

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<b>HOSE</b>					
<b>HOS1</b>					
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd	368	Support to HOS1 and additional extension offered. Comments regarding SS2		Comments regarding HOS1 noted. HOS1 (15/00944/OUT) was approved on 26/May/2016	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to increase the site capacity.
Mr Houghton	139	Concerns regarding the overdevelopment of Hose. Public transport not linked to Leicester/Nottingham/Grantham. All proposed development in same area affecting the bad roads and the traffic in the area. Vegetation, mature trees and wildlife are other issues arisen in the representation. He also mentions issues about multiple ownership and not all of them are aware of the proposal. Better alternatives as Electro Motion.		Comments regarding HOS1 noted. HOS1 (15/00944/OUT) was approved on 26/May/2016	None.
David Crowther	60	Some wording changes in the text in Appendix 1. LCZ have been used incorrectly in the assessment. Need to reappraise.		Comments noted. The way it has been written tries to cover potential changes (additional services) in the future. Agree with the justification about the LCZ and the approach from the West.	Suggested modification of the Landscape Character Zones description on Appendix 1 (page 31, Hose) and <i>'the approach to the village from the West'</i> .
<b>HOS2</b>					
Mr Houghton	139	Concerns regarding the overdevelopment of Hose. Public transport not linked to Leicester/Nottingham/Grantham. All development in same area affecting the bad roads and the traffic in the area. Vegetation, mature trees and wildlife are other issues arisen in the rep. He also mentions issues about multiple ownership and not all of them are aware of the proposal. Better alternatives as Electro Motion.		Comments noted. As a result of the housing allocations re-assessment HOS2 and HOS3 are lower ranked than other sites within the villages and therefore they are no longer considered potential housing allocations.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
David Crowther	60	Some wording changes in the text in Appendix 1. LCZ have been used incorrectly in the assessment. Need to reappraise.		Comments noted. The way it has been typed	Suggested modification regarding the

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				tries to cover potential changes (additional services) in the future. Agree with the justification about the LCZ and the approach from the West.	description of the Landscape Character Zones on Hose on Appendix 1 (page 31, Hose) and ' <i>the approach to the village from the West</i> '.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Sites HOS2 and HOS3 are adjacent to the Conservation Area, which is not reflected within the policy and contrary to the NPPF which stresses the need to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets.		Comments noted. As a result of the housing allocations re-assessment HOS2 and HOS3 are lower ranked than other sites within the villages and therefore they are no longer considered potential housing allocations.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	Heritage implications. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance		Comments noted. As a result of the housing allocations re-assessment HOS2 and HOS3 are lower ranked than other sites within the villages and therefore they are no longer considered potential housing allocations.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
<b>HOS3</b>					
Mr Houghton	139	Concerns regarding the overdevelopment of Hose. Public transport not linked to Leicester/Nottingham/Grantham. All development in same area affecting the bad roads and the traffic in the area. Vegetation, mature trees and wildlife are other issues arisen in the rep. He also mentions issues about multiple ownership and not all of them are aware of the proposal. Better alternatives as Electro Motion.		Comments noted. As a result of the housing allocations re-assessment HOS2 and HOS3 are lower ranked than other sites within the villages and therefore they are no longer considered potential housing allocations.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
David	60	Some wording changes in the text in Appendix 1. LCZ have		Comments noted.	Suggested modification

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
Crowther		been used incorrectly in the assessment. Need to reappraise.		The way it has been typed tries to cover potential changes (additional services) in the future. Agree with the justification about the LCZ and the approach from the West.	regarding the description of the Landscape Character Zones on Hose on Appendix 1 (page 31, Hose) and ' <i>the approach to the village from the West</i> '.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Sites HOS2 and HOS3 are adjacent to the Conservation Area, which is not reflected within the policy and contrary to the NPPF which stresses the need to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets.		Comments noted. As a result of the housing allocations re-assessment HOS2 and HOS3 are lower ranked than other sites within the villages and therefore they are no longer considered potential housing allocations.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	Heritage implications. Development management decisions should give careful consideration to the heritage implications as required by national and local planning policy and informed by relevant guidance		Comments noted. As a result of the housing allocations re-assessment HOS2 and HOS3 are lower ranked than other sites within the villages and therefore they are no longer considered potential housing allocations.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
<b>HOS (new)</b>					
Andrew Granger & Co Ltd	368	There might be additional capacity (HOS1) for approximately 15 dwellings, including affordable housing and any associated infrastructure. The proposed development scheme would provide a range of property types and sizes. Therefore, we consider the site to be in a sustainable location, close to a number of services and facilities and highly accessible. It provides a good opportunity to make a significant contribution towards meeting the Borough's development needs.		The extension has been included in the reassessment of the housing allocations and it has ranked in a better position than HOS2 and HOS3. The site is proposed to join HOS1 as part of this housing allocation.	The suggested site has been included as an extension of the current (potential) housing allocation HOS1.