</p>  | <p>The plan seeks to strike a balance between identifying sufficient land to meet future housing needs, whilst also protecting the vast majority of land as countryside</p>            | <p>No change</p> | <p>297, 298, 362,<br/>363, 408, 521,<br/>522, 530, 532,<br/>550, 563, 566,<br/>572, 576, 578,<br/>585, 599, 609,<br/>610, 611, 616,<br/>617, 628, 649</p> | <p>John Fleming,<br/>Rhiannon<br/>Fleming, Susan<br/>Beech, John<br/>Beech, Michael<br/>Reid, Gayle<br/>Baker, Howard<br/>Baker, Eileen<br/>Turrell, Phillip<br/>Collings, John<br/>Price, Phillip<br/>Hopkins, Emma<br/>Pearson, Joyce<br/>Black, Kathleen<br/>Ingall, Ronald<br/>Ingall, J Lewis,<br/>Trevor Armston,<br/>John Perry, Gail<br/>Perry, Liam<br/>Perry, Verity<br/>Cave, Aaron<br/>Cave, Sandra</p> |

|   |  |           |  |  |
|---|--|-----------|--|--|
|   |  |           |  | McNally,<br>Christopher<br>Nedza   |
| Significant loss of actively farmed land as a resource. This land is used for crops and the grazing of animals.               | Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land is defined as Classes 1,2 and 3a. Natural England's Provisional Agricultural Land Classification map record the site as being Grade 3. It is not clear, therefore, whether or not BMV would be affected. Generally speaking, 20 or more hectares is generally considered to be significant, the term use in the NPPF. This is more than the proposed site. Therefore, if the site was to be assumed as all being Grade 3a (and it might not), the loss would not be significant. The NPPF advises that it is necessary to consider the loss of agricultural land against other policy considerations. In this instance the loss of agricultural land has to be weighed against the need for new housing. | No change | 63, 81, 86, 96, 250, 251, 362, 363, 399, 511, 513, 521, 532, 591, 599, 640   | Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, Alex Carr, Roy Williams, Elaine Williams, Susan Beech, John Beech, Alexandra Derbyshire, Nigel Chapman, Kirtsy Marriott, Gayle Baker, Phillip Collings, Jessica Curtis, Trevor Armston, Felix Bass |
| Loss of our natural habitat, biodiversity, ecosystems, wildlife, flora, fauna, ancient hedgerows, woodlands, trees and ponds. | Other policies of the plan include specific requirements to support wildlife and habitats, including securing biodiversity net gain  | No change | 81, 97, 98, 250, 251, 267, 286, 297, 298, 362, 363, 366, 378, 397, 398, 399, | Neil Jefferies, Shirley Brotherhood, Lindsey Sawbridge, Roy  |

|  |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p>Representations have identified a range of species being present, including Birds of Prey, mammals, amphibians.</p> | <p>improvements in accordance with national requirements and to retain and enhance existing trees and hedgerows within and on the boundaries of the site.</p> |  | <p>407, 490, 505,<br/>507, 511, 513,<br/>514, 519, 520,<br/>522, 529, 530,<br/>532, 533, 537,<br/>547, 552, 556,<br/>559, 564, 566,<br/>570, 572, 575,<br/>576, 577, 579,<br/>582, 585, 588,<br/>591, 599, 603,<br/>608, 609, 610,<br/>611, 620, 628,<br/>642, 644, 648,<br/>649</p> | <p>Williams, Elaine<br/>Williams, Iva<br/>Knapcikova,<br/>Chris Jobburn,<br/>John Fleming,<br/>Rhiannon<br/>Fleming, Susan<br/>Beech, John<br/>Beech, Jennifer<br/>Smith, Leanne<br/>Flude, Pat<br/>McReynolds,<br/>Richard<br/>Derbyshire,<br/>Alexandra<br/>Derbyshire,<br/>Angela Burr, T<br/>Taylor, Jonathan<br/>Harrison,<br/>Stephanie<br/>Barker, Nigel<br/>Chapman, Kirtsy<br/>Marriott, Karen<br/>Harrup, Maxwell<br/>Brooks, Ellie<br/>Leeland, Howard<br/>Baker, John<br/>Dunncliffe,<br/>Eileen Turrell,<br/>Phillip Collings,<br/>John Turner,<br/>Sue Clarke,<br/>Margaret Turner,<br/>Julie Kinton,<br/>Christine Jarmin,</p> |
|--|---|--|--|---|

|   |  |                  |   |   |
|---|--|------------------|---|---|
|   |  |                  |   | <p>Stephen Foxall,<br/>Michelle McNally, Emma Pearson, Gaynor Armston, Joyce Black, Nicola Pickering, Kathleen Ingall, Richard Pickering, Matthew Turner, Emma Goode, J Lewis, Lisa Webster, Jessica Curtis, Trevor Armston, Trevor McNally, David Gubb, John Perry, Gail Perry, Liam Perry, Sarah Fielding, Sandra McNally, Stuart Flude, Talyor Flude, Graham Bass, Christopher Nedza</p> |
| <p>Loss of, and access to, green open space/recreational space. A free facility that that is used by a variety of users, of all ages.</p> <p>The loss of this resource would be detrimental to people's physical and mental health. The loss of green</p> | <p>Whilst there is some public access across the site via public footpaths, the majority of the land is not publicly accessible. Any development will need to incorporate any existing public footpaths and appropriate provision of new</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>75, 81, 86, 98,<br/>201, 267, 286,<br/>297, 298, 362,<br/>363, 395, 408,<br/>490, 393, 511,<br/>513, 520, 533,<br/>537, 546, 547,<br/>548, 556, 559,</p> | <p>Mr R &amp; Mrs J Hopkins ,Neil Jefferies, Claire Cauldfield, Lindsey Sawbridge, Susan White, Iva Knapcikova,</p>   |

|   |  |                  |   |   |
|---|--|------------------|---|---|
| <p>spaces to development would be contrary to Local Plan policy which seek to address Health and Wellbeing of residents.</p> <p>Whitwick Parish would be left with no green space.</p> <p>The provision of green spaces within a future housing development would not be a substitute for this valued resource.</p> | <p>paths and greenspaces. This will benefit not only residents of the new development, but also residents from nearby areas.</p>                         |                  | <p>582, 588, 599, 600, 604, 620, 649, 654</p> | <p>Chris Jobburn, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Susan Beech, John Beech, Duncan White, Michael Reid, T Taylor, Jennifer Robertson, Nigel Chapman, Kirtsy Marriott, Ellie Leeland, Sue Clarke John Turner, Robert Ansiingh, Margaret Turner, Susan Ansigh, Christine Jarmin, Stephen Foxall, Emma Goode, Lisa Webster, Trevor Armston, Matthew Tredwell, David Gubb, Sarah Fielding, Christopher Nedza, Neil Hoult</p> |
| <p>Loss of land designated as/for National Forest</p>   | <p>Other policies in the plan will require the provision for areas of tree planting as part any future development. This will contribute towards the</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>81, 585</p>                                | <p>Neil Jefferies, J Lewis</p>  |



|   |  |           |                            |  |
|---|--|-----------|----------------------------|--|
|   | National Forest, but also provide opportunities for biodiversity net gain.   |           |                            |  |
| A preservation order should be put on C78 to protect the natural environment.   | It is not clear what type of preservation order is envisaged.  | No change | 251                        | Elaine Williams  |
| The character, biodiversity, geodiversity, cultural and industrial heritage of the area should be managed.  | Other policies, for example policies in respect of the National Forest, the Charnwood Forest and biodiversity, require that new development takes account of these and other factors in the design of new developments.  | No change | 407                        | Angela Burr  |
| <b>Loss of Green Wedge/Area of Separation</b>   |  |           |                            |  |
| Land has previously been designated as Green Wedge and a Countryside Priority Area. A Green Wedge and/or Countryside designation should remain and not be developed on.<br><br>The allocation undermines previous work and opinions on the protection of our green spaces. Due consideration must be given to previous campaigns to protect and improve our green spaces. | The land in question was identified as Green Wedge in the Local Plan of 2002. However, in the adopted Local Plan, all of the land which comprises the Broad Location is identified as countryside. The land in question is more properly considered as countryside rather than as part of the Area of Separation, which superseded the Green Wedge. There is now a need to identify more land for housing development to meet future needs. This means some areas that are currently identified as | No change | 81, 286, 298, 406, 649,654 | Neil Jefferies, Chris Jobburn, Rhiannon Fleming, Jo Straw, Christopher Nedza, Neil Hoult |

|  |   |           |  |  |
|--|---|-----------|--|--|
|  | countryside will need to allocated for development.   |           |  |  |
| <b>Highways and transport</b>  |   |           |  |  |
| <p>The highway network in the vicinity of the site is at capacity and will be unable to cope with the additional levels of traffic generated by new development. This will result in gridlock and congestion and also raises issues regarding safety, noise and air quality. sewage</p> <p>Specific concerns raised regarding Church Lane, School Lane, Spring Lane, Brooks Lane, Talbot Road and Thornborough Road.</p> <p>No comprehensive assessment appears to have been carried out for the suitability of highways access for this site, either on its own or in combination with other sites.</p> <p>More logical to concentrate development where there is easy access to major roads and/or bypasses.</p> <p>A suitable access cannot be provided for the site.</p> | <p>In its response to the consultation on the draft Local Plan, the County Highway authority has advised that the issue of access to this site should be considered in junction with the proposed site at Thornborough Road (C48). It is understood that the site promoter has agreed to do this.</p> <p>Further detailed transport modelling will be undertaken to inform the final version of the plan.</p> | No change | 63, 75, 81, 86, 97, 201, 250, 251, 267, 286, 289, 297, 298, 337, 338, 355, 362, 363, 378, 393, 395, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 406, 409, 490, 491, 493, 494, 505, 507, 511, 514, 519, 521, 522, 529, 530, 532, 533, 544, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 556, 559, 563, 564, 572, 573, 574, 576, 577, 587, 579, 585, 591, 603, 615, 620, 623, 628, 642, 644, 649, 655 | <p>Neil Riley, Mr R &amp; Mrs J Hopkins, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, Shirley Brotherhood, Susan White, Roy Williams, Elaine Williams, Iva Knapcikova, Chris Jobburn, Swannington Parish Council, John Fleming, Rhiannon Fleming, Deb Unwin, Richard Unwin, Joanne Lunn, Susan Beech, John Beech, Leanne Flude, Daniel Wagstaff, Duncan White, Pat McReynolds, Richard Derbyshire, Alexandra Derbyshire, Christine Jorgens, Whitwick Parish</p> |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  | Council, Jo<br>Straw, Andrew<br>Palmer, T Taylor,<br>Janet Shaw,<br>Jennifer<br>Robertson,<br>Stuart Boam,<br>Jonathan<br>Harrison,<br>Stephanie<br>Barker, Nigel<br>Chapman, Karen<br>Harrup, Maxwell<br>Brooks, Gayle<br>Baker, Howard<br>Baker, John<br>Dunicliffe, Eileen<br>Turrell, Phillip<br>Collings, John<br>Turner, Michael<br>Owens, Susan<br>Ansigh, Pauline<br>Price, John<br>Price, Kenneth<br>Neal, Julie<br>Kinton, Christine<br>Jarmin,<br>Stephen Foxall,<br>Phillip Hopkins,<br>Joyce Black,<br>Michelle McNally<br>E A Wells, K A<br>Wells, Kathleen<br>Ingall, Richard<br>Pickering, |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |   |   |     |   |
|--|---|---|-----|---|
|  |   |   |     | Ronald Ingall, Matthew Turner, J Lewis, Jessica Curtis, Trevor McNally, Amy Collis, Sarah Fielding, Carol Allen, Sandra McNally, Stuart Flude, Taylor Flude, Graham Bass, Christopher Nedza, Linda Houl |
| It remains unclear if safe and appropriate access can be achieved and will need more detailed assessment going forward if the broad area is to remain. Suggest that this site should be combined with site C48 (Land south of Church Lane) as it may help overcome some of the challenges relating to this site/location as it stands, particularly with regards to access arrangements. | At the time that the draft plan was prepared those sites that comprise the West of Whitwick Broad Location were being promoted separately from each other and the south of Church Lane site (C48). Since then, it has become apparent that the Church Lane site and most of the West of Whitwick Broad Location are largely in the control of one site promoter (Gladman Developments). As a result, there is now significant confidence that this site could be brought forward for development. | That the following be added to the list of requirements:<br><br>Co-ordinate development with land north of Church Lane (C48), particularly in respect of vehicular access and design and layout | 341 | <b>Leicestershire County Council</b>  |

|  |   |  |                                     |   |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|
|  | Whilst it still appropriate to maintain this site as a separate entity, it would be appropriate to ensure that and future development is co-ordinated with development of the site south of Church Lane (C48)   |  |                                     |   |
| A number of Public Rights of Way will be affected.<br><br>Clarification is needed on how these Rights of Way would be retained.  | The draft policy requires that existing public rights of way N34, N36, O14 and O15 which cross the site are retained and enhanced, so ensuing that they are accessible to local residents. They will also maintain access to the wider countryside  | No change  | 63, 81, 86, 192, 362, 363, 511, 556 | Neil Riley, Neil Jefferies, Claire Caulfield, Leicestershire Access Forum, Susan Beech, John Beech, Nigel Chapman, Maxwell Brooks, Christine Jarmin |
| The local bus services do not serve the area very well. There is no bus service to the centre of Whitwick.<br><br>Buses also struggle to get through the village due to traffic levels and parked cars.<br><br>There are difficulties in improving the public transport. | A number of bus services currently pass along Brooks Lane, including direct services to Coalville Town Centre, Loughborough, Leicester, East Midlands Airport and Nottingham. The draft policy requires the provision of pedestrian routes through and within the site. It is considered that this could be strengthened to include reference to providing direct links to Brooks Lane in order to provide a direct access to the bus routes. | That an additional requirement be included to provide direct pedestrian links to Brooks Lane | 409, 519, 556, 573, 574             | Andrew Palmer, Maxwell Brooks, Christine Jarmin, E A Wells, K A Wells   |

|  |  |           |  |  |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|
| Leicester City Council have been awarded funds following the cancellation of HS2. Rather than providing bus lanes, cycle lanes and traffic calming they should use the funds to open the Leicester to Burton railway line to reduce congestion.  | The potential to reopen the Leicester -Burton line is the subject of ongoing investigations. Reducing traffic congestion will require a number of different initiatives in addition to reopening the railway line.   | No change | 654  | Neil Hoults  |
| <b>Parking</b>   |  |           |  |  |
| The Co-op stores in the area do not have adequate parking for customers.   | This is not an issue that can be addressed as part of the Local Plan.  | No change | 409  | Andrew Palmer  |
| New developments rarely provide adequate parking resulting in further on street parking.<br><br>Parking would be an issue as there is nowhere to park in the area.   | The requirements for parking provision are established by Leicestershire County Council as the Highway Authority. These require a minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling, with 3 for properties with 4 or more bedrooms.   | No change | 640, 648   | Felix Bass,<br>Graham Bass   |
| <b>Flooding</b>  |  |           |  |  |
| The area regularly floods, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall. A stream runs through the site and is known to flood and the land doesn't drain well and the fields retain a lot of flood water. There are problems with water run-off. It will increase flood risk on the Grace Dieu Brook which already floods in heavy rains.<br><br>Additional built development will exacerbate flooding issues, with a reduction in natural drainage, leading to an increase flood risk within and | Proposed draft policy AP7 seeks to direct development to areas at least risk of flooding. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is the lowest risk area for flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Local Plan confirms that the site satisfies the Sequential Test. The SFRA also identifies that the site is within area with low permeability. However, | No change | 63, 75, 81, 96,<br>97, 250, 251,<br>286, 297, 298,<br>337, 338, 362,<br>363, 366, 378,<br>393, 397, 398,<br>399, 402, 406,<br>407, 489, 507,<br>519, 532, 551,<br>552, 556, 564,<br>570, 579, 582,<br>591, 599, 603,<br>609, 610, 611,<br>616, 617, 620, | Neil Riley, Mr R<br>& Mrs J Hopkins,<br>Neil Jefferies,<br>Alex Carr,<br>Shirley<br>Brotherhood,<br>Roy Williams,<br>Elaine Williams,<br>Chris Jobburn,<br>John Fleming,<br>Rhiannon<br>Fleming, Deb<br>Unwin, Richard<br>Unwin, Susan |

|   |  |  |                           |  |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| <p>close to the site, including on Thornborough Road, Talbot Lane and Church Lane. Local watercourses will be unable to cope exacerbated by the ground being impermeable clay. It will also increase pollution in watercourses.</p> | <p>the draft policy includes a requirement for the incorporation Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems in order to manage surface water runoff, for example by holding water on site and releasing it at a rate equivalent to a greenfield site.</p> <p>The Lead Local Flood Authority has not raised an objection.</p> |  | <p>640, 642, 644, 648</p> | <p>Beech, John<br/> Beech, Jennifer<br/> Smith, Leanne<br/> Flude, Daniel<br/> Wagstaff, Pat<br/> McReynolds,<br/> Richard<br/> Derbyshire,<br/> Alexandra<br/> Derbyshire,<br/> Whitwick Parish<br/> Council, Jo<br/> Straw, Angela<br/> Burr, Andy<br/> Butler,<br/> Stephanie<br/> Barker, Maxwell<br/> Brooks, Phillip<br/> Collings,<br/> Kenneth Neal,<br/> Julie Kinton,<br/> Christine Jarmin,<br/> Michelle<br/> McNally, Gaynor<br/> Armston,<br/> Matthew Turner,<br/> Emma Goode,<br/> Jessica Curtis,<br/> Trevor Armston,<br/> Trevor McNally.<br/> John Perry, Gail<br/> Perry, Liam<br/> Perry, Verity<br/> Cave, Aaron<br/> Cave, Sarah</p> |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|--|

|  |   |           |  |   |
|--|---|-----------|--|---|
|  |   |           |  | Fielding, Felix<br>Bass, Stuart<br>Flude, Taylor<br>Flude, Graham<br>Bass   |
| Potential homeowners will not be able to get their properties insured due to water being so close. Both the council and builders could be sued if land is developed.             | The is not a planning issue.  | No change | 96   | Alex Carr   |
| Site has an ordinary watercourse running through it.   | Noted   | No change | 404  | <b>The Environment Agency</b>   |
| <b>Subsidence/Mining land</b>  |   |           |  |   |
| The area is subject to the presence of mining tunnels and shafts. There is the potential for further subsidence and danger. Who would pay for properties affected by subsidence? | The Coal Authority has not identified any issues in respect of land stability with this site in its response.<br><br>Any prospective developer will need to satisfy themselves in respect of any land stability issues. | No change | 250, 251, 362, 363, 366, 513, 519, 556, 599, 402, 640, 648 | Roy Williams, Elaine Williams, Susan Beech, John Beech, Jennifer Smith, Kirtsy Marriott, Maxwell Brooks, Christine Jarmin, Trevor Armston, Whitwick Parish Council, Felix Bass, Graham Bass |
| One of the developments would be built on the fault which surely should not be allowed.  | There are no known reasons as to why development along the line of the Thringstone fault would not be appropriate.  | No change | 616  | Verity Cave   |



|   |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
|   | <p>The Coal Authority has not identified any issues in respect of land stability with this site in its response.</p> <p>Any prospective developer will need to satisfy themselves in respect of any land stability issues.</p>  |   |  |   |
| <b>Heritage</b>   |   |   |  |   |
| Land has some archaeological interest, including Romand finds and past mining works.  | The Council is not aware of any specific interest that would preclude development.  | No change   | 81   | Neil Jefferies  |
| It is not clear how the ridge and furrow earthworks field system has been considered in the site assessment work. Disagree with the Sustainability Appraisal outcome of neutral, as there would be some harm to non-designated heritage in NPPF terms. From the information available, it is not clear whether the site could be developed or delivered in the way the Council anticipates. | The site promoters have been alerted to this issue and it is understood that they are undertaking work to assess and understand the potential impact on heritage issues. The Council will keep the matter under review. The requirements in respect of this site could be strengthened in terms of heritage matters through the inclusion of an additional requirement. | <p>Add the following requirement to the policy:</p> <p>A Heritage Assessment which will identify the heritage assets both on and beyond the site which may be impacted, their significance, including the significance derived from setting, and how it is proposed to mitigate any impact.</p> | 357  | <b>Historic England</b>   |
| <b>Infrastructure</b>   |   |   |  |   |
| Concerns raised in respect of the negative impact and strain on local infrastructure and amenities (e.g. Schools, healthcare facilities, shops, road, utilities, policing).   | The need to contribute towards the cost of additional infrastructure is recognised in the draft policy. A draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies that this site will be  | No change   | 201, 251, 298, 362, 363, 366, 393, 398, 400, 406, 407, 408, 492, 493, 494, 505, 511, 513, 519, 529, 530, | Susan White, Elaine Williams, Rhiannon Fleming, Susan Beech, John Beech, Jennifer |

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>There is a lack of infrastructure to support the scale of development, and the infrastructure would not be able to cope.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure and amenities are already under pressure and development would exacerbate this problem, resulting in facilities being more difficult to access. No details are provided as to what infrastructure will be provided.</p> <p>It is unclear what infrastructure would be provided and considerable expenditure would be needed to provide new infrastructure.</p> <p>Investment is needed in infrastructure before homes are even built.</p> | <p>required to contribute towards the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary education;</li> <li>• Secondary education;</li> <li>• Healthcare;</li> <li>• Policing and</li> <li>• A variety of Green Infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>The exact level of contributions required from this site will need to be determined as part of future work.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken to address what contributions are required in respect of transport (including public transport), as well as any impact upon viability of development.</p> |  | <p>532, 533, 544, 547, 556, 559, 564, 570, 572, 573, 575, 576, 582, 585, 591, 599, 603, 604, 609, 610, 611, 628, 649, 654</p> | <p>Smith, Daniel<br/>Wagstaff, Richard<br/>Derbyshire, Christine<br/>Jorgens, Jo<br/>Straw, Angela<br/>Burr, Michael<br/>Reid, Adele<br/>Woods, Jennifer<br/>Robertson, Stuart<br/>Boam, Jonathon<br/>Harrison, Nigel<br/>Chapman, Kirtsy<br/>Marriott, Maxwell<br/>Brooks, John<br/>Dunicliffe, Eileen<br/>Turrell, Phillip<br/>Collings, John<br/>Turner, Michael<br/>Owens, Margaret<br/>Turner, Christine<br/>Jarmin, Stephen<br/>Foxall, Michelle<br/>McNally, Gaynor<br/>Armston, Joyce<br/>Black, E A<br/>Wells, Nicola<br/>Pickering, Kathleen<br/>Ingall, Emma<br/>Goode, J<br/>Lewis, Jessica<br/>Curtis, Trevor<br/>Armston, Trevor</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|   |  |           |   |  |
|---|--|-----------|---|--|
|   |  |           |   | McNally,<br>Graham<br>Hibberd, John<br>Perry, Gail Perry,<br>Liam Perry,<br>Sandra McNally,<br>Christopher<br>Nedza, Neil<br>Hoult   |
| <p>Schools do not have available capacity for the existing population.</p> <p>There is a lack of, and need for, SEN Support, free nursery places, childcare and pre-school facilities.</p> <p>Secondary schools are over 2 miles away.</p> <p>Development would require a new primary and secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Highly likely developers will provide new school facilities.</p> | <p>The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies that this site will be required to contribute towards the provision of primary and secondary education. There may also be a need to contribute towards Special Education Needs and also early years provision, subject to the specific needs arising from the development. This is reflected in the draft policy for this site.</p> | No change | 81, 97, 250, 251, 286, 362, 363, 366, 378, 393, 397, 513, 519, 520, 532, 534, 548, 556, 559, 564, 572, 575, 577, 578, 582, 588, 609, 610, 611, 616, 620, 640, 642, 644, 648 | <p>Neil Jefferies,<br/>Shirley<br/>Brotherhood,<br/>Roy Williams,<br/>Elaine Williams,<br/>Chris Jobburn,<br/>Susan Beech,<br/>John Beech,<br/>Jennifer Smith,<br/>Leanne Flude,<br/>Daniel Wagstaff,<br/>Pat McReynolds,<br/>Kirtsy Marriott,<br/>Maxwell Brooks,<br/>Ellie Leeland,<br/>Phillip Collings,<br/>Andrew Carter,<br/>Susan Ansigh,<br/>Christine,<br/>Jarmin, Stephen<br/>Foxall, Michelle<br/>McNally, Joyce<br/>Black , Nicola<br/>Pickering,<br/>Richard<br/>Pickering,</p> |

|   |  |                  |  |   |
|---|--|------------------|--|---|
|   |  |                  |  | Ronald Ingall,<br>Emma Goode,<br>Lisa Webster,<br>John Perry, Gail<br>Perry, Liam<br>Perry, Verity<br>Cave, Sarah<br>Fielding, Felix<br>Bass, Stuart<br>Flude, Taylor<br>Flude, Graham<br>Bass  |
| <p>Existing health facilities (e.g. GP surgeries and doctors, dentists, pharmacies, emergency services) do not have available capacity for the existing population. These services are already oversubscribed, and it is difficult to get an appointment.</p> <p>Inadequate health facilities and capacity to support the scale of development proposed. Additional development would exacerbate the existing problems experienced.</p> | <p>The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies that this site will be required to contribute towards the provision of additional healthcare. This is also reflected in the draft policy for this site.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>81, 97, 250, 286,<br/>362, 363, 366,<br/>378, 393, 397,<br/>398, 399, 513,<br/>519, 522, 534,<br/>546, 550, 551,<br/>552, 556, 559,<br/>564, 572, 573,<br/>575, 577, 578,<br/>582, 588, 616,<br/>617, 620, 640,<br/>642, 644, 648</p> | <p>Neil Jefferies,<br/>Shirley<br/>Brotherhood,<br/>Roy Williams,<br/>Chris Jobburn,<br/>Susan Beech,<br/>John Beech,<br/>Jennifer Smith,<br/>Leanne Flude,<br/>Daniel Wagstaff,<br/>Pat McReynolds,<br/>Richard<br/>Derbyshire,<br/>Alexandra<br/>Derbyshire,<br/>Kirtsy Marriott,<br/>Maxwell Brooks,<br/>Howard Baker,<br/>Andrew Carter,<br/>Robert Ansiingh,<br/>John Price,<br/>Kenneth Neal,<br/>Julie Kinton,</p> |

|   |  |           |  |   |
|---|--|-----------|--|---|
|   |  |           |  | Christine Jarmin,<br>Stephen Foxall,<br>Michelle McNally, Joyce Black, E A Wells, Nicola Pickering, Richard Pickering, Ronald Ingall, Emma Goode, Lisa Webster, Verity Cave, Aaron Cave, Sarh Fielding, Felix Bass, Stuart Flude, Taylor Flude, Graham Bass |
| There is a lack of entertainment facilities and jobs for new residents.   | The plan identifies land for future employment development which will provide more job opportunities. The Council is setting out plans for regeneration of the Coalville Town Centre, which includes new entertainment facilities. | No change | 97   | Shirley Brotherhood   |
| Sewage Treatment Works on Snarrows Lane is at capacity and overstretched.<br><br>There is only one sewer covering all of Whitwick and this cannot cope, resulting in flooding problems. | The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes that Severn Trent Water has indicated that schemes will come forward within the Asset Management Plan 8 period (2025-2030) to address capacity constraints                            | No change | 201, 250, 362, 363,398, 400, 402, 489, 588 | Susan White, Roy Williams, Susan Beech, John Beech, Christine Jorgens, Whitwick Parish Council, Andy  |

|   |  |           |   |  |
|---|--|-----------|---|--|
|   | <p>at Snarrows Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Any future development will need to ensure that adequate provision is made for drainage of sewage.</p>   |           |   | Butler, Lisa<br>Webster  |
| <b>Impact on local residents and residential amenity.</b>   |  |           |   |  |
| <p>Negative impact on residential amenity and quality of life of existing residents. Factors contributing to this issue include the scale of development proposed, loss of green space and traffic congestion. Impacts include loss of light, privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, visual intrusion, outlook, loss of views from homes and of open fields, noise pollution, disturbance and smell and contributing to climate change and affecting human health.</p> <p>Some have raised questions on how adverse impacts would be mitigated.</p> <p>The allocation produces no benefits for existing neighbourhoods and residents.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has to ensure that sufficient housing provision is made to meet the future needs of the district. However, these have to be balanced against the impact of development on existing communities. The issues listed are largely matters which will depend upon the design of a development. Draft Policy AP2 addresses the potential impact of all new development on the amenity of existing residents and would be applied to any subsequent planning application for development on the site.</p> | No change | 63, 75, 86, 98, 267, 286, 298, 362, 363, 393, 393, 395, 514, 519, 552, 559, 566, 603, 604, 623, 649 | Neil Riley, Mr R & Mrs J Hopkins, Claire Caulfield, Lindsey Sawbridge, Iva Knapcikova, Chris Jobburn, Rhiannon Fleming, Susan Beech, John Beech, Daniel Wagstaff, Duncan White, Karen Harrup, Maxwell Brooks, Julie Kinton, Stephen Foxall, Emma Pearson, Graham Hibberd, Carol Allen, Christopher Nedza |
| Existing properties will be devalued.   | The impact upon the price of existing properties is not a material planning consideration.   | No change | 286, 362, 363, 615  | Chris Jobburn, Susan Beech, John Beech, Amy Collis   |

|   |  |                  |                                     |   |
|---|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Problems associated with construction including disruption, noise, dirt, air pollution and traffic.</p>  | <p>Any future development will be subject to a range of planning conditions to ensure that any impact from construction is minimised as far as possible and consistent with other legal requirements.</p>  | <p>No change</p> | <p>505, 519, 556</p>                | <p>Jonathan Harrison,<br/>Maxwell Brooks,<br/>Christine Jarmin</p>  |
| <p><b>Limits to Development Methodology</b></p>   |  |                  |                                     |   |
| <p>The Methodology excludes areas of agricultural land, meadows, woodland, rivers and lakes and other greenfield land and other environmental spaces. However, this proposed allocation/extension to the limits to development includes these exclusions of agricultural land, meadows, rivers and greenfield land and will impact local wildlife.</p> <p>This 'broad locations for growth' should not be included in the Limits to Development Area.</p> | <p>In identifying sufficient land for development to meet the districts future needs, it will be necessary to allocate land that is currently in agricultural use and/or is a greenfield site. The plan seeks to strike a balance between identifying sufficient land to meet future housing needs, whilst also protecting the vast majority of land as countryside.</p> | <p>No change</p> | <p>63,563</p>                       | <p>Neil Riley, Phillip Hopkins</p>  |
| <p><b>Other Issues</b></p>  |  |                  |                                     |   |
| <p>The public consultation undertaken on these proposals has been inadequate and unmeaningful. Suggestions made include an extension of the consultation deadline and for individual letters to be sent to households.</p> <p>Too many consultation documents it is virtually impossible to know what is really going. People don't have the</p>  | <p>The consultation was advertised via the Council's website, whilst all Parish Councils were made aware of the consultation as were any individuals who had previously asked to be notified of any consultations.</p>   | <p>No change</p> | <p>63, 75, 86, 96,<br/>294, 546</p> | <p>Neil Riley, Mr R &amp; Mrs J Hopkins,<br/>Claire Caulfield,<br/>Alex Carr, Peter Kimber, Robert Ansiingh</p> |

|  |   |           |        |                                    |
|--|---|-----------|--------|------------------------------------|
| time to navigate them or cannot understand them.   |   |           |        |                                    |
| Not everyone has access to the computers and impacts on residents' ability to be involved in the consultation to meet deadlines. | Copies of the draft Local Plan were available to view in public libraries and also at the Council's Customer Services centre in the Belvoir Centre, Coalville, where officers were also present on a number of occasions. In addition, a number of drop-in events were held throughout the district.  | No change | 400    | Christine Jorgens                  |
| NWLDC should give due time, consideration and acknowledgement to all residents. The planning committee should be scrutinised.    | The Council is required to have regard to comments made in response to any consultation.  | No change | 407    | Angela Burr                        |
| Will the decision makers financially gain from these proposals?  | The Council is required to make a judgement based on the merits of a proposal from a planning point of view. This requires having regard to the need to mitigate the impact of any development upon infrastructure such as roads, schools and GPs. Legislation requires that any requirements are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms. | No change | 98,395 | Lindsey Sawbridge,<br>Duncan White |
| Object to the Council's proposed bin scheme. It is expensive, and the current system is fine.                                    | This is not relevant to the Local Plan  | No change | 400    | Christine Jorgens                  |
| Support the rigorous control to be put in place to ensure promoters work   | Noted   | No change | 563    | Phillip Hopkins                    |



|   |  |           |     |                  |
|---|--|-----------|-----|------------------|
| collaboratively and a comprehensive is established.   |  |           |     |                  |
| No timeline is given for this development nor any details how the development will be laid out. Multiple landowners with no cohesive plan proposed. | It is understood that most the land is now controlled by a site promote. Details as to the design and layout of any future development are largely matters for a planning application. | No change | 532 | Phillip Collings |

