

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS (MARCH 2025)

OTHER COMMENTS RECEIVED

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
General – Local Plan Strategy				
[It is important to ensure effective sustainable transport connectivity and accessibility to Leicester for residents of NWL as the city provides the key source of employment and a wide range of services, educational, health facilities and retail and leisure opportunities. Any adverse transport impacts identified on the city's network will require mitigation measures to support this new growth, based on robust transport modelling findings. The focus of the sustainable transport interventions needs to be based on a bus-based strategy, to help manage the city's urban congestion.]	In the event of there being a demonstrable impact from development in North West Leicestershire upon transport provision in Leicester City, then this would need to be addressed as part of any planning application and secured via Planning Obligation.	No change	48	Leicester City Council
Plan Period				
The anticipated adoption date would now leave less than 15 years from adoption and this is before any potential delays/the plan period should be extended to 2043.	Based on the Local Development Scheme adoption would leave marginally less than a 15-year plan period. However, in view of the cut-off date for submission of plans by December 2026, there is insufficient time to allocate additional sites and to also update the evidence base. Furthermore, there are many examples of where plans have been	No change	72; 91	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons)

	allowed to be adopted with less than 15-years.			
Housing Need				
[We note that the Plan does not mention that the NWL housing requirement would contribute towards Leicester's unmet need. We would like to see a reference within the plan to continued commitment to meeting our unmet need through partnership to address the L&L cross boundary matters.]	This is something which can be addressed in the supporting text.	That the supporting text include reference to an ongoing commitment to joint working with other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.	48	Leicester City Council
It will be important, ahead of the Submission of the Local Plan, that the current Statement of Common Ground, between the Leicester and Leicestershire planning authorities is updated to reflect the current position on housing needs (both the new standard method and the implications of the transitional arrangements) and to consider the unmet needs post 2036. The need to balance housing and employment growth will also need to be considered as before.	As reported to the 30 July 2025 LPC, "the issue of housing requirements across Leicester and Leicestershire is the subject of ongoing work with the other Leicestershire authorities." This work will inform an updated Statement of Common Ground in due course.	No change	72; 91	Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons)
[The housing requirement of 686dpa is not positively prepared as it does not consider the most recent local housing need figures]			255; 289; 290	William Davis; Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)

[A housing buffer of between 15-20% should be applied to the housing requirement]	The plan already includes a buffer of 10% to ensure that in the event of sites either being build out at a slower rate than anticipated or not coming forward at all, that the overall requirement will be met by the end of the plan period. It is considered that there is no justification to increase this further.	No change	91; 111; 150	Pegasus Group (Davidsons); Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes); Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
The distribution strategy with regards to the Sustainable Villages (5%) is too low. More growth is needed in the villages to support facilities and services.	Officers justified a revised distribution strategy at the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee. No further comment is necessary at this stage.	No change	387	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)

PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATIONS

General – Site Allocations				
[General objection to the locations of proposed housing and employment allocations (with reference to the Freeport, Isley Woodhouse and the northern part of the district). Development of these sites would have significant environmental impacts. There have already been decades of change affecting the area; the Local Plan should not be allocating any greenfield sites. The answer is to build up or down rather than out]	The overall scale of housing development that the plan must provide for has been established through the Statement of Common Ground with the other Leicestershire authorities consistent with national policy. The proposed development strategy in the plan seeks to balance homes and jobs in proximity to each other. The need for new infrastructure is recognised and will be addressed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change	9	Michael Goy
[Concerned that employment land allocations are based upon unreliable forecasts and modelling. The pressure for strategic warehousing is not sustainable]	The new Local Plan is planning for a 15+ year time horizon. Employment land forecasts are based on expert analysis and offer a sufficiently robust evidence base for the new Local Plan. Current findings indicate future demand for strategic warehouses; further work to confirm the scale of development needed is ongoing and will inform the next iteration of the Local Plan.	No change	12	Siobhan Dillon
[Concerned about the loss of agricultural land and the impact upon food security]	The NPPF advises that if developing agricultural land is necessary, lower-quality land should be chosen over higher-quality land. The use of land for food production should be considered with other policies when	No change	12	Siobhan Dillon

	selecting development sites. This means that the development of agricultural land is not of itself a reason to resist development. It is a factor to weigh in the planning balance.			
[Objects to the proposals to build houses on the flood plain / catchment of the Gilwiskaw Brook]	At 30 July Local Plan Committee, officers confirmed that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is being updated in line with the requirements of the 2024 NPPF. To be deemed sound, the Local Plan needs to be consistent with national policy, including NPPF paragraph 170: <i>"Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere."</i>	No change	349	Rebekah Harrison-Page
[The poor percentage of rental and low-cost housing needs addressing, as does the fact that the supporting infrastructure such as roads, health centres etc often never materialises (e.g. the additional parking promised for Hugglescote Surgery)]	The Regulation 19 version of the plan will include policies regarding the need for new housing development to also make provision for affordable housing, subject to not making development unviable as required by national policy. The need for new infrastructure is recognised and will be addressed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No change	416	Kay Adams

Housing Allocations				
Principal Town				
<p>[Objects to additional housing developments in Coalville, given existing road congestion, long waits for medical appointments, and the loss of green space.]</p>	<p>The need for new housing nationally is significant as recognised in national policy.</p> <p>The Broom Leys Farm site is located within the Coalville Urban Area which is defined in the settlement hierarchy as the Principal Town to where “The largest amount of new development will be directed”. The site is well related to services and facilities as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The County Highway Authority has advised that a safe and suitable access is achievable.</p> <p>The draft policy requires the provision of S106 contributions towards the cost of a variety of infrastructure.</p>	No change	228	Lisa Hooper
Land at Broom Leys Farm, Broom Leys Road, Coalville (C46)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient school, medical, and dental facilities for new housing developments Loss of countryside and the increased flood risk 	<p>These comments were also made in relation to C18, C19a, C19b and so were reported to the 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee.</p>	No change	28	Zoe Williams

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heavy traffic and unsafe roads near Stephenson's Way throughout the day 				
[Objects to the number of houses planned for Torrington Avenue, Hall Lane, Broomleys Farm, Off Stephenson's Way and Thornborough Road from a traffic, road safety and flooding perspective]			55	Paul Rowe
[Resubmission of comments originally submitted in 2024]	Comments were reported and responded to as part of the 16 December 2024 Local Plan Committee.	No change	412	Jamie Bishop
<i>South of Church Lane, New Swannington (C48)</i>				
[Object to allocation of this site]	The same comments were made in relation to C18 and/or C19a/C19b and so were reported to the 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee.	No change	213; 214; 239; 240; 245;	Matt Bennett; Michael Angrave; Alwyn Hill; Brienne Bennett; Jayne Angrave;
<i>Land at Lily Bank, Thringstone (C74)</i>				
[The site should be allocated for 84 dwellings]	The Planning Committee of 16 December 2024 agreed to allocate this site for 64 dwellings as per the previous submissions. At this stage as no significant evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that a greater amount of development would be acceptable in planning or highway terms, it is considered	No change	136	Andrew Large Surveyors

	prudent to continue to assume a capacity of 64 dwellings.			
Broad Location West Whitwick (C47, C77, C78, C86, C81)				
[Objects to the proposed allocation of this site]	The same comments were made in relation to C18 and so were reported to the 30 July 2025 Local Plan Committee	No change	404; 406	Jay Rocks; Claire Caulfield
Housing Allocations				
New settlement - Isley Woodhouse (IW1)				
[Agrees with the proposed housing figure of 4,250 (reduced from 4,500) as this aligns with the planning application]	Noted	No change	78	Oxalis (Harworth Estates & Caesarea]
[Considers the 1,950 homes anticipated at IW1 up to 2042 to be an underestimation. Confident that the delivery rate could be closer to 250dpa after 3-4 years on site / a further 525 homes could be delivered up to 2042, meaning the Council would need to allocate additional sites. The allocation of land to the west of Castle Donington for residential development could have the potential to reduce the build out rate at Isley Woodhouse, as both sites will be competing within the same market]	This issue was addressed in reports to Local Plan Committee on 17 January 2024 and on 16 December 2024. Notwithstanding the fact that a planning application for the new settlement has been submitted, there is still significant uncertainty, particularly in respect of transport related issues which mean an assumed start date before 2032/33 would be risk to the plan.	No change	78	Oxalis (Harworth Estates & Caesarea]

[The delivery assumptions for IW1 are overly optimistic and not supported by sufficient evidence]			255, 289, 290	William Davis; Fisher German (Mr Botham); Fisher German (Richborough Estates)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Continues to object to the proposed new settlement (IW1). • It should be made clear that the 1,950 dwellings is not a reduction in site capacity, but what can be built by 2042. • Disappointed by lack of progress on area of separation between Diseworth and IW1] 	<p>Noted. The Regulation 19 Plan will be accompanied by a housing trajectory which will provide further clarity on the number of homes IW1 will be allocated for and when they are expected to be constructed.</p> <p>Work has been commissioned to consider the issue of separation between Isley Woodhouse and Diseworth</p>	No change	101	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council
Housing Allocations				
Key Service Centres				
[General objection to more development in Ashby]	The strategy for allocating housing sites in Ashby and the reasons for allocating/not allocating sites have been reported to several previous Local Plan Committees.	No change	409; 418;	Hayley Essen; Jane Plackett
<i>Land north of Moira Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A25) & Land south of Moira Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A26)</i>				
[The sites should be allocated for housing in the Local Plan]	Officers responded to these representations as part of the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee	No change	289	Fisher German (Mr Botham)

<i>South of Burton Road, Ashby de la Zouch (A27)</i>				
Lack of sufficient notice and engagement to local residents. The council has known about this development since at least 2017, but residents not made aware.	This site was included as part of the draft Local Plan consulted upon in February and March 2024. Prior to that it was identified in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) since 2018. The SHELAA has been available since then on the Council's website.	No change	34,35, 41,71,75,76,77,86,94,152	Roger Baker, Demi Middleton, Eve Bird, Oliver Ison, Reuben Hall-McNair, Janet Ruffoni, Paul Cruise, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, James Peck, Abigail Kingaby
Contrary to previously agreed development boundaries which were in place to stop urban sprawl and protect wildlife and green spaces.	The Council is required to allocate sufficient sites to meet the future requirements of the district. 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.	No change	34,71	Roger Baker, Oliver Ison
Impact and disruption to existing residents during construction of any development. This will be in terms of traffic, but also noise and dust. This will impact those with health issues such as asthma.	Any proposed development will be required to comply with other policies of the plan which seek to ensure that the amenity of existing residents is protected during the construction phase of any development.	No change	34,37,71, 75,77,152,266, 383	Roger Baker, Nicola Briggs, Oliver Ison, Reuben Hall-McNair, Paul Cruise, Abigail Kingaby, Laura Tucker, Darren Thompson

Additional traffic impact upon existing residents of Rushey Close. Issues already when buses and lorries use Bishops Hall Road, for example having to mount kerbs. Also results in congestion on local roads. Rushey Road is not fit for purpose and could not cope with the additional traffic; Burton Road would be a more suitable point of access. There would be a loss of spaces for parking where new road will go through and an increase in noise.	Leicestershire County Council as the highway authority has not raised an objection to the proposal.	No change	34,37,41,67,71, 75, 76, 77,85,86, 94, 152,266, 383, 384	Roger Baker, Nicola Briggs, Eve Bird
Outside of previously agreed Limits to Development which have been moved to accommodate new development but without communicating to local residents.	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. The draft Local plan was subject to public consultation between 5 February and 17 March 2024. The responses to that consultation were considered by the Local Plan Committee of 11 March 2025.	No change	35,37,71, 94, 152, 384	Demi Middleton, Nicola Briggs, Oliver Ison, James Peck, Abigal Kingaby, Sahel Najib
Site lies within National Forest and borders a Birch tree plantation and hedgerows used by nesting birds.	The sites' location within the National Forest does not preclude development. Instead, it will be necessary to ensure that any development reflects its National Forest setting and that it	No change	35,71,94	Demi Middleton, Oliver Ison, James Peck

	includes tree planting consistent with the requirements of the policies of the Local Plan.			
Located within Special Area of conservation for River Mease.	Whilst the site is located within the catchment for the River Mease Special Area of Conservation, this does not preclude development subject to satisfying the requirements of policy En2.	No change	35,71,152	Demi Middleton, Oliver Ison, Abigail Kingaby
Impact upon local amenities such as doctors, dentists and schools.	Policy IF1 ((Development and Infrastructure) requires that new development contribute towards the provision of new infrastructure to mitigate its impact upon local communities. In accordance with national policy, the nature and scale of any such provision must be related to the scale of development proposed. This means that for larger pieces of infrastructure, such as new school, it will be necessary for a number of developments to contribute towards such infrastructure. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is in the process of being prepared which will identify the specific infrastructure requirements arising from individual sites.	No change	37, 41,67,71,86, 152,383	Nicola Briggs, Eve Bird, Patrick Marston, Oliver Ison, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, Abigal Kingaby, Darren Thompson

Site is designated as greenbelt land which provides an ecological and recreation resource for Ashby community.	There is no Green Belt within the district. In the adopted Local Plan, the site is identified as countryside. As required under national legislation, any new development will be required to include provision for Biodiversity Net Gain as part of any future development to offset the impact upon the local ecology. Whilst a public footpath crosses the site, the majority of the site is not publicly accessible. As required in the draft policy any future development will be required to retain and enhance this footpath.	No change	67,86,266, 383	Patrick Marston, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, Laura Tucker, Darren Thompson
Development would set precedent.	Each individual proposal must be considered on its own specific merits.	No change	67	Patrick Marston
Loss of open countryside and views over fields.	The protection of areas of countryside must be balanced against the need to address the future housing requirements through the allocation of land for development. In landscape terms a Landscape Sensitivity Assessment identifies that the site is part of wider landscape that is judged to be of medium-low sensitivity. Other areas around Ashby de la Zouch are judged to be of higher sensitivity.	No change	71,76, 86,	Oliver Ison, Janet Ruffoni, David and Elizabeth Sanderson

Impact upon local wildlife and pollution run off from construction work.	The draft policy includes specific requirements to support wildlife and habitats, including securing biodiversity net gain improvements in accordance with national requirements and to retain existing trees and hedgerows within and on the boundaries of the site. There are no ecological designations, such as Sites of special Scientific Interest, which apply to the site. Any development will be subject to a range of planning conditions to ensure that any impact from construction activity is minimised as far as possible and consistent with other legal requirements.	No change	71,75,77, 86, 94,152	Oliver Ison, Reuben Hall-McNair, Paul Cruise, David and Elizabeth Sanderson, James Peck, Abigal Kingaby,
Loss of privacy for existing residents.	All policies in the plan must be taken together when considering planning applications. Draft policy AP2 (Amenity) requires that new development be designed to ensure that its impact on existing residents in the vicinity of the proposed development is acceptable.	No change	71,152, 383	Oliver Ison, Abigail Kingaby, Darren Thompson
Potential increase in crime during the construction phase and afterwards as there will be more people around.	These are matters which are not under the control of the planning system. There is no evidence that residents, workers and visitors to this site will be any more likely to commit crime or	No change	71	Oliver Ison

	anti-social behaviour than anyone else.			
Decrease in the value of homes.	The impact upon the price of existing properties is not a material planning consideration.	No change	71,85, 152, 383	Oliver Ison, Daniel Evans, Abigail Kingaby, Darren Thompson
Assessment of sites is misleading in respect of distance to services and facilities as it uses straight line measurements which will result in shorter distances.	The site assessment methodology uses a consistent approach when assessing individual sites thus ensuring that no site is at an advantage to any other site.	No change	71, 152	Oliver Ison, Abigail Kingaby,
Impact upon local footpaths which are used by local residents.	As per the draft policy any future development will be required to retain and enhance this footpath.	No change	75	Reuben Hall-McNair
Residents were misled when purchasing their homes as they were advised that the site was Greenbelt, protected farmland and that no new development would be allowed.	There is no Green Belt within the district. The Council is not responsible for any advice provided by the developer or any other parties. There is no record of the Council having provided such advice.	No change	94	James Peck,
Ashby has already taken a significant amount of new housing development in recent years. This has put pressure on local infrastructure and resulted in the loss of areas of countryside.	Ashby de la Zouch is identified in the settlement hierarchy as a Key Service Centre (together with Castle Donington), which is the second level in the hierarchy. It is also the second largest	No change	94	James Peck

	<p>settlement in the district in population terms behind the Coalville Urban Area and also has an extensive range of services and facilities. It is, therefore, appropriate that a significant amount of new housing is directed to Ashby de la Zouch.</p> <p>Policy IF1 ((Development and Infrastructure) requires that new development contribute towards the provision of new infrastructure to mitigate its impact upon local communities.</p> <p>This site, together, with a smaller site to the north of Burton Road, are the only new allocations over and above those included in the adopted Local Plan.</p>			
Impact upon residents as additional groundworks required which could have been undertaken when Rushey Close was built.	At the time that Rushey Close was being built there was no need to make provision for future development as the housing needs at that point in time had been addressed. It would not have been reasonable for the Council to require a developer to undertake additional works, the need for which was not sufficiently clear or justified.	No change	152	Abigail Kingaby

Additional light pollution will impact wildlife, but also local residents.	All policies in the plan must be taken together when considering planning applications. Draft policy AP2 (Amenity) includes specific provision to ensure that lighting schemes are designed to minimise light pollution.	No change	152	Abigail Kingaby
Impact upon ability to run a business from home due to the loss of views.	It is a long-established principle in English Law that there is no right to a view from a property.	No change	152	Abigail Kingaby
Proposed development appears to be excessive.	The Council is required to allocate sufficient sites to meet the future requirements of the district.	No change	383	Darren Thompson
Housing allocations				
Local Service Centres				
<i>Land off Leicester Road, Ibstock (Ib18)</i>				
[Wants to be kept in the loop regarding planning applications on this land]	The Council's Statement of Community Involvement states: <i>"Neighbour notification by letter is the principal method of consultation on most planning applications. For most planning applications, letters are sent to all owners/occupiers of properties that immediately adjoin the boundary of the application site. In addition, the Council will notify more widely where an application is likely to have a wider impact."</i>	No change	396	Carol Metcalf

Land at Station Road, Ibstock (lb23)				
[An increased housing buffer should be added to the housing requirement; this site should be allocated to meet the increased requirement.]	See comments in relation to the housing buffer above. This site has been assessed in detail and is not considered necessary to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
Land north of Bosworth Road, Measham (M18)				
Welcomes the Council's intention to allocate more housing in Measham but urge the Council to reconsider the proposed allocations – M18 is a more suitable and deliverable allocation.	The proposed allocation of additional sites in Measham was justified as part of the 11 March Local Plan Committee. The suitability of M18 was considered as part of this process and it was concluded that the site is not needed to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.	No change	111	Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes)
Housing Allocations				
Sustainable Villages				
East and West of Measham Road, Appleby Magna (Ap13a, Ap13b & Ap13c)				
[This site should be allocated in the Local Plan for 70 to 85 dwellings]	Officers responded to these representations as part of the 11 March 2025 Local Plan Committee	No change	290	Fisher German (Richborough Estates)
Main Street/Tongue Lane, Breedon on the Hill (Br5)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions why a site in Appleby Magna was chosen over Breedon on the Hill Appleby Magna scored lower (8) in the Council's Settlement Study compared to Breedon on the Hill (10). 	Housing allocations are proposed across several of the District's Sustainable Villages, with officers having undertaken a comprehensive assessment of sites.	No change	79	Cora

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Br5 should be considered instead of Appleby Magna. 	<p>However no Local Plan allocation is proposed in Breedon on the Hill given its recently adopted Neighbourhood Plan which includes a housing allocation. Permission has also now been granted for the development of this site. There is no requirement for the Council to allocate additional sites in Breedon on the Hill to meets its housing needs up to 2042.</p>			
<i>Newton Road, Heather (H1)</i>				
<p>[An increased housing buffer should be added to the housing requirement; this site should be allocated to meet the increased requirement.]</p>	<p>See comments in relation to the housing buffer above. This site has been assessed in detail and is not required to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.</p>	No change	150	Leicestershire County Council (landowner)
<i>Land off Ashby Road, Moira (Mo8)</i>				
<p>[Strongly supports the allocation of the site for 70 dwellings]</p>	<p>Local Plan Committee on 11 March 2025 agreed the proposed allocation of land off Ashby Road, Moira (Mo8) for around 49 dwellings for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. The detailed site assessment noted that development of the front part of the site would be acceptable whilst the rear part of the site would be out of character, at a</p>	No change	137	Metacre Limited

	significant depth compared to the current built form and would represent an encroachment into the countryside. The detailed site assessment concluded that development should be restricted to the frontage part only of the site.			
<i>Land at School Lane, Oakthorpe (Oa5)</i>				
[The site could be expanded to include additional land in the same ownership and deliver more housing – a site plan accompanies the representations]	Land ownership is noted. The proposed allocation of Oa5 is for around 47 dwellings and includes land to the south to facilitate the provision of open space. This scale of development is appropriate considering the District's future housing requirement and the scale and character of Oakthorpe.	No change	136	Andrew Large Surveyors
<i>Land south of Normanton Road, Packington (P4)</i>				
[The entry for P4 in Table 5 should be changed from eight to nine dwellings to reflect the current planning application for nine dwellings on this site.]	<p>Table 5 identifies 'eight' as the change in the capacity of allocation P4, which has been reduced from 18 to around 10 dwellings.</p> <p>The current planning application for nine dwellings has not yet been determined.</p>	No change	387	Stone Planning Services (Peveril Homes)

Land off Ibstock Road, Ravenstone (R18)				
<p>[This site should be allocated as it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the control of a housebuilder with local expertise. • Well-located, unconstrained, and visually contained. • Offers good access to local services and infrastructure. • More sustainable than some preferred allocations (e.g., Thringstone). 	<p>The proposed allocation of an additional site in Ravenstone was justified as part of the 11 March Local Plan Committee. The suitability of R18 was considered as part of this process and it was concluded that the site is not needed to meet the Council's housing needs up to 2042.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>255</p>	<p>William Davis</p>

Employment Allocations				
<i>Land north of Derby Road Kegworth (EMP73 part)</i>				
We welcome the suggestion in the consultation document that the land proposed to be allocated north of Remembrance Way could be suitable for strategic warehousing. However, we also believe that the land north of Derby Road could similarly help to deliver for strategic needs.	Noted. Local Plan Committee on 16 December 2024 provisionally agreed Land north of Derby Road (EMP73 part) as a general needs employment site for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. A study which will quantify the future need for strategic warehousing in Leicester and Leicestershire is underway. This study, once finalised, will inform the selection of sites for inclusion in the Local Plan.	Officers will bear this information in mind when considering the implications of the forthcoming strategic warehousing study for site allocations in the emerging Local Plan.	69	Curzon Coaker Trust and CHC Children's Settlement
<i>West of Hilltop, Castle Donington (EMP89)</i>				
The parish council is minded to accept the change for EMP89 if there is not a proven need for offices.	Noted. For context, this comment relates to the decision, made following the Regulation 18 public consultation (2024), to omit offices as one of the potential uses at EMP89.	No change.	336	Castle Donington PC

Other				
'No comment'	Noted	No change	100; 145; 278; 309	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council; Charnwood Borough Council; Breaston Parish Council; Canal & River Trust
Did not attach response / wrote response in subject box	Officers unable to respond	No change	341; 482; 484; 485	Taz Edwards; John Sadler; Maggie Daulby; Maureen Smart