

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/006	Angela Brooks	Fisher German obo DWH	M001	MM10	DS1	Table 1	refer to their comments on 5YHLS (EXAM 58L). Plan period should extend to 2039/2040 for 15 year period on adoption.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M002	MM10	DS1	Table 1	object, inadequate plan period, should run to 2040, no deliverable five year housing land supply on adoption, additional years should be included, and a 10% buffer.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M003	MM101	OS1	OS1 bullet 3	MM101, third bullet, should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/039	Andrew Thomas	TT Planning Ltd obo Mr S Scottorn	M004	MM101 New Proposed Main Mods	OS1		Policy OS1 should be amended to ' <i>is small-scale and within defined Limits to Development or else is in accordance with Policy DS1 and protects the intrinsic character of the Countryside <b>where the proposal involves employment development outside Limits to Development</b></i> '	Disagree. Not discussed during examination.
MMC/023	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M005	MM102	C1	new 3.226	Support	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M006	MM102	C1	After 3.226	MM102 is supported	Noted
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M007	MM102	C1	3.226	Do not support definition of limits to development. Fundamentally inconsistent with national policy to denote the land within the LUA boundary including our client's site at Gorse Hill as countryside. It is irrational that the policy is in effect drafted to indicate that countryside inside the Leicester Urban Area would not accord with application proposals recognised as opportunities to boost supply in circumstances of a land supply deficit. There is no rationale to define Countryside with reference to Limits of Development in locations with such urban characteristics (i.e. not undeveloped in character).	Disagree. Limits to development methodology discussed at hearing sessions. Omission site.
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M008	MM102 New Proposed Main Mods	C1	3.226	Second part of 3.226 should be amended as follows - Policies Map 1 sets out the Limits to Development, Countryside ( <b>beyond the LUA boundary</b> ), Green Wedge and Areas of Local Separation. The principles outlined above will be applied to the Housing Allocations as they progress to detailed permissions and which postdate the preparation of the Policies Map.	Disagree. Limits to development methodology discussed at hearing sessions. Omission site.
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M009	MM102 New Proposed Main Mods	C1	3.226	Para 3.226 should be amended to - The Limits to Development follow the boundaries of the Housing Allocations, including the Sustainable Urban Extensions, and outline planning permissions where there is no detailed planning permission. Where detailed planning permission has been secured (full planning permission or reserved matters), the Limits to Development take account of approved plans and will define the settlement by enclosing the established, cohesive built form. <b>Beyond the Leicester Urban Area boundary</b> Countryside (and, where appropriate, Green Wedge and Areas of Local Separation) designations occupy the undeveloped land immediately beyond the cohesive built form (once defined by detailed planning permission).	Disagree. Limits to development methodology discussed at hearing sessions. Omission site.
MMC/039	Andrew Thomas	TT Planning Ltd obo Mr S Scottorn	M010	MM105 New Proposed Main Mods	C1		Policy C1 should be amended as follows 'supporting <b>all forms of</b> rural economic development <b>and employment creation which protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside including those</b> which <b>has have</b> a strong relationship with the operational requirements of agriculture, horticulture, forestry and other land-based industries'	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M011	MM106	H2	4.17	MM106 is supported	Noted
MMC/034	Natasha Styles	Planning Bureau obo McCarthy Stone & Churchill Living	M012	MM107	H2		Support removal of reference to M4 (3) as this was not effective.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M013	MM107	H2		MM107 is supported	Noted
MMC/034	Natasha Styles	Planning Bureau obo McCarthy Stone & Churchill Living	M014	MM108	H3	after 4.19	Support recognition that NDSS has a cost implication and flexibility may be needed	Noted
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M015	MM108	H3	after 4.19	Concerns over deviation from space standards for social housing. Having sufficient space in a home has a huge impact on the quality of life for the occupiers. Would like to see a different compromise such as less privately owned homes on a development.	Noted
MMC/034	Natasha Styles	Planning Bureau obo McCarthy Stone & Churchill Living	M016	MM109	H4	4.33	Support recognition that the 'viability evidence shows that neither sheltered housing nor extra care housing developments are likely to be viable if a contribution towards affordable housing is sought'	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M017	MM11	DS1	Table 2	object , inadequate plan period, should run to 2040, no deliverable five year housing land supply on adoption, additional years should be included, and a 10% buffer.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions.
MMC/034	Natasha Styles	Planning Bureau obo McCarthy Stone & Churchill Living	M018	MM110	H4		Support ammendment, makes policy justified.	Noted
MMC/041	Hannah Price	William Davis Homes	M019	MM112 New Proposed Main Mods	H6		Object to requirement for self build/ custom build on sites of 250 more dwellings. There are issues relating to health and safety, compliance with any site wide construction management plan, accordance with site wide design principles and the likelihood that those seeking self/custom build plots will not want plots on large scale housing estates (as is set out in paragraph 4.45 of the emerging Local Plan). As such, this part of the policy is not effective and therefore unsound. Policy should be amended as follows to remove reference to 250 dwellings - <b>We will seek the provision of at least five serviced plots for self-build and custom housebuilding on sites of more than 250 dwellings. Where plots have been made available and marketed appropriately for at least for a 12 month marketing period and have not sold, the plots can be used to deliver general market housing.</b> "	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions.
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M020	MM12	DS1	2.16	little contingency allowed to respond positively to failure of allocated sites to deliver, identified supply not guaranteed.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions.
MMC/039	Andrew Thomas	TT Planning Ltd obo Mr S Scottorn	M021	MM123 New Proposed Main Mods	E3		Policy E3 does not encourage the development of new businesses in the Countryside. Suggest following amendments: We will maximise the potential of our rural economy by 2037 by supporting development <b>within the Countryside, including land and buildings outside identified Settlement Development Limits that:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides <del>small</del> small scale, sustainable growth and expansion of existing and new businesses in rural areas both through conversion and <b>re-use</b> of existing buildings and <b>previously developed land</b> and <b>through the construction of</b> well-designed new <b>or replacement</b> buildings;.....</li> <li>provides tourism and leisure facilities, particularly developments that benefit the Great Central Railway, the River Soar and Grand Union Canal, the National Forest Strategy and the Charnwood Forest Regional Park; and <b>protects the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the Countryside in terms of its scate, character and operationat requirements</b></li> </ul>	Disagree.
MMC/016	Daniel Fleet	NHS Property Services Ltd	M022	MM125	T2		Inclusion of Healthcare facilities in definition of community facilities has a potentially harmful impact. In respect of redundant healthcare facilities requiring consideration of alternative community uses adds unjustified delay to disposal. It should be accepted that a facility is neither needed or viable for current use if identified for disposal.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M023	MM125	T2		MM125 is supported	Noted
MMC/016	Daniel Fleet	NHS Property Services Ltd	M024	MM125 New Proposed Main Mods	T2		Proposed additional change.. the second and third criteria should be combined to make it clear that the third criteria regarding marketing evidence is not needed if the first criteria is satisfied. As follows: "we will protect community facilities and support their enhancement. Development resulting in the loss of an existing community facility will only be permitted where: * suitable alternative provision exists or will be provided in an equally accessible or more accessible location within 800m walking distance; or * <u>the existing facility is a healthcare facility that has been declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS or identified as surplus as part of a published estates strategy or service transformation plan; or</u> * all reasonable efforts have been made to preserve the facility, but it has been demonstrated that it would not be economically viable, feasible or practicable to retain the building or site for its existing use; and *evidence is provided .....	Disagree. Not discussed during examination.
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M025	MM128	CC1	7.13-7.19	sequential testing has been long debated and expecting further guidance in near future may be better to just refer to NPPG. The mod itself doesn't accurately reflect updated NPPG in that seeks Sequential Testing for all sites subject to any extent of flood risk at the application stage. NPPG confirms not necessary to apply sequential test if the site is allocated and matter dealt with in Local Plan process or site at low risk from all sources. The LP should recognise this. Suggest LP defers to national guidance.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M026	MM128	CC1	7.13-7.19	MM128 requires modification to be sound. The addition of reference to areas at risk of surface water flooding follows recent case law which suggests sequential tests are needed for surface water flooding as well as fluvial flooding. This case law is however being challenged through the courts and the outcome of this will not be known until next year. It is suggested that the supporting text could be future proofed by referencing the sequential test and exception test in accordance with national policy requirements rather than specifying the flood zones and surface water flooding specifically.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M027	MM128	CC1	7.13-7.19	MM128 is supported	Noted
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M028	MM129	CC1		sequential testing has been long debated and expecting further guidance in near future may be better to just refer to NPPG. The mod itself doesn't accurately reflect updated NPPG in that seeks Sequential Testing for all sites subject to any extent of flood risk at the application stage. NPPG confirms not necessary to apply sequential test if the site is allocated and matter dealt with in Local Plan process or site at low risk from all sources. The LP should recognise this. Suggest LP defers to national guidance.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M029	MM130	C2	7.22-7.24	MM130 is supported	Noted
MMC/009	Nigel Trasler	Haddon Way Residents Association	M030	MM131	They note CC2 but mean CC1		Support policy.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/041	Hannah Price	William Davis Homes	M031	MM131	CC2		There is no clarity in the emerging Local Plan on how the potential for cumulative impact will be established or how mitigation could be incorporated across multiple sites which individually may not give rise to an impact and may not be able to provide them on site. Neither the NPPG (ibid.) or the NPPF (paragraph 167 and 175) identify any requirement or expectation that non-major and minor developments should incorporate SUDS. Alternative measures of addressing local storage capacity issues or flood flows may be more appropriate. There is an inconsistency in wording between CC1, which merely encourages the inclusion of SUDS on non-major and minor developments, and CC2 which expects the inclusion of SUDS. This should be addressed to ensure that decision makers know how to respond. CC2 should be reworded to only encourage the inclusion of SuDs on non-major and minor developments where there is evidence that it is necessary and directly related to the development	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M032	MM138	CC5	7.54	reference to Transport Strategies now in INF 2. refer to response to MM157 and MM158 . Until Transport Strategies are robustly evidenced, impact on viability fully accounted for and adopted as DPD or CIL the LP should seek highway contributions directly related to the development etc CIL Reg compliant.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M033	MM138	CC5	para 7.54	object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M034	MM138	CC5	para 7.54	MM138 should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M035	MM139	CC5	para 7.56	object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M036	MM139	CC5	7.56	MM139 should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M037	MM14		2.29	extent of Leicester Urban Area as defined is too limited. conclude that their site East of Thurcaston should be allocated.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions. Omission site
MMC/009	Nigel Trasler	Haddon Way Residents Association	M038	MM140	CC5		Support policy, however, money is still not allocated to mitigate impacts of HA15 and HA16. This is a huge omission and CBC/ LCC should include designs and ring fence monies.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M039	MM140	CC5		The term 'at least good' is not defined and is essentially worthless in terms of ensuring sufficient effectiveness to be considered sound. 'At least good' should be defined.	Agree, consider this is an 'other/ additional modification' suggest adding the definitions used regarding accessibility to the glossary should the Inspectors consider this appropriate. The definition would be along the lines of "a 'good' level of accessibility for a public transport service being of at least 30 minute frequency and providing access to employment opportunities and higher order services and a less than 30 minute journey time via walking or cycling."
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M040	MM140	CC5		object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2



REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/041	Hannah Price	William Davis Homes	M041	MM140 New Proposed Main Mods	CC5		As drafted the policy appears to require development of any size or type to secure enhancements to bus services if it is more than 400m away from an existing stop. Not every development will be able to justify a new bus stop and/or a diversion of bus service. Policy CC5 should be reworded as follows "secures, <u>where justified</u> , <u>where possible</u> , new and enhanced bus services..."	Discussed at hearing sessions. Proposed change is supported should Inspectors consider this appropriate
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M042	MM15	DS1	new para after 2.29	fails to include adjoining settlements to north of Leicester such as Thurcaston (land east of Thurcaston also has sustainable connections to North of Birstall SUE). Definition should be revisited.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M043	MM152	INF1	9.5	Support.	Noted
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M044	MM152	INF1	9.5	support modifications. A well evidence Planning Obligations SPD will be important. in the interim approach must be compliant with CIL Regulations.	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M045	MM152	INF1	9.5	MM152 is supported	Noted
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M046	MM152	INF1	9.5	support modifications. A well evidence Planning Obligations SPD will be important. in the interim approach must be compliant with CIL Regulations.	Noted
MMC/038	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M047	MM152	INF1	para 9.5	support modifications. A well evidence Planning Obligations SPD will be important. In the interim approach must be compliant with CIL Regulations.	Noted
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M048	MM152	INF1	9.5	MM recognises that funding is unlikely to be sufficient to fund the envisaged infrastructure. It puts faith in the production of a Planning Obligations SPD. It suggests that in the interim contributions will be sought on a site-by-site basis according to a scheme's overall viability. This demonstrates the issues arising from the failure to consider the cost of essential infrastructure prior to accepting sites as suitable for development. This is an inherent problem of the current planning system and the call for sites process in conjunction with the interpretation of what is considered to be sound.	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M049	MM152	INF1	para 9.5	object to uncertainty over proposed funding of infrastructure, including off site highways works, arising as a result of proposed allocations and the CTCs, uncertainty over preparation of a planning obligations SPD for which there is no timescale. Planning applications with resolutions and/or working through the system and will impact on pooling contributions and funding to free up constraints.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M050	MM152	INF1	9.2	the Plan's failure to address national planning policy requirements in respect of planning obligations and its references to the preparation of freestanding 'developer contributions policies' which are at risk of being unlawful;	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M051	MM152	INF1	9.5	MM152 should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M052	MM154	INF1	after para 9.11	object to uncertainty over planning obligations piecemeal approach - some development plan policy, mostly not. We objected to LCC refresh of Planning Obligations Policy and enclose a copy of the response	LCC Planning Obligations Policy is not part of the Local Plan.
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M053	MM155	INF1	9.13	Support.	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M054	MM155	INF1	9.13	MM155 is supported	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M055	MM155	INF1	para 9.13	Objection to modification, wording should stay. Assessing deliverability is an essential part of the current examination including cumulative costs. Should have been done by the Council already.	Disagree. Discussed at Hearings
MMC/016	Daniel Fleet	NHS Property Services Ltd	M056	MM156	INF1		Supports	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M057	MM156	INF1		Support	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M058	MM156		INF1	MM156 is supported	Noted
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M059	MM156	INF1		MM is intended to improve soundness and clarity for a range of infrastructure in the Infrastructure Schedule including transport improvements and working. It refers to priorities and funding needed to mitigate the impacts of development and pooling of contributions in a cumulative way across several sites. It recognises that timing and viability considerations may be a barrier to delivery. Refers to their response to MM152, MM157 and MM158	Noted. Refer to responses to MM152, MM157 and MM158
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M060	MM156	INF1		object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments. INF1 is unsound as a result of uncertainty over legality and delivery	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. In respect of Policy INF1 disagree.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M061	MM156	INF1		Fundamental issues with the way that the Local Plan proposes to deal with the provision of infrastructure, the Plan fails to clarify what infrastructure will or is likely to be required and how infrastructure requirements link back to the allocations that the Plan proposes to make;	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M062	MM156	INF1		the Plan's references to the pooling of developer contributions in ways that appear to replicate a levy or development tax and, if so, would be unlawful;	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M063	MM156	INF1		MM156 should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/024	Phoebe Conway	Marrons obo Richborough, William Davis & Bowler Family	M064	MM156 New Proposed Main Mods	INF1		as drafted INF1 fails to relate the highways infrastructure impacts of development to those identified in any Transport Assessment submitted as part of a planning application. This is a central mechanism for understanding sites direct impact on Road network and should be used to determine whether off site transport infrastructure improvements/ contributions are required. Propose further modification to INF1 " contributes to the reasonable costs of any infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of the development strategy including through the pooling of developer contributions where it is demonstrated <u>through robust and appropriate Transport assessments</u> , that the impacts can only be addressed in a comprehensive way including cumulative and cross boundary impacts;"	Disagree. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport assessments.'
MMC/025	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Bellway Homes	M065	MM156 New Proposed Main Mods	INF1		as drafted INF1 fails to relate the highways infrastructure impacts of development to those identified in any Transport Assessment submitted as part of a planning application. This is a central mechanism for understanding sites direct impact on Road network and should be used to determine whether off site transport infrastructure improvements/ contributions are required. Propose further modification to INF1 " contributes to the reasonable costs of any infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of the development strategy including through the pooling of developer contributions where it is demonstrated <u>through robust and appropriate Transport Assessments</u> , that the impacts can only be addressed in a comprehensive way including cumulative and cross boundary impacts;"	Disagree. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport assessments.'

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M066	MM156 New Proposed Main Mods	INF1		need to provide further clarity in respect of reasonable costs of the on and offsite infrastructure needed to mitigate the impacts of each individual development. INF1 fails to relate the highways infrastructure impacts of a particular development to contributions that may be sought through various Transport Strategies. LP not accompanied by CIL charging schedule so all the more important to be compliant with CIL Reg 122. Should not endorse schemes such as CTCS which is not being examined as DPD or even advanced as SPD. Does not establish the relationship between the effects of a development and contribution it seeks. Central to understanding a sites direct impact on road/ transport network and this should determined whether off site transport infrastructure improvements/ contributions are required. Proposed change: "contributes to the reasonable costs of any infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of the development <u>in question strategy</u> , including through the pooling of developer contributions where it is demonstrated through appropriate and robust evidence, <u>including Transport Assessments</u> , that the impacts of that development can only be addressed in a <u>fair, reasonable and proportionate way</u> , and are <u>necessary to make that development acceptable if made in a</u> comprehensive way, including cumulative and cross boundary impacts;...	The Council intends to introduce a CIL. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport assessments.'
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M067	MM156 New Proposed Main Mods	INF1		need to provide further clarity in respect of reasonable costs of the on and offsite infrastructure needed to mitigate the impacts of each individual development. INF1 fails to relate the highways infrastructure impacts of a development with those identified by any Transport Assessment submitted with a planning application. Consider that as a central mechanism for understanding the direct impacts of a development and should be used to determine whether off site improvements/ contirbutions are required. Proposed change " contributes to the reasonable costs of any infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of the development strategy, including through the pooling of developer contributions where it is demonstrated <u>through appropriate and robust evidence, including Transport Assessments</u> , that the impacts can only be addressed in a comprehensive way, including cumulative and cross boundary impacts;...	The Council intends to introduce a CIL. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, the need for evidence is implicit in the use of the word 'demonstrated' and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport assessments.'
MMC/044	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Ashberry Strategic Land	M068	MM156 New Proposed Main Mods	INF1		There is a need to provide further clarity in respect of the provision of the reasonable costs of the on and off-site infrastructure needed to mitigate the impacts of the development. As currently drafted, and subject to the acceptance of MM156, Policy INF1 fails to relate the highways infrastructure impacts of a development to those identified within any associated Transport Assessment submitted as part of a planning application. We consider that this is a central mechanism in the pursuit of understanding a sites direct impact on the road network and should be utilised to determine whether off-site transport infrastructure improvements/contributions are required. Suggest amendment to MM:  ' to the reasonable costs of any infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of the development strategy including through the pooling of developer contributions where it is demonstrated <u>through appropriate and robust evidence including Transport Assessments</u> , that the impacts can only be addressed in a comprehensive way including cumulative and cross boundary impacts; and'	Disagree. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, the need for evidence is implicit in the use of the word 'demonstrated' and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport assessments.'

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/046	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Richborough	M069	MM156 New Proposed Main Mods	INF1		As currently drafted MM156 fails to relate the highways infrastructure impacts of a development to those identified within any associated Transport Assessment submitted as part of a planning application. This is a central mechanism in the pursuit of understanding a sites direct impact on the road network and should be utilised to determine whether off-site transport infrastructure improvements/contributions are required. Propose amendment to MM156:  'contributes to the reasonable costs of any infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of the development strategy including through the pooling of developer contributions where it is demonstrated through appropriate <u>and robust evidence including Transport Assessments</u> , that the impacts can only be addressed in a comprehensive way including cumulative and cross boundary impacts; and'	Disagree. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, the need for evidence is implicit in the use of the word 'demonstrated' and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport assessments.'
MMC/007	Paul Herbert		M070	MM157	INF2	9.14-9.26	Still no detailed and coherent transport policy to say how Barrow will cope with extra traffic. These matters should be dealt with before detailed planning. Slash Lane & Bridge Street congested & flood regularly.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/010	Andy Collis	Gladmans	M071	MM157	INF2	9.14-9.19	we understand the approach proposed by LCC through CTCS is subject to scrutiny, and question regarding legality, and conflict with INF2 as proposed to be modified. Wish to reserve right to respond further to queries from Inspectors in this regard.	Noted
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M072	MM157	INF 2	9.14-9.19 supporting text	Policy and text require further modification. Cite NPPF para 34 and PPG. Seeks to impose a CIL via S106 without the statutory and national policy checks of either. Attach their response to the CTCS consultation highlighting concerns regarding compliance, adequacy of supporting evidence, justification for mitigation and effectiveness of proposed means of implementation. Should be addressed either through policy in LP or a DPD subject to consultation and examination. Contributions must meet the CIL regulations. Text and policy should be amended. See MM158	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M073	MM157	INF2	9.14- 9.19	Refer to their response to the CTCS consultation (and include). Concern approach introduces policy outside statutory process, no substitute for a DPD. State Inspectors have made it clear that DPD is appropriate.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M074	MM157	INF2	para 9.22	not justified. Thurcaston is included for the purposes of the transport strategy but not in the Leciester Urban Area which is inconsistent.	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/045		CPRE Leicestershire	M075	MM157	INF2	9.14-9.19	Proposed changes do not overcome the fundamental failure to deal with the transport impacts of development in an appropriate manner. No information on how Transport Strategies will be effective, funded or influence future travel, they are too vague. Increasing capacity encourages more car use. There are issues with securing developer contributions across multiple sites, coming forward at different times and linking these to individual measures. SUEs have taken longer than envisaged and have low completion rates, none have a bus service or show how they will achieve lower car use from the outset. Insufficient regard given to sites in sustainable locations. Rep notes discrepancies in transport modelling. Proposed Contribution Methodology has weaknesses in terms of the timing and the expected funding it could deliver. Level of scrutiny of transport implications at the Examination was insufficient to explore the issues in enough detail. For the MM to be sound, it should be demonstrated that the proposed measures will contribute to the mitigation of climate change. References to specific junctions and diagrams that have been produced should be removed.	Disagree. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M076	MM157	INF2	para 9.14- 9.19	object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments. INF2 is unsound as a result of uncertainty over legality and delivery. Changes to INF 2 amount to complete rewrite and significant in implications for delivery of Local Plan overall. Evolving strategy for infrastructure has not been sufficiently developed and tested and as a result proposed changes are ineffective.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. Disagree re INF 2
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M077	MM157 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2	paras 9.14-9.19	Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Append response to CTCS consultation including legal opinion Paul Tucker KC and Constanze Bell 17 August 2024. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley. <b><u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document.....</u></b> " other consequential changes to the preceding explanation may be necessary	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M078	MM157 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2	paras 9.14-9.19	Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley. <b><u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document.....</u></b> " other consequential changes to the preceding explanation may be necessary	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/038	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M079	MM157 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2	paras 9.14-9.19	Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley. <b><u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document.....</u></b> " other consequential changes to the preceding explanation may be necessary	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/006	Angela Brooks	Fisher German obo DWH	M080	MM158	INF2		LCC Draft CTCS not subject to any hearings or direct examination, would be reasonable and appropriate to examine this due to relationship with CIL tests.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/007	Paul Herbert		M081	MM158	INF2		Still no detailed and coherent transport policy to say how Barrow will cope with extra traffic. These matters should be dealt with before detailed planning. Slash Lane & Bridge Street congested & flood regularly.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/010	Andy Collis	Gladmans	M082	MM158	INF2		as for MM157 and confirm commitment to working with the Council to bring forward residential development on allocated sites.	Noted
MMC/015	Sam Gale/ John Kirby	Lichfields obo St Philips Land Ltd	M083	MM158	INF2		contravenes CIL regulations and conflict with NPPF para 57, could jeopardise deliverability of housing. Roof tax approach not directly related in scale and kind to the development. To fund existing deficiencies would not be compliant.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/017	Rachel Danemann	Home Builders Federation	M084	MM158	INF2		Concerns regarding CTCS underpinning Policy INF2, refer to letter of 06/11/23 to additional examination documents. [Post Hearing Consultation Response - Home Builders Federation]. CLP relying on incomplete evidence and deferring to yet to be finalised Transport Strategies and question whether the formulation of costs in these strategies meet the CIL Regulations tests.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/017	Rachel Danemann	Home Builders Federation	M085	MM158	INF2	9.18	Wording indicates existing known deficiencies which it is inappropriate for new development to mitigate.	Noted
MMC/017	Rachel Danemann	Home Builders Federation	M086	MM158	INF2	9.38	indicates the strategies are not finalised, the costs not known and the viability of sites cannot have been fully tested. CLP seeking developers to sign up to unknown level of costs. Will delay housing delivery, make development unviable, and fails to meet CIL tests.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/017	Rachel Danemann	Home Builders Federation	M087	MM158	INF2		seek further examination hearings	Noted. Disagree
MMC/018	Bob Woollard	Planning & Design Group obo William Davis	M088	MM158	INF2		significant concerns about approach in the CTCS - detail in Rep includes potential for double counting between CTCS and INF2 contributions. Legal Opinion on CTCS included (Paul Tucker KC , Constanze Bell 17/8/2024) . recommend CTCS is a DPD/ CIL.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to produce a CIL.
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M089	MM158	INF2		Disagree with location of growth at urban centres particularly in relation to warehouse and distribution, need market led locations adjacent to strategic highways corridors and junctions.	Discussed at hearings
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M090	MM158	INF2		New policy not subject to EiP procedures, requires revisit of SA work , welcome SA addendum. Given seeking developer contributions disappointed that methodologies have not been previously discussed with development industry. Refer to CTCS, not transparent, not CIL Regulations Compliant, fails to link proposed mitigation measures to proposed allocations. Sums not been previously consulted on, nor has INF2 proposal, would like further scrutiny and engagement with development industry. Implications of INF2 could have serious impacts on viability and deliverability and developability across the plan period.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to produce a CIL.
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M091	MM158	INF2	9.19	considers typo "Our evidence also highlights that growth within and without the Borough will result in:..."	This is not a typo.
MMC/024	Phoebe Conway	Marrons obo Richborough, William Davis & Bowler Family	M092	MM158	INF2		In principle the approach might be appropriate but the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted is separate from the Local Plan. It doesn't allow for the proper testing and scrutiny of a DPD or CIL. Separate representations made to the CTCS. Inspectors aware of view expressed in EXAM 80 of suitability of DPD.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M093	MM158	INF2		refer to points made under MM156, and that they include the response submitted to the CTCS consultation. In principle the approach might be appropriate but the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted is separate from the Local Plan. It doesn't allow for the proper testing and scrutiny of a DPD or CIL. Separate representations made to the CTCS. Inspectors aware of view expressed in EXAM 80 of suitability of DPD.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M094	MM158	INF2		MM158 provides no clarity on how the policy should function alongside the CTCS. Note the use of the words 'Transport Strategies' which suggests documents such as the CTCS yet rest of policy ties to make it clear that contribution must relate to specific impact of development. this lacks clarity	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to produce a CIL.
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M095	MM158			object	Noted
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M096	MM158	INF2		<p>The Transport Strategies have vague objectives and are not developed - weak processes and crude estimates; the proposed highway interventions, were conceived in a hurry using a crude approach and dubious information; National Highways funding cut back. Schemes cut, No certainty of delivery or public funding; The proposed Contribution Methodology has conspicuous weaknesses in terms of the timing and the expected funding it could deliver; Development industry could challenge a strategy that has obvious weaknesses; The LPA has to consider all implications; not just LHA and developers; The level of scrutiny of the transport implications at the Examination was insufficient to explore the issues in the required detail.</p> <p>To make the MM sound it should be demonstrated that the proposed measures will contribute to the mitigation of climate change instead of making it worse and promote healthy lifestyles. Measures should be proposed that prioritise walking, cycling and public transport in all decisions. Remove all reference to specific junctions and the diagrams that have been produced.</p>	Noted. Disagree
MMC/046	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Richborough	M097	MM158	INF2		<p>Concerned that the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are in reality being developed and adopted is to support Leicestershire County Council's (LCC) financial contribution requests detailed within their Charnwood Transport Contributions Strategy (CTCS). This approach does not allow for the proper testing and scrutiny that would come through a development plan or CIL process. MM158 provides no clarity on how the policy should function alongside the CTCS, were this to be adopted by LCC and if this was the intention of the policy, nor how contributions requested on the basis of Policy INF2 are balanced against any contributions required through the CTCS. Suggest amendment to MM158:</p> <p>Specific requests for developer contributions to fund the delivery of the Transport Strategies will be informed by appropriate evidence, <u>such as transport appraisals</u>, and by the policy framework in the Local Plan.</p>	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence' not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport appraisals'. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M098	MM158	INF2		object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments. INF2 is unsound as a result of uncertainty over legality and delivery. Changes to INF 2 amount to complete rewrite and significant in implications for delivery of Local Plan overall. Evolving strategy for infrastructure has not been sufficiently developed and tested and as a result proposed changes are ineffective.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/048	Helena Taylor	RPS obo Redrow, Davidsons, & Helen Jean Cope Charity	M099	MM158	INF2		Clients form part of a wider consortium of developers which has submitted formal Representations under separate cover to the Leicestershire County Council 'Charnwood Transport Contributions Strategy' Consultation. Wish to stress that any legitimate concerns expressed as to the legality and viability of the TCS (within the consortium representations) would undoubtedly have a corresponding impact on the soundness of Policies INF1 and INF2 (given these policies give the TCS effect) and therefore the ability for the Plan to proceed to adoption.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M100	MM158	INF2		the Plan fails to explain what the proposed Transport Strategies will contain, how and when these will be prepared, what status they will have, what role they will play in the determination of planning applications and how they will differ from the Charnwood Transport Contributions Strategy ("CTCS") that LCC is in the process of preparing;	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M101	MM158	INF2		conflicts between the Plan and national planning policy as regards the approach that is to be taken to the preparation of transport assessments and its failure to account for the fact that assessments that are being undertaken at the application stage are: (i) not assessing cumulative impacts in the way that LCC has for plan-making purposes or the MMs appear to suggest will be expected going forward; and (ii) not forecasting the severe adverse impacts that LCCs modelling predicts and so are not justifying the making of developer contributions that LCC and CBC seem to believe are necessary in order to help deliver the infrastructure that is required to address the cumulative effects of planned growth;	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M102	MM158	INF2		there is an evident disconnect between how Policies INF1 and 2 suggests that transport impacts should be assessed and how LCC is proposing to secure developer contributions via the CTCS;	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M103	MM158	INF2		the Council's apparent reliance on LCCs CTCS as the means by which the developer contributions referred to in INF2 will be justified, having regard to the fact that Leading Counsel has advised interested parties that the CTCS, if adopted by LCC, will be unlawful;	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M104	MM158	INF2		the Plan's failure to grapple with funding gaps that will exist as regards infrastructure interventions, the implications this will have for infrastructure delivery, and the implications this will have for the determination of planning applications; and	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M105	MM158	INF2		the Council's failure to appropriately assess the implications of its stated infrastructure requirements for Plan viability.	Disagree
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jetson Homes	M106	MM158	INF2	paragraphs 9.19; 9;21 to 9;26 inclusive	MM158 paragraphs 9.19; 9;21 to 9;26 inclusive, should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/023	Sophie Truth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M107	MM158	INF2		Refer to their response to the CTCS consultation (and include). Concern approach introduces policy outside statutory process, no substitute for a DPD. State Inspectors have made it clear that DPD is appropriate.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/025	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Bellway Homes	M108	MM158	INF2		In principle the approach might be appropriate but the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted is separate from the Local Plan. It doesn't allow for the proper testing and scrutiny of a DPD or CIL. Separate representations made to the CTCS. Inspectors aware of view expressed in EXAM 80 of suitability of DPD.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.



REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/018	Bob Woollard	Planning & Design Group obo William Davis	M109	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2	9.25	supporting text should reflect national policy and CIL tests. Text doesn't sufficiently clarify that contributions can only mitigate impacts arising directly from the development proposed. Propose Modification: We will expect development to mitigate the <u>direct</u> impact of additional traffic <u>arising from the development proposed</u> by improving accessibility, encouraging travel by sustainable modes of transport and through the necessary highway improvements. Development should not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, and assessment of the impacts should include consideration of the cumulative and/ or cross boundary impacts of growth and the need for pooled contributions <u>to ensure that the network remains robust where such impacts are identified</u> . Where applicable, the potential for co - ordinating developer contributions with those of neighbouring authorities to mitigate impacts will be investigated.	The insertion of 'direct' in Policy INF2 to refer to an individual development proposal would negate the ability to address severe cumulative impacts. The impact of an individual development may not be severe when considered in isolation but when combined with the impact of other developments this may collectively result in a severe cumulative impact which needs to be satisfactorily mitigated.
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M110	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF 2		Proposed amendment: "Specific requests for developer contributions <u>secured via a Section 106 obligation</u> to fund the delivery of the Transport Strategies will be informed by appropriate evidence and by the policy framework in the Local Plan <u>,and must be compliant with CIL Regulation 122."</u> "Where a transport assessment <u>indicates evidences</u> that a proposed development will have a <u>direct and severe</u> impact on <u>significant</u> cumulative traffic conditions across the Borough, <u>and-or indicates cross-boundary impacts</u> , a proportionate contribution will be required to the reasonable costs of measures required to <u>directly</u> mitigate such impacts in accordance with Polcy INF1 either through a financial contribution or scheme delivery." Further amendments would then be required to the remainder of the plan notably the Infrastructure Schedule in Appendix 3.	The insertion of 'direct and severe' in Policy INF2 to refer to an individual development proposal would negate the ability to address severe cumulative impacts. The impact of an individual development may not be severe when considered in isolation but when combined with the impact of other developments this may collectively result in a severe cumulative impact which needs to be satisfactorily mitigated.
MMC/024	Phoebe Conway	Marrons obo Richborough, William Davis & Bowler Family	M111	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		MM158 provides no clarity on how the policy should function alongside the CTCS nor how contributions required through INF 2 are balanced against the CTCS. Propose additional change: "Specific requests for developer contributions to fund the delivery of the Transport Strategies will be informed by appropriate evidence, <u>such as transport appraisals</u> , and by the <u>policy framework in the Local Plan</u> ."	Disagree. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence', not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport appraisals.'
MMC/030	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis Homes & Roythornes Trustees	M112	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism and approach by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Append response to CTCS consultation including legal opinion Paul Tucker KC and Constanze Bell 17 August 2024. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley. <u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document....</u>	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M113	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Append response to CTCS consultation including legal opinion Paul Tucker KC and Constanze Bell 17 August 2024, and ADC Infrastructure Transport Review of the CTCS. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley <b><u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document.....</u></b> " other consequential changes to the preceding explanation may be necessary	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M114	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley <b><u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document.....</u></b> " other consequential changes to the preceding explanation may be necessary	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/038	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M115	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		Whilst approach may be acceptable in principle the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted doesn't allow for testing and scrutiny through development plan process. Process is insecure, flawed , likely to be challenged, not subject to whole plan viability through the examination , reference EXAM 80 and Inspectors view. Propose amendment: "We will continue to work with Leicestershire County Council , National Highways, Leicester City Council, wider HMA authorities and other stakeholders as required to mitigate the transport impacts of our development strategy through the delivery of Transport Strategies for Loughborough Urban Centre and Shepshed Urban Settlement; Leicester Urban Area; and the Soar Valley <b><u>We will prepare the Transport Strategies as a Development Plan Document.....</u></b> " other consequential changes to the preceding explanation may be necessary	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M116	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		In principle the approach might be appropriate but the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are being developed and adopted is separate from the Local Plan. It doesn't allow for the proper testing and scrutiny of a DPD or CIL. Separate representations made to the CTCS. Inspectors aware of view expressed in EXAM 80 of suitability of DPD. No clarity on how policy should function alongside CTCS nor how contributions sought under INF2 are balanced against CTCS. Propose amendment: "Specific requests for developer contributions to fund the delivery of the Transport Strategies will be informed by appropriate evidence, <b><u>such as Transport Appraisals</u></b> , and by the policy framework in the Local Plan.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence' not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport appraisals'. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/044	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Ashberry Strategic Land	M117	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		<p>Concerned that the mechanism by which the Transport Strategies are in reality being developed and adopted is to support Leicestershire County Council's (LCC) financial contribution requests detailed within their Charnwood Transport Contributions Strategy (CTCS). This approach does not allow for the proper testing and scrutiny that would come through a development plan or CIL process. MM158 provides no clarity on how the policy should function alongside the CTCS, were this to be adopted by LCC and if this was the intention of the policy, nor how contributions requested on the basis of Policy INF2 are balanced against any contributions required through the CTCS. Suggest amendment to MM158:</p> <p>Specific requests for developer contributions to fund the delivery of the Transport Strategies will be informed by appropriate evidence, <u>such as transport appraisals</u>, and by the policy framework in the Local Plan.</p>	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence' not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport appraisals'. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/025	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Bellway Homes	M118	MM158 New Proposed Main Mods	INF2		MM158 provides no clarity on how the policy should function alongside the CTCS nor how contributions required through INF 2 are balanced against the CTCS. Propose additional change: "Specific requests for developer contributions to fund the delivery of the Transport Strategies will be informed by appropriate evidence, <u>such as transport appraisals</u> , and by the policy framework in the Local Plan.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. There will be a variety of sources of 'appropriate evidence' not least the Local Plan's own modelling evidence base, and there is no need to identify a specific type of evidence such as 'transport appraisals'. The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/001	Mrs Alice Gardam	Barrow Parish Council	M119	MM16	DS1	Table 4	Barrow upon Soar only meets the minimum criteria as a service centre.	Noted
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M120	MM16	DS1	Table 4	fails to include adjoining settlements to north of Leicester such as Thurcaston (land east of Thurcaston also has sustainable connections to North of Birstall SUE)	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M121	MM17	DS3	2.38	would also like to see more specific mention of improved public transport services for South Loughborough to ensure future and current residents will be encouraged to change behaviours and <u>reduce the number of car journeys</u>	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M122	MM17	DS3	2.38	The Local Plan is legally required to demonstrate that it contributes to the mitigation of climate change. The settlement hierarchy process did not give sufficient weight to locations which offer a genuine choice of travel. This could have demonstrated contribution to mitigation of climate change. At this stage the Plan cannot be made legally compliant and therefore it could be <u>open to legal challenge</u> .	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M123	MM176	CC5	Appendix 1 Monitoring	To be compliant with NPPF paras 108 and 109 the 400m distance from a bus stop monitoring requirement should be maintained.	Noted. Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M124	MM18	DS1	Table 5	object to decrease of number of homes proposed in Leicester Urban Area. Should extend Leicester Urban Area to include Thurcaston.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M125	MM18	DS1	Table 5	object, inadequate plan period, should run to 2040, no deliverable five year housing land supply on adoption, additional years should be included, and a 10% buffer.	Discussed at hearings
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M126	MM183	Appendix 3	Whole Infrastructure Schedule - MM183 - MM211	object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments. INF2 is unsound as a result of uncertainty over legality and delivery. Changes to INF 2 amount to complete rewrite and significant in implications for delivery of Local Plan overall. Evolving strategy for infrastructure has not been sufficiently developed and tested and as a result proposed changes are ineffective. (refer MM138 and MM158 response)	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2. Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M127	MM188	Appendix 3	Infrastructure Schedule page 238	refer to responses to MM157 and MM158 the proposed contribution requirements of the TCS should be removed from the Infrastructure Schedule until fully evidenced, impact on viability fully considered, adopted as CIL or DPD.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M128	MM189	Appendix 3	Infrastructure Schedule IS Shepshed Urban Settlement	in principle it is agreed that proportionate transport contributions will be required to mitigate the impact of proposed developments and this is considered to be compliant with the CIL Regulations.	Noted.
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M129	MM189	Appendix 3	Infrastructure Schedule IS Shepshed Urban Settlement	in principle it is agreed that proportionate transport contributions will be required to mitigate the impact of proposed developments and this is considered to be compliant with the CIL Regulations.	Noted
MMC/038	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M130	MM189	Appendix 3	Infrastructure Schedule IS Shepshed Urban Settlement	in principle it is agreed that proportionate transport contributions will be required to mitigate the impact of proposed developments and this is considered to be compliant with the CIL Regulations.	Noted
MMC/042	Liz Hawkes	Anstey Parish Council	M131	MM190	Appendix 3	Infrastructure Schedule	The replacement of specific elements of an overall transport package to mitigate the impact of development around Anstey by a general reference to "The North of Leicester Transport Strategy" is unjustified and not sound. Specific mitigation measures should be identified and included.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/001	Mrs Alice Gardam	Barrow Parish Council	M132	MM191	Appendix 3	Page 244, Infrastructure Schedule Barrow upon Soar	Traffic issues have not been addressed by the modifications to the plan. Still concerns regarding junction pinch points, exit and egress of the village to major road network, pedestrian safety. Housing numbers for Barrow have been increased which will only exacerbate these issues.	Noted
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M133	MM191	Appendix 3	page 244 Infrastructure Schedule	refer to responses to MM157 and MM158 the proposed contribution requirements of the TCS should be removed from the Infrastructure Schedule until fully evidenced, impact on viability fully considered, adopted as CIL or DPD.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/030	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis Homes & Roythornes Trustees	M134	MM206	Appendix 3	Infrastructure Schedule HA32	Amends school cost but does not reflect all reasonable costs of making provision to be shared amongst the developments it would serve. The reasonable costs of making the land available and serviced must be referenced. Proposed amendment: <del>£12,769,000</del> <b>£19,362,603* *plus additional costs of making serviced, accessible and prepared land available.</b>	Agreed that this accurately represents the situation. Therefore there would be no objection to the modification should the Inspectors consider this appropriate
MMC/006	Angela Brooks	Fisher German obo DWH	M135	MM22	DS1	2.54	refer to their comments on updated policies map. Support inclusion of areas which benefit from planning permission and no fundamental objection to limits of development following the built form of development where there is detailed consent.	Noted
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M136	MM22	DS1	2.54	Support.	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M137	MM22	DS1	2.54	MM22 is supported	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M138	MM22	DS1	para 2.54	It would be helpful for the Council to provide an Examination Document list of consented sites but not in detail, hence won't be included in the Proposed Limits to Development	Noted
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M139	MM22	DS1	2.54	Limits to Development should also follow line of employment allocations where these are adjacent to settlements	Noted
MMC/006	Angela Brooks	Fisher German obo DWH	M140	MM24	DS1		Supported	Noted
MMC/010	Andy Collis	Gladmans	M141	MM24	DS1		broad support but suggest a change to be in line with new proposed NPPF.	Noted
MMC/011	Emilie Carr	Historic England	M142	MM24	DS1		Amendments agreed though SOCG have not been made. Does not meet requirements of NPPF including footnote 68. SOCG agreed that 'natural, built and historic' should be substituted for 'built and natural'.	The Council continues to consider that this is not required for soundness but should the Inspectors consider this appropriate the policy would then read " Development proposals should conserve and enhance the built and natural <del>built and historic</del> environment, protect biodiversity....

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/015	Sam Gale/ John Kirby	Lichfields obo St Philips Land Ltd	M143	MM24	DS1		Approximate number of homes for HA49 should be updated to reflect the proposed housing delivery from live planning applications ie up to 260 dwellings	Not necessary, allocation wording is approximate
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M144	MM24	DS1		Suggested amended wording for Policy DS1 - In circumstances where national planning policy indicates that the policies <b>which are most important for determining the application</b> are out of date, including reasons for	Noted
MMC/039	Andrew Thomas	TT Planning Ltd obo Mr S Scottorn	M145	MM24	DS1		DS1 third bullet should be amended to 'protects the intrinsic character of the Countryside <b>where the proposal involves employment development outside Limits to Development in accordance with Policies OS1, C1 or E3 elsewhere in this Plan</b> ' to reflect the importance of employment to the rural economy.	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M146	MM24	DS1		Do not support MMs to DS1 and limits described in C1, limits are fundamentally & irrationally & fundamentally at odds with boosting supply. Plan fails to optimise development opportunities for SME developers like Lagan Homes such as Gorse Hill. Site has been inconsistently scored in site allocation process.	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M147	MM24	DS1		Definition of LUA boundary is supported	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M148	MM24	DS1		object , inadequate plan period, should run to 2040, no deliverable five year housing land supply on adoption, additional years should be included, and a 10% buffer.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/039	Andrew Thomas	TT Planning Ltd obo Mr S Scottorn	M149	MM24 New Proposed Main Mods	DS1		DS1 9th bullet should be amended to 'makes efficient use of land including using brownfield or underused land and buildings <b>in the Countryside, outside Limits to Development</b> '. To reflect the importance of employment to the rural economy	Discussed at hearing sessions. Not considered to be necessary
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M150	MM24 New Proposed Main Mods	DS1		First bullet should be amended as follows "We will support sustainable development that: 'contributes towards meeting our needs for housing, employment and town centre uses within the defined Limits to Development <b>and Leicester Urban Area</b> and allocations defined in this plan"	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/040	John Goodall	DLP Planning Ltd obo Lagan Homes	M151	MM24 New Proposed Main Mods	DS1		Second bullet at end of DS1 should be amended to - Adjoin the Limits to Development <b>or forms part of the area designated as the Leicester Urban Area (LUA)</b> "	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/010	Andy Collis	Gladmans	M152	MM25	DS2		do not support deletion insofar as leaves plan without an implementable review policy. Should retain/ strengthen policy wording to define areas and process that will trigger plan review	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mutberry Land	M153	MM25	DS2	2.59-2.62	Council needs to ensure sufficient land allocated for employment development to meet employment requirements and Strategic Objectives. Welcome the requirement and continuation of monitoring unmet need, particularly relating to strategic warehousing in Leicester and Leicestershire. This work likely to give rise to further need for strategic employment at market influenced locations.	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M154	MM25	DS2	2.59-2.62	Date of Statement of Common Ground Should be amended to June 2022.	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M155	MM25	DS2	para 2.59	note that this does not use the words 'equitable apportionment' that we object to under MM8. There has been correspondence and updates of SoCG since May 2022, request latest version correctly referred to. Object to lack of certainty that LA's meeting their own needs and any unmet needs and will review and update SoCG as necessary. Absence of explanation of timescale and methodology for this.	Noted, June 2022 is the up to date version. Refer EXAM43
MMC/006	Angela Brooks	Fisher German obo DWH	M156	MM26	DS2		Supported	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/013	Gina Wynter	Savllis obo Wilson Bowden	M157	MM26	DS2		Policy DS2 should not be deleted. Doesn't take account of on-going work to agree the apportionment of L&L strategic warehousing and logistics unmet need. Plan doesn't meet the Borough's own need for large scale industrial development. Doesn't allocate 10ha site as identified by 2018 Employment Land Review, therefore plan is not sound. Existing employment allocations do not meet need for large scale industrial and logistics units adjacent to the strategic road network. Slight NWLDC proposed policy EC4 as a positive example of planning for strategic distribution. DS2 should be amended, not deleted to take account of the ongoing Icen work. Request for windfall policy to be included in the plan if DS is deleted to allow for unallocated sites that meet the criteria in the Employment Land Review to come forward. Reference proposed mods to NPPF para 84b/ 87 and strengthening of criteria to identify strategic employment sites. Failure to allocate sufficient land will suppress demand for this type of development and could result in 'occupiers' looking elsewhere.	Noted. Discussed at hearing sessions.
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M158	MM26	DS2		still needs to be a mechanism in place to monitor and review unmet need	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M159	MM26	DS2		There is no replacement text for a review policy despite the plan not being a minimum of 15 years.	Noted
MMC/009	Nigel Trasler	Haddon Way Residents Association	M160	MM27	DS3	After 2.64	Amended wording "proposals should respond to opportunities for integrating..." is too weak and open to interpretation by promoters. Could result in non-integrated approach as no onus for developers to work together. MM27 relates to transport only and should include flood risk, GI, education & cross boundary issues.	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/014	Tony Rivero	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	M161	MM27	DS3	After para 2.64	Modification is unsound as there is no specific reference to seeking improvements to the station from policy HA1 (and other nearby allocations) in respect of impacts on the station in terms of passenger numbers and type upon the station facilities and train services. Reference to rail infrastructure should be included and for other Syston allocations.	Noted. This issue has not been raised by representor previously.
MMC/024	Phoebe Conway	Marrons obo Richborough, William Davis & Bowler Family	M162	MM27	DS3	after para 2.64	causes serious potential for misinterpretation. seeks comprehensive design and layout with adjoining allocations which is not a requirement of DS3 (HA15) specifically identified in MM27, which requires a masterplan and not a development brief consistent with HA16 and HA17. Regardless there is no associated policy to rely on for MM27 and the clusters of sites note necessarily linked and in some cases are separated by existing built form. Propose deletion of MM27.	Noted, in principle the published modification is appropriate. However, the wording 'adjacent or adjoining' is perhaps unhelpful and its deletion would be supported should the Inspectors consider this appropriate. In which case it would read "...." <u>The design and layout of development can contribute to managing its impact on, and accessibility to, infrastructure. We expect the design and layout of development on our allocated sites to be considered comprehensively with development at nearby sites, especially with regards to the following clusters of adjacent or adjoining sites:</u>
MMC/025	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Bellway Homes	M163	MM27	DS3	after para 2.64	serious potential for misinterpretation. Whilst list of cluster sites doesn't specifically include HA59, it appears to apply to any allocation. This doesn't extend to specific policy for HA59 and such a requirement would be inappropriate. No associated policy to rely on and clusters not always linked. Highways and transport matters can be dealt with on a site by site basis through INF1 and INF2. Wording just adds confusion.	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M164	MM27	DS3	after 2.64	seeks comprehensive design and layout with adjoining allocations which is not a requirement of DS3 specifically identified in MM27, which requires a masterplan and not a development brief consistent with HA65. Requirement to do so would be inappropriate. Regardless there is no associated policy to rely on for MM27 and the clusters of sites note necessarily linked and in some cases are separated by existing built form. Highways and Transport matters can be dealt with on a site by site basis through INF1 and INF2. Wording adds confusion	Noted. Disagree.

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M165	MM27	DS3 (HA34)	after para 2.64	Supported, reflects collaboration already taking place between parties bringing forward HA32 and HA34	Noted
MMC/036	Clr Birgitta Worrall		M166	MM27	DS3	After 2.64	Welcome the statement about layout and design of a development to be considered alongside developments at nearby sites and lists HA15, HA16 and HA17. These sites require a masterplan rather than a peicemeal approach. Stronger wording should be used than is currently proposed. Should include other infrastructure, not just transport. Should include statement that LA's will work with residents groups too.	Noted
MMC/041	Hannah Price	William Davis Homes	M167	MM27	DS3	After 2.64	There is a mismatch between additional text after para 2.64 and allocation specific policies in DS3 i.e. 2.64 sets out requirements for general links to be made between sites whereas requirement has been removed from HA18 (for access to LSEP). MM27 should be deleted to remove any ambiguity.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M168	MM27	DS3	after para 2.64	seeks comprehensive design and layout with adjoining allocations which does not extend to site specific policies such as DS3 (HA7) specifically identified in MM27, which requires a masterplan and not a development brief consistent with other sites. Requirement to do so would be inappropriate. Serious potential for inconsistent interpretation. Regardless there is no associated policy to rely on for MM27 and the clusters of sites note necessarily linked and in some cases are seperated by existing built form. Hlghways and Transport matters can be dealt with on a site by site basis through INF1 and INF2. Wording adds confusion.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/044	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Ashberry Strategic Land	M169	MM27	DS3	After 2.64	The wording introduced by MM27 is not presented as a specific policy but seeks comprehensive design and layout with adjoining allocations. This requirement does not extend to the site specific policies such as Policy DS3(HA49) which require an agreed masterplan for the whole allocation and not a consistent development brief with any other allocations. A requirement to do so would be entirely inappropriate. As currently drafted MM27 is entirely unclear and as a result unsound. The 'clusters' of adjacent sites are not necessarily directly linked and in some cases are clearly separated by significant existing built form. Highways and transport matters can be dealt with on a site-by-site basis under INF1 and INF2 as proposed to be modified. MM27 provides no additional function other than to seed confusion when reading the drafted policies.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M170	MM27	DS3	After para 2.64	The modification uses words like 'we expect' and 'respond positively to opportunities for integrating infrastructure provision between sites'. There can be no guarantee that sites will be brought forward in a way that would facilitate this and it provides no assurance that the aspirations would achieve satisfactory outcomes if they do. NPPF para 108 (Dec 2023) states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals.	Noted
MMC/046	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Richborough	M171	MM27	DS3	After 2.64	The wording introduced by MM27 does not form a specific policy but seeks comprehensive design and layout with adjoining allocations. This was not a requirement of the site-specific policy for HA39 and there has been no specific discussion through the examination hearings about such a requirement for HA39. MM27 provides no additional function other than to seed confusion when reading the drafted policies.	Noted. Disagree

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M172	MM27	DS3	after para 2.64	object, no specific reference to CTCS but intended that this is a core aspect of the delivery, this is not examined, is unlawful, refer to their consultation response to the CTCS and legal opinion therein. Potential to undermine delivery	Noted, comment doesn't address main modification.
MMC/051	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Mr Paul O'Shea	M173	MM27	DS3(HA65)	HA65	Developer interest relates to site HA65 which is the subject of a current application (P/22/2310/2). Layout has been prepared on the basis of the criterion on MM27.	Noted
MMC/018	Bob Woollard	Planning & Design Group obo William Davis	M174	MM27 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	after 2.64	impractical to seek comprehensive design and layout on sites with multiple ownership or contractual obligations for delivery. Should acknowledge that delivery should not be impeded by failure of parties to engage proactively and positively. Desire to provide appropriately collaborative highways solutions must not prevent delivery provided safe access can be provided without severe impacts. Misguided notion that fewer access points are better. Risks inhibiting delivery. Proposes modification deleting " <del>expect</del> " replacing with " <u>encourage</u> " and further changes to wording for bullet i. and iii. i avoiding a proliferation of new site access points <del>and unless required to avoid potential deliverability risks and where safe to do so (eg. due to highway safety or capacity issues):</del> .... ii ... walking and cycling facilities and/or passenger transport services that connect through/ between the sites ( <del>unless this would jeopardise delivery</del> )....	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M175	MM27 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	after 2.64	only appropriate to require comprehensive consideration when significant relationship between sites. Not the case for HA16 which has no significant physical, functional or visual relationship with HA15 and HA17. Proposed change contrives a relationship and HA15, HA16 and HA17 shouldn't be mentioned in the text and it should be made clear that a single application is not required. Recognise cumulative impact of sites is a consideration, and contribution to primary school. Proposed changes : remove HA15, HA16 and HA17 from proposed text and .. "The design and layout of development can contribute to managing its impact on, and accessibility to, infrastructure. <u>Though it is likely that separate applications will be submitted for each allocation site,</u> we expect the design and ...." to make compliant with NPPF paras 16d , 35c and d .	Noted, in principle the modification consulted upon is appropriate. In respect of relevance to all three sites, whilst there is a direct relationship between 16 and 17, HA15 appears to lack such a relationship. The new proposed Mod is not supported however there is no objection to the removal of HA15 from the list should the Inspectors consider this appropriate.
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M176	MM27 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3 (HA32)	After 2.64	Proposed amendment to MM27 - <i>The design and layout of development can contribute to managing its impact on, and accessibility to, infrastructure. We expect the design and layout of development on our allocated sites to <b>respond positively to be considered comprehensively with</b> development at nearby sites, especially with regards to the following clusters of adjacent or adjoining sites:...</i> . This revised text provides more flexibility to recognise that the sites may not come forward at the same time and therefore it may not be possible to comprehensively consider the design and layout of the clusters of allocated sites.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M177	MM28	DS3	2.65	Support, important to clarify that the diagrams are illustrative, and only once developments are completed that the designations for Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge are capable of being extended into allocations.	Noted
MMC/024	Phoebe Conway	Marrons obo Richborough, William Davis & Bowler Family	M178	MM28	DS3	2.65	wording on orange areas implies illustrative diagrams are more than the title suggests. need to clarify illustrative diagrams are advisory not policy.	Noted.
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M179	MM28	DS3	2.65	wording on orange areas implies illustrative diagrams are more than the title suggests. need to clarify illustrative diagrams are advisory not policy.	Noted
MMC/036	Clr Birgitta Worrall		M180	MM28	DS3	2.65	The school has been removed from the diagram, and replaced with dark orange shading, this should be reinstated.	Noted.



REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M181	MM28	DS3	para 2.65	wording on orange areas implies illustrative diagrams are more than the title suggests. need to clarify illustrative diagrams are advisory not policy.	Noted.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M182	MM28	DS3	para 2.65	object, does not explain whether proposed net developable areas (dark orange) relate to proposed intensification of housing within site allocations	Discussed at hearing sessions. Modifications do relate to intensification of sites.
MMC/006	Angela Brooks	Fisher German obo DWH	M183	MM28	DS3	2.65	no objection to aim, but internal logical conflict with illustrative status yet being used to determine planning applications. Plans need to be more clear and weight increased beyond only indicative, or requires further amendment for clarity and effectiveness.	Noted
MMC/009	Nigel Trasler	Haddon Way Residents Association	M184	MM28	DS3	2.65	It is not helpful to show darker orange areas where development will be allocated. Statement should be deleted or downplay importance of these areas as doesn't take account of local knowledge.	Noted
MMC/018	Bob Woollard	Planning & Design Group obo William Davis	M185	MM28 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3 (HA43)	2.65 (HA 43)	restricts the flexibility to respond to context and constraints issues or opportunities for enhancement. Risks delivery and is inflexible. Suggests modification: .....If there is no site policy this means that the issues relating to that site are adequately addressed by applying place- based and topic-based policies in this local plan. <del>Some of the site policies are accompanied by illustrative diagrams to assist with interpreting the policies. In some cases these diagrams show, in darker orange, where housing should be located within the allocation boundary.-...</del>	Noted. Disagree.
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M186	MM28 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	2.65	not clear from text that only one designation will be applied at one time. Propose change: "When development is complete, designations of Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge <u>(as appropriate)</u> will extend into ..." to make compliant with NPPF paras 16d, 35c and d .	Noted. Disagree
MMC/024	Phoebe Conway	Marrons obo Richborough, William Davis & Bowler Family	M187	MM28 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	2.65	Questions how Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge can be defined in this way in instances where there are future phases to come that have not been signalled. to amend designations post permission, without DPD process would be improper. Suggest change as follows: "Some of the site policies are accompanied by illustrative diagrams to assist with interpreting policies. <del>In some cases these diagrams show, in darker orange, where housing should be located within the allocation boundary. When development is complete, designations of Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge will extend into the allocation up to the edge of the built form of the development.-</del>	Discussed at hearings
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M188	MM28 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	2.65	Questions how Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge can be defined in this way in instances where there are future phases to come that have not been signalled. to amend designations post permission, without DPD process would be improper. Suggest change as follows: "Some of the site policies are accompanied by illustrative diagrams to assist with interpreting policies. <del>In some cases these diagrams show, in darker orange, where housing should be located within the allocation boundary. When development is complete, designations of Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge will extend into the allocation up to the edge of the built form of the development.-</del>	Discussed at hearings
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M189	MM28 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	2.65	MM28 is supported in principle but requires modification to be sound. It is necessary to clarify that the diagrams supporting Policy DS3 are illustrative. <i>'in some cases, these diagrams show, in darker orange, where housing should be <b>broadly</b> located within the allocation boundary.'</i>	Noted. Not considered necessary

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M190	MM28 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3	para 2.65	Questions how Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge can be defined in this way in instances where there are future phases to come that have not been signalled. to amend designations post permission, without DPD process would be improper. Suggest change as follows: "Some of the site policies are accompanied by illustrative diagrams to assist with interpreting policies. <del>In some cases these diagrams show, in darker orange, where housing should be located within the allocation boundary. When development is complete, designations of Countryside, Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedge will extend into the allocation up to the edge of the built form of the development.</del>	Discussed at hearings
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M191	MM29	DS3(HA48)	HA48	support, welcome recognition of capacity at 220 dwellings	Noted
MMC/021	Rod Axon		M192	MM29	DS3(HA60)	Table HA60	Site is not suitable for more than 180 dwellings due to part of site been contaminated – war time quarry and tip. Further investigation is required. The contaminated area of land could be used for Solar PV.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M193	MM29	DS3 (HA43)	Table HA43	Supported that 'approximate' is added. Support change to HA43 informed by planning application.	Noted
MMC/025	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Bellway Homes	M194	MM29	DS3(HA49)	Table HA59	support increase in yield. support representations by Clarendon Land and Planning in respect of land between HA59 and railway providing for housing	Noted
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M195	MM29	DS3 (HA64)	HA64	Supportive of increase in yield	Noted
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M196	MM29	DS3	Table	intensification of sites has the potential to increase significant negative effects across a number of sustainability objectives	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/030	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis Homes & Roythornes Trustees	M197	MM29	DS3 (HA32)	Table HA32	support insertion of the word 'approximate'. should amend further to make yield 350 units in line with outline application submitted.	Not necessary, allocation wording is approximate
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M198	MM29	DS3 (HA34)	Table	Planning application submitted for up to 400 dwellings should be reflected for HA34, Land off Tickow Lane (north) Shepshed.	Not necessary, allocation wording is approximate
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M199	MM29	DS3		MM29 is supported	Noted
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M200	MM29	DS3(HA33)	Table HA33	supported, reflects submissions by previous promoter of site, landowners remain committed to bringing forward for development and seeking new partners	Noted
MMC/038	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M201	MM29	DS3 (HA35)	HA35	Supported. HA33 and HA35 in same ownership and well placed to ensure joined up provision of infrastructure.	Noted
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M202	MM29	DS3 (HA7)	Table HA7	supportive of modifications that increase the yield of HA7	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M203	MM29	DS3	Table	Object for same reasons as MM27 and MM28	Noted
MMC/051	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Mr Paul O'Shea	M204	MM29	DS3	Table	Support MM29 and addition of word 'approximate'.	Noted
MMC/015	Sam Gale/ John Kirby	Lichfields obo St Philips Land Ltd	M205	MM29	DS3(HA49)	HA49	Welcome the increase in housing requirement and the need for a higher level of growth at Anstey and Barrow-upon-Soar.	Noted
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M206	MM3	Introduction	1.24	The wording does not clarify that the Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) did not consider climate change and presented a long-term vision of a plan that is incompatible with national and local policies to tackle climate change and prioritise walking, cycling and public transport. Include additional wording to clarify that the vision presented in the SGP is incompatible with national and local policies and is no longer relevant.	The SGP is not part of the Local Plan.
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M207	MM30	DS3(HA1)	HA1	MM30 is supported	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M208	MM32	DS1(HA3)	HA3	MM32 is supported	Noted
MMC/026	Phoebe Conway	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land	M209	MM33		HA64	Support... this may be an error on the part of the respondent. The MM does not relate to HA64	Noted
MMC/031	Nick Baker	Lichfields obo CEG	M210	MM33	DS3 (HA7)	para 2.70 HA7	Object to MM33. It is not clear how overlap between LUA2 and HA7 is to be resolved. HA7 encroaches onto the Thorpebury SUE, full extent of LUA2 is not shown.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/043	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Bellway Homes	M211	MM33	DS3 (HA7)	para 2.70	supportive of modifications that increase the yield of HA7, provide for the safeguarding of the road corridor to serve the SUE and explain the relationship with road infrastructure required in relation to LUA2.	Noted
MMC/031	Nick Baker	Lichfields obo CEG	M212	MM33 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3 (HA7)	para 2.70 HA7	Suggested amendment to MM33 to ensure consistency with MM76. The site, <b>which is within LUA2, is divided into two parts (HA7A and HA7B) which are separated by</b> the route of the road.	Noted. Discussed at hearing sessions.
MMC/041	Hannah Price	William Davis Homes	M213	MM35	DS3(HA12)	HA12	MM35 is supported. HA12 forms part of a wider development area with parcels of land in neighbouring authorities. Slower progress in neighbouring LAs will not hinder masterplanning, phasing and delivery in Charnwood.	Noted
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M214	MM4/ MM6	Vision		Support vision & intention of MM4 and MM6 but disappointed not to find any mention of improved walking/cycling facilities from HA15/HA16 or HA19 anywhere in the Exam document. There is also no mention of improvements to the Allendale Road roundabout or along Ling Road to make walking/cycling safer between these developments and the town centre.	Noted
MMC/012	Mrs Leesa J. Smith		M215	MM41	DS3(HA20)	HA20	The local plan has been amended before the application has been approved. There is currently no access to HA20 from Parklands Drive.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/030	Daniel Robinson-Wells	Marrons obo William Davis Homes & Roythornes Trustees	M216	MM46 New Proposed Main Mods	DS3 (HA32)	HA32	Modifications do not extend to preceding bullet in relation to provision of primary school on HA32. It should make reference to reasonable and proportionate construction and serviced land costs. reference MM156. This amendment should be made to all other relevant allocations. Proposed change: <del>and</del> provide the site for a new 3 form entry primary school located on land within the allocated site boundaries and of a size and specification which meets Leicestershire County Council's requirements. We will expect the reasonable <b>and proportionate</b> costs <b>(including the costs of making serviced, accessible and prepared land available in accordance with INF1 and build costs)</b> of making this provision to be shared amongst the developments that it would serve; <del>make use of opportunities .....</del>	Agree that this accurately represents the situation in respect of costs. However, the suggested change to the footnote in the Infrastructure Schedule (MM206) addresses this matter and it is not necessary to change the policy.
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M217	MM47	DS3(HA33)	2.98	Supported. HA33 and HA35 in same ownership and well placed to ensure joined up provision of infrastructure.	Noted
MMC/037	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M218	MM48	DS3(HA33)		Supported. HA33 and HA35 in same ownership and well placed to ensure joined up provision of infrastructure.	Noted
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M219	MM49	DS3 (HA34)	2.99	Support text and inclusion of diagram.	Noted
MMC/032	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Trustees of Grace Dieu & Longcliffe Estates & Roythornes Trustees Ltd	M220	MM50	DS3 (HA34)	HA34	Support text.	Noted
MMC/038	Lynette Swinburne	Savills obo Grace Dieu Corporate Trustee 1 & 2	M221	MM51	DS3 (HA35)	para 2.100	Supported. HA33 and HA35 in same ownership and well placed to ensure joined up provision of infrastructure.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/046	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Richborough	M222	MM53	DS3(HA39)		No explanation provided in the reasoned justification to explain what necessitates the modification. As drafted the text requires HA39 to 'reasonably and appropriately provide for or facilitate' the 'delivery of site specific highways and transport requirements' necessary for the delivery of HA40 and HA41 in the future. This is onerous and excessive and there is no evidential position to justify such an unreasonable policy requirement of HA39. MM53 provides no additional function other than to seed confusion when reading the drafted policies. The absence of any discussion on this modification and how it relates to HA39 at the examination hearings means we have no understanding that would allow us to helpfully propose alternative wording. For this reason the modification proposed by MM53 (and MM54/55) should be deleted as they are not necessary to ensure the policy is positively prepared, effective and justified.	Noted. The requirement is considered necessary
MMC/046	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Richborough	M223	MM54	DS3(HA40)		MM54 should be deleted as it is not necessary to ensure the policy is positively prepared, effective and justified.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/046	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Richborough	M224	MM55	DS3(HA41)		MM55 should be deleted as it is not necessary to ensure the policy is positively prepared, effective and justified.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/023	Sophie Trouth	Pegasus obo Davidsons	M225	MM56	DS3	HA43	Support.	Noted
MMC/042	Liz Hawkes	Anstey Parish Council	M226	MM56	DS3(HA43)	HA43	The requirement for a Masterplan to be agreed before development is permitted is welcomed. However, fails to identify who will agree the Masterplan, and what, if any, location consultation and representations will be allowed, for it to take place. MM should be amended to make it clear who will be involved in developing the Masterplan and that local consultation and representations will be part of the process.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M227	MM61	DS3 (HA48)	new paras before DS3 (HA48)	welcome principle of modification but changes to policies and allocation boundaries not sufficient to provide necessary clarity and certainty that existing farmstead can be located to the north of the modified allocation site, an essential enabling measure. Explains changes sought at Reg 19 and that requested change has not been made to the policy. Should extend boundary of allocation site for HA48 to include relocated farmstead, and include a diagram for site to demonstrate location of access, school and expansion site, residential uses and relocation of farmstead. Alternate mod to policy but not preferred.	Noted. The Council would not object to the inclusion of the farmstead relocation in the allocation should the Inspectors consider this appropriate.
MMC/007	Paul Herbert		M228	MM62	DS3(HA48)	HA48	Why has the proposed site of the school was changed, and why the proposed housing allocation of site HA48 continues to increase	Noted
MMC/007	Paul Herbert		M229	MM62	DS3(HA48)	HA48	Claim that Hall Orchard Primary School had no school places and therefore a new school is required at Barrow is wrong. The school has combined yrs 5 & 6. Using this to direct housing to Barrow is unjustified.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M230	MM62	DS3 (HA48)	HA48	mirrors response to MM61	Noted
MMC/015	Sam Gale/ John Kirby	Lichfields obo St Philips Land Ltd	M231	MM64	DS3(HA49)	HA49	Relocation of primary school to allocation H48 is welcomed.	Noted
MMC/044	Alasdair Thorne	Marrons obo Ashberry Strategic Land	M232	MM64	DS3(HA49)	HA49	Support the range of modifications which support the movement of the primary school from HA49 to HA48 including the wording changes set out under MM64	Noted
MMC/051	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Mr Paul O'Shea	M233	MM66	DS3 (HA64)	HA64	Developer interest relates to site HA65 which is the subject of a current application (P/22/2310/2) and the layout has been prepared on the basis of the new bullet point in MM66 and MM67.	Noted
MMC/051	Stephen Harris	Emery Planning obo Mr Paul O'Shea	M234	MM67	DS3 (HA65)	HA65	Developer interest relates to site HA65 which is the subject of a current application (P/22/2310/2) and the layout has been prepared on the basis of the new bullet point in MM66 and MM67.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/008	John Belton	Loughborough Football Club	M235	MM69	DS4(E5)	E5	Dishley Grange employment site would result in loss of LFC stadium, three football pitches, one rugby pitch, thirty mature trees and two hundred meters of mature hedgerow. LFC is in the right place, suggest either E5 is removed from the plan, the area including the stadium is removed from the plan or land at the opposite end of the stadium is used for development.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M236	MM69	DS4	E5	Only single allocation at Shepshed, disagree that allocations will provide sufficient land, choice and flexibility of supply over plan period.	Noted. Disagree
MMC/031	Nick Baker	Lichfields obo CEG	M237	MM69	DS4		support	
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M238	MM69	DS4	Table	The table should identify where the 23Ha needed to meet the Leicester City requirement will be located within Charnwood Borough.	Noted. Table includes land to meet Leicester City requirement.
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M239	MM74	LUA1	3.25	The 'evidence' does not demonstrate that there is a need or a priority to increase the capacity of the 'higher order' road network. It appears that reliance has been placed on an inappropriate strategic traffic model and an interpretation of forecast traffic flows and congestion which raises numerous questions about their validity. It does not state how the highway junction proposals included in INF2 would reduce the impact of growth on less appropriate routes.	Disagree.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M240	MM74	LUA1	3.25	MM74 should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M241	MM75	LUA1		MM75, second bullet, should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/031	Nick Baker	Lichfields obo CEG	M242	MM77	LUA2	New para after 3.42	MM77 is supported	Noted
MMC/035	Clare Clarke	Pegasus obo Taylor Wimpey UK & Merton College Oxford	M243	MM8	DS1	2.11	Date of Statement of Common Ground Should be amended to June 2022.	Noted
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M244	MM8	DS1	2.11	object to the term 'equitable apportionment' process has not been fair and impartial - references SoCG	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/008	John Belton	Loughborough Football Club	M245	MM82	LUC1	3.88	MM re-enforces 'retain or relocate' clause on stadium but condemns stadium to another 30 years of stagnation. But then also gives permission to build on a large section of the Derby Road Playing Fields. LFC stadium should remain on Derby playing fields and other options considered for Dishley Grange.	Noted
MMC/036	Cllr Birgitta Worrall		M246	MM83/MM84	LUC1	3.113	Support reference to improvements to cycling/walking but there is no mention of the provision of safer walking/cycling from HA15/HA16. This should be rectified in policy and supporting text.	Noted
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M247	MM84	LUC1		MM84, second bullet, should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M248	MM9	DS1	2.13	object to this and Table 1, inadequate plan period, should run to 2040, no deliverable five year housing land supply on adoption, additional years should be included, and a 10% buffer.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/045	John Marriott	CPRE Leicestershire	M249	MM92	SUA1		The modification refers to Policies INF1 and INF2 which contain nothing relevant to creating genuine travel alternatives to the LIG area. Moreover, the proposal to increase the capacity of M1 Junction 23 would facilitate car use and therefore worsen cumulative travel impacts.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M250	MM92	SUA1		MM92, second bullet, should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M251	MM94	SC1	para 3.200	object to number for distribution amongst Service Centres, insufficient due to: plan period; insufficient buffer; lack of evidence on delivery of intensified housing allocations; proposed defining of net developable areas; and reliance on the CTCS.	Disagree. Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M252	MM96	SC1	new para after 3.205	refer to transport strategies in relation to Policy INF2. Concerns regarding CTCS. Response to MM157 and MM158 explain in detail.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M253	MM96	SC1	new para after 3.205	object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M254	MM96	SC1	New para after 3.205	MM96, second bullet, should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/015	Sam Gale/ John Kirby	Lichfields obo St Philips Land Ltd	M255	MM97	SC1		contravenes CIL regulations and conflict with NPPF para 57, could jeopardise deliverability of housing.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/019	Sam Perkins	Define obo Bloor Homes East Midlands	M256	MM97	SC1		refer to transport strategies in relation to Policy INF2. Concerns regarding CTCS. Response to MM157 and MM158 explain in detail.	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M257	MM97	SC1		object to CTCS for reasons already stated and as per enclosed response to CTCS consultation, and other attachments.	CTCS is a County Council guidance document and does not form part of the Local Plan. Any future planning application is determined in accordance with Policy INF2
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M258	MM97	SC1		MM97, second bullet and bullet 2 (2), should be removed - proposal to defer the infrastructure solution to Transport Strategies is flawed and contrary to with NPPF 36. This should be by way of a DPD. An SPD is wholly inappropriate and must be removed from the Plan	The Council intends to introduce a CIL.
MMC/018	Bob Woollard	Planning & Design Group obo William Davis	M259	MM97 New Proposed Main Mods	SC1		necessary to ensure approach will be CIL compliant. Not clear that contributions must be proportionate and only mitigate impacts arising directly from the development proposed. Suggest modification: ensures the timely and co ordinated delivery of infrastructure to support sustainable communities and address <del>cumulative</del> impacts <u>arising from the development proposed</u> , with co ordination across authority..... : and <del>contributing appropriate and relevant contributions</del> to the measures to be identified through the relevant Transport Strategy for either the Soar Valley or the North of Leicester to be prepared under INF2, <u>where impacts arise from the development proposed</u> ;	The change in Policy INF2 to refer to an individual development proposal would negate the ability to address severe cumulative impacts. The impact of an individual development may not be severe when considered in isolation but when combined with the impact of other developments this may collectively result in a severe cumulative impact which needs to be satisfactorily mitigated.
MMC/050	Hannah Surtees	Mountsorrel Parish Council	M260	N/A			Broadnook concerns were expressed that there is now no Doctors surgery planned which will put pressure on Mountsorrel and Birstal, both of which are already under pressure. This would also result in more car journeys being needed.	GP surgery was part of the Core Strategy. Discussions are underway between CBC the developer and Integrated Care Board, to ensure appropriate provision in line with the S106 agreed for the Broadnook SUE.
MMC/050	Hannah Surtees	Mountsorrel Parish Council	M261	N/A			No policy for car parking standards which is disappointing. Please advise if CBC plan to introduce a policy.	Noted. Policy T3 Car Parking Standards deals with this matter.
MMC/050	Hannah Surtees	Mountsorrel Parish Council	M262	N/A			Support for local service centres. Commitment to improve / offer car parking provision. Please advise what this would mean for Mountsorrel.	Noted
MMC/002	Owen Bentley	BABTAG	M263	N/A	DS3		HA1, HA2, HA3, HA7 and HA8 are not supported.	Noted
MMC/003	Carla Cunningham-Atkins	Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Parish Council	M264	N/A	DS3		HA1, HA2, HA3, HA7 and HA8 are not supported.	Noted
MMC/009	Nigel Trasler	Haddon Way Residents Association	M265	N/A	DS3		Refer to Mod for HA12 (MM35)Should be a full Masterplan for HA15, HA16 and HA17, not just adjoining LAs and this should also reference LCC, 3 x resident associations and protecting 'Half Way House'.	Discussed at hearing sessions

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/011	Emilie Carr	Historic England	M266	N/A	LUC1	3.84	Amendments agreed to para 3.84 through the SOCG have also not been made.	The Council continues to consider that this is not required for soundness but should the Inspectors consider this appropriate the policy would then " Development proposals should conserve and enhance the built and natural built and historic environment, protect biodiversity...."
MMC/016	Daniel Fleet	NHS Property Services Ltd	M267	N/A	H4		supports policy - draws attention to implementation of H4 in respect of affordable housing for NHS staff.	Noted
MMC/016	Daniel Fleet	NHS Property Services Ltd	M268	N/A	INF1	9.8 and 9.9	Please replace "Clinical Commissioning Groups" with "Integrated Care Board	Support
MMC/018	Bob Woollard	Planning & Design Group obo William Davis	M269	N/A	DS3	HA43	to make sound should acknowledge in policy and diagram that indicative only, not expression of developable area. At minimum must recognise that supportive infrastructure may need to be delivered adjoining the allocation, ref detailed masterplan with Planning application P/21/2359/2 . At minimum diagram should be amended to include land for access to Bradgate Road and school	Noted. Allocation boundary does include access land, agree not clear on illustrative diagram.
MMC/020	Emily Bishop	Mulberry Land	M270	N/A	E1		Note no ammendments to warehousing and logistics section paras 5.30 - 5.35, Council should identify additional employment allocations.	Noted
MMC/028	Annabelle Parkinson	Carter Jonas obo Mr C Green	M271	N/A	N/A		Draw attention to a recent S73 application that will reduce housing numbers and increase employment land provision in Ashton Green	Noted
MMC/029	Nick Wakefield	Environment Agency	M272	N/A	N/A		No adverse comments	Noted
MMC/033	Stephen Day	Leicestershire Police	M273	N/A	INF1		Reference paras 96-101 of NPPF. Note new developments will require additional police resources and that the Council should consult with LP on large scale applications. Firstly from a design persepective and secondly to ascertain what additional police infrastructure is required.	Noted
MMC/033	Stephen Day	Leicestershire Police	M274	N/A	INF1		Council currently has several S106 agreements in support of policing. Note no CL. Note other types of applications police should be consulted on e.g. areas with high footfall, traveller provision.	Noted
MMC/053	Emma Crowe	Woodhouse Parish Council	M275	N/A	DS3(HA15)	HA15	Disappointed to see that it's comments on the draft local plan submitted on 20 <sup>th</sup> August 2021 regarding HA15 have not resulted in any changes to the draft plan. HA15 provides a wildlife corridor and contains popular managed walking routes which should not be lost. The development will further increase pressure on the rural roads and footpaths and as such have a harmful impact on the area. We believe that insufficient consideration has been given to these points.	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/004	Joe Ctori	Marrons obo Clarendon Land Development	M276	N/A	DS1	HA59	The settlement limits at Cossington should be amended to include the land between the eastern boundary of permission P/20/2392/2 and the railway line. This would reflect the land promoted and provide a defensible boundary. The land could be identified as being safeguarded for development should the Council's housing land supply fall below five years. (PC14)	Discussed at hearing sessions
MMC/005	Sharon Jenkins	Natural England	M277	N/A			None	Noted
MMC/022	Joanne Althorpe	North West Leicestershire District Council	M278	N/A			No comments	Noted
MMC/027	Callum Harrison	Tarmac Limited	M279	N/A	DS4(ES1)	ES1	Supportive of employment allocation at Sibleby. Put forward case that site can be significantly extended beyond what is proposed in the local plan.	Noted
MMC/027	Callum Harrison	Tarmac Limited	M280	N/A	N/A		Ask that land at Lilacs Farm, Mountsorrel, be considered as an employment allocation.	Noted

REP ID	FULL NAME	ORGANISATION DETAILS	COMMENT ID	MAIN MODIFICATION REF	LP POLICY	PARA / DIAGRAM/SITE	COMMENT SUMMARY	RESPONSE
MMC/047	David Bainbridge	Savills obo Redrow	M281	N/A	overall		Call for further examination hearings due to: plan period; housing land supply; use of CTCS. Include documentation relating to legal opinion in this regard from James Corbett Burcher 30/8/24, responses to LCC consultations (including Transport Review by ADC Infrastructure and response to viability report by Savills) and letters regarding inspection regime between SoS and PINS. Considers plan does not meet each test of soundness. Encloses the LDS. Seek to put forward the CTCS documents as examination documents, as well as Redrow and Jelsons responses to the CTCS consultation.	Disagree.
MMC/048	Helena Taylor	RPS obo Redrow, Davidsons, & Helen Jean Cope Charity	M282	New Mod Proposed -Plan Period			A modification should be brought forward which extends the Plan period to cover this minimum 15 year period post adoption. If the Plan is adopted after 31st March 2025, as appears possible, consideration should be given to extending the plan period to 2041. This would further increase the housing requirement by an additional three years, adding to the housing requirement and further adding to the need for additional allocations beyond just intensifying sites.	Discussed at hearings
MMC/049	Tim Evans	Avison Young obo Jelson Homes	M283	New Mod Proposed -Plan Period			No MM to change the Plan period. It remains 2021 – 2037. The Plan is likely to be adopted in 2025 and it will have a plan period of just 12 years. That is 3 years less than the minimum 15 year period that is required by national planning policy (NPPF paragraph 22). The Plan is in serious conflict with the NPPF and is, thus, unsound, having failed to correctly apply national policy under s19(2)(a) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Adopting it in this form would therefore be unlawful, being based on an incorrect interpretation of national planning policy. The Plan must be modified by expending the period that it covers to 2040 as a minimum. The Plan will necessarily need to allocate further sites, this would need to be done following a further site assessment process. <b>Counsel Opinion notes the Plan is in breach of para 22 of the NPPF.</b>	Discussed at hearings
MMC/031	Nick Baker	Lichfields obo CEG	M284	New Proposed Main Mods	DS3(HA7)	HA7	Not possible to reconcile the overlapping allocations, the Plan should include requirements for these to be resolved before any permission for the HA7 allocation is granted. A NEW modification is therefore proposed to DS3(HA7): We will support development proposals at site HA7 that: • restrict built development to the north-western and south-eastern corners of the site to mitigate the impact on the settlement identities of Syston and Thurmaston <b>and ensure that the delivery of the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension is not compromised;</b> .....; and • are accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, or similar document, that sets out how these and other measures will minimise the impact of the development on the settlement identities of Thurmaston and Syston and <b>safeguards the route of the road that will the delivery of the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension.</b> Before <b>outline</b> permission is granted for the site, or any part of the site, we will require: • a masterplan to be agreed which includes delivery and phasing arrangements for the whole allocation, in order to achieve comprehensive <b>and coordinated</b> development <b>of the allocation as a whole and the North East of Leicester Sustainable Urban Extension;</b> and	Noted. Not considered necessary



