

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
<b>LONG CLAWSON</b>					
<b>LONG1</b>					
None.					
<b>LONG2</b>					
Elizabeth Crowther	61	The Neighbourhood Plan Group objects to LONG2 and LONG4. Main reason due their environmental value and historic meaning (HE objection). They consider Open Space (LONG2) and LGS (LONG4) in their Plan. They are not consistent with draft LP polices EN1, EN2, EN6, EN8, EN11, EN12 and EN13. They mention alternative sites but without giving a reference to these. Other general comment as follows: 'Settlement requirement for Long Clawson at 127 is not based on a fair share of Objectively Assessed Need within the locality and is likely to lead to unsustainable oversupply and undue pressure on limited infrastructure and local services, while also causing harm to rural character and appearance of the village and its setting in the wider landscape. Hence the LP is UNSOUND in this regard. Not consistent with NPPF 47, 48 and 54 (Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes).'This needs to go to C1 - Long Clawson.		Comments noted. As a consequence of the strong objections regarding the Historic Heritage implications of the site and the conversations between MBC and Historic England, this site has been deallocated and removed from the C1 policies.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
Laura and Sarah Fitzpatrick	77	Support to LONG2.		Supporting comments noted.	None.
Carole Brown	23	If the LP has to allocate sites then objects to LONG2 (and LONG4). They should be replaced for other sites due their historic and environmental issues.		Comments noted. As a consequence of the strong objections regarding the Historic Heritage implications of the site and the conversations between MBC and Historic England, this site has been deallocated and removed from the C1 policies.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Objection due historic impact (Conservation Area & SAM)		Comments noted. As a consequence of the	A change to Policy C1 and the

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
				strong objections regarding the Historic Heritage implications of the site and the conversations between MBC and Historic England, this site has been deallocated and removed from the C1 policies.	associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
Leicestershire County Council (Archaeology)	409	LONG 2 objection: significant and outstanding heritage implications potentially warranting objection in principle to their development.		Comments noted. As a consequence of the strong objections regarding the Historic Heritage implications of the site and the conversations between MBC and Historic England, this site has been deallocated and removed from the C1 policies.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated Appendix 1 to delete this site as a housing allocation.
<b>LONG3</b>					
Ben Hunt on behalf of Mr A Birley	374	Support to Long Clawson position and particularly LONG3. Confusion in how the plan is written (Appendix A, Chapter 5, etc...), Appendix A should be in Chapter 5. For instance, Policy C1A includes a ranking of sites, but this ranking only comes out in Appendix 1, and it is not clear how this might affect the determination of applications under Policy C1A.		Comments regarding LONG3 noted. See response under the 'Policies Map' section.	None.
<b>LONG4</b>					
Elizabeth Crowther	61	The Neighbourhood Plan Group objects to LONG2 and LONG4. Main reason due their environmental value and historic meaning (HE objection). They consider Open Space (LONG2) and LGS (LONG4) in their Plan. They are not consistent with draft LP polices EN1, EN2, EN6, EN8, EN11, EN12 and EN13. They mention alternative sites but without giving a reference to these. Other		Comments noted. No objections have been submitted by Historic England for this site. The AoS, Settlement Fringe	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		general comment as follows: 'Settlement requirement for Long Clawson at 127 is not based on a fair share of Objectively Assessed Need within the locality and is likely to lead to unsustainable oversupply and undue pressure on limited infrastructure and local services, while also causing harm to rural character and appearance of the village and its setting in the wider landscape. Hence the LP is UNSOUND in this regard. Not consistent with NPPF 47, 48 and 54 (. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes). This needs to go to C1 - Long Clawson.		Sensitivity & LGS Study doesn't consider this site a LGS.	
Carole Brown	23	If the LP has to allocate sites then objects to LONG4 (and LONG2). They should be replaced for other sites due their historic and environmental issues.		Comments noted.	None.
Pegasus obo Davidsons Developments Limited	423	Support. MBC and the Local Education Authority should ensure the provision to accommodate growth in terms of education provision. Plan should be clear that the contributions are an appropriate mechanism for delivering new primary school places. Trajectory says that due school issues no development will be in the next 5 years. This needs to be amended as the school capacity shouldn't limit. In terms of heritage, a heritage assessment has been submitted with the Planning Application concluding that there is no substantial harm. They suggest that providing housing in Long Clawson outweigh harm to Conservation Area and Listed Building. The policies include a buffer to the Listed Building meaning that there is no need for an heritage assessment. No technical or environmental issues. The proposals have taken into account the PC comments (July 2015).		Supporting comments noted.	None.
<b>LONG5 (reserve)</b>					
David Haston obo Richard D. Chandler	385	Objection to the way the site has been assessed on the ' <i>SS5/ Long Clawson Site Assessment by Settlement</i> '.		An update of the assessments has been done on May 2017. The site is still ranked on 5 <sup>th</sup> place and due the Long Clawson threshold this is still a Reserve Site.	None.
Maurice Fairhurst	73	Unsure when Planning Permission will be granted. Sites selected from SHLAA and not depending on the capacity of the settlement resulting on some sites not fully evaluated. Some reserve sites would be too negative due their size and relation to the village/town example of this in Old Dalby, Long Clawson,		The Council has limited influence on when people wish to submit planning applications,	None.

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		Frisby, Somerby, Harby and Waltham.		however, as part of evidence gathered for the Local Plan, developers' intentions for individual sites were gathered and put into a trajectory which MBC have published. The SHLAA is the best resource the Council has to assess site availability; it would be neither effective nor efficient to spend time and resource assessing sites that may not be available for development. The Council has the ability to reduce SHLAA sites into allocations or reserve sites and has done across the Borough.	
Melanie Steadman	284	Objection. Highways objection as there is no footpath to centre. Result of forcing sites just to make numbers up. The degree to which allocated requirement is unmet. Should this not be on sustained and not on whether the allocation met. Likelihood HA and Outstanding permissions will be delivered. Evidence of the extent of community support. The wider public benefits arising from development. Compliance with each of the criteria of SS3. Numbers game in non-sustainable villages. Forcing through less desirable sites if the allocation of houses on the village is not met.		Comments noted.	None.
<b>LONG (new)</b>					
Hazelton Homes	396	Proposal to add the previously rejected SHLAA site MBC/144/15 if the requirement increases. Current application for 31 units. Pre-app (Jen Wallis) with no objection as the position of MBC was not having a 5 years land		Comments noted.	A change to Policy C1 and the associated

Name	Representor Number	Response	Suggested Changes	MBC response	Proposed change or suggested modification
		supply.			Appendix 1 to add this site as a housing allocation.
Emilie Carr (HE)	33	Deletion of sites MBC/144/13 and 15 is welcomed.		Comments noted.	None.