

Market Harborough Strategic Development Area Masterplan

Options Consultation

Summary of Consultation Responses, July 2012

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(The Woodlands, MH) PC001	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets the basic housing requirement and lessens impact on existing local services - Uses least amount of green space and preserves separation of Lubenham - Offers contained village community 			
(The Woodlands, MH) PC002	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - support establishment of a village community to north as opposed to western extension - least effect on the environment - alternatives provide more than requirement but have detrimental effect on a more sensitive area - balance of 400 in other areas of MH 	None stated		Map attached showing area which should be protected for environmental and traffic safety reasons.
(Symington Way, MH)	Option C as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has a link road to the A4304 	Option F; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the road infrastructure 	Is the current infrastructure and services available enough	The link road should be dual carriageway.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not have an access to Leicester Road - removes the need for development elsewhere in the town 	could not cope with heavy, concentrated traffic going in and out of the showground	to accommodate the additional traffic?	Further bypasses should be built linking the A6 to A508 at the Leisure Centre, and A4304 to the same junction.
(The Woodlands, MH) PC004	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preserves the character of the existing space - avoids urban sprawl - reduces impact on the town - preserves green space within walking distance for many 	<p>Option F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is relatively unobtrusive - prevents the impression of urban sprawl 	Alternative entrance at the south that avoids the canal bridge and enters from further up the B6047	The areas by the canal and between Lubenham & Mh should be protected; keeping developments to the north retains a self contained village and preserves the landscape. Access point and road use need to be well planned
(Coventry Rd, MH) PC005	<p>Option C because; It is a considered opinion with less commercial input and more community involvement in design With the modification I propose [see plan included] access (i) is best choice as it allows vehicles to join the through road at a clear point (instead of a restricted uphill / downhill stretch)</p>	<p>Showground Option E & employment site Option G; Allow coherent design including proposed road modification</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council should set out all housing required for the next 2 decades in one complete design instead of piecemeal developer designs that have no coherence. 2. Lack of funding from Traffic Authority should not be a reason to exclude it from the design. Building the link road as a 	<p>[Plan showing modified 'boulevard' location]</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
			<p>'boulevard' (like Asquith Boulevard in Leicester was before the ring road was complete) with 2 narrow services roads – with traffic calming / wide grass area between them; then when funds available / traffic density justifies it the grass in the centre could be turned into a road. Believe the designers of the estates in Leicester did a good job of anticipating future traffic needs – we could easily do the same if we had sufficient forethought.</p>	
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC006	Option A			
(Woodbreach Drive, MH) PC007	<p>Option A Other options would adversely impact on Lubenham.</p> <p>Support idea of a road over canal.</p> <p>1000 homes should be committed whilst further provision could be made as required</p>	<p>Option G Suitably located. Showground will be buffer between Gartree and development</p>	<p>Question whether suitable access can be provided at Lubenham Hill. Has it been tested?</p>	<p>Development should take place to north, more suitable in landscape terms. No development to the south</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC008	Option A as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would provide its own facilities, - uses the least amount of green land, - provides a separation area between Market Harborough and Lubenham - other options include a dangerous link road 			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC009	Option A to create a more self contained development, with less impact on the stretched facilities in the town. Feel that an access road onto Lubenham Hill would be too close to the corner and would increase the risks of traffic accidents on Lubenham Hill.	Option A		
(The Woodlands, MH) PC010	Option C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - against bridge over canal, not safe traffic solution and visually intrusive - canal tow path must be protected for recreational activity - traffic generated will affect access to The Woodlands adversely - support access at existing roundabout or leaving the development via A4304 	None stated		Green strip from Gardiner Road to the Travellers Site should be a protected area for recreational purposes with off road parking. Area shown on map.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Lubenham) PC011	Option A As it is the smallest	Option G Would link in with the showground. There would be a balance in size between this option, option A and the showground.		Against a bridge over the canal as not in keeping with the area. Should have only one access via roundabout onto the B6047. As regards other access roads, there should be no access at the top of Lubenham Hill as dangerous. There have been serious accidents at this point over the years. Nor should there be access on to the A4304 nearer to Lubenham.
(Great Bowden) PC012	Option C So that a western relief road is catered for. Without this town centre will be gridlocked. Traffic must also be kept away from Foxton.	Option F	Traffic implications to Great Bowden not been fully considered. Need to look at rat run to A14, Corby, station, The Point etc. Village already has problem with speeding traffic, without this development. Must not get worse. Traffic must be directed around	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
			bypass and avoid village. Essential that link road joins Leicester Road at new roundabout.	
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC013	Option A - best complies with the core strategy - offer a contained village supported by its own facilities - uses the least amount of green space and avoids building on sensitive landscape to the south of the site - provides a strong area of separation - avoids a link road			
(The Woodlands, MH) PC014	Option C as; Cause the least amount of traffic chaos	More employment is needed than proposed to support the development. The showground is not necessary or needed.	Options B & C generate more housing than needed. Primary and junior schools are required and a medical practice. Empty houses should be filled prior to building more.	
(The Woodlands, MH) PC015	Option A as; - uses less open countryside - less effect on existing residential properties - maintains an area of separation between Lubenham and Harborough - has a chance of developing into a separate community	Option G as; - retains the showground intact	The bridge over the canal should be reconsidered. It should be re-sited to the northern entrance to the lay by. This would remove the need for a further junction and allow the footbridge to remain.	The area south of the airfield should be protected.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	- benefits of a link road would be minimal			
(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC016	Option A			
(Great Bowden) PC017			Closure of Leicester Lane Great Bowden to 4 wheel vehicles at canal bridge (allow cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians only) otherwise further through traffic through this village (Great Bowden) with a development of this size.	Request further public meeting – when HDC have received LCC Highways Survey of routes / impact
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC018	Option A - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain	Option G	Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography. Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA	Map showing where development should go attached. No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre
(Brookfield Rd, MH)	Option A because; – Offers a contained village community supported by	Option G ; delivers additional employment as well as showground	1. Possible link road – is it likely to be narrow / winding / speed humped /	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC019	<p>facilities (e.g. school, health care)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uses least amount of greenspace for development - Avoids development on sensitive landscape / main entrance to town - Doesn't impact on separation area between Lubenham / MH 		<p>weight controlled? If so it will allow people to access their homes but do little to resolve traffic problems in MH</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. MH currently lacks good informal greenspace / Country Park. This is an important factor in proposals for the SDA. 3. Any access onto Lubenham Hill has serious road safety issues. 	
(Brookfield Rd, Market Harborough) PC020	<p>Option A because;</p> <p>- it's the least offensive plan (none of the option address residents issues & concerns) although it leaves open the possibility of a future route from the Airfield site to Lubenham which is strongly objected to on grounds of; road safety in Lubenham, volume of traffic, creating a short cut.</p> <p>The identity of MH will erode & the countryside around it will be destroyed, as these areas are built up around it.</p> <p>Option A talks about further development elsewhere in MH –</p>	<p>No preference stated.</p> <p>Neither option is ideal for an industrial estate, as these will impact on the new residents & make that property less marketable.</p> <p>Better option would be to consider other land around the bypass (Leicester Rd / Mc Donalds island) or opposite 'The Point' to keep commercial traffic on the outskirts of the town.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly opposed to the No. of houses (as stated in objection to Linden Homes application) 2. Infrastructure (roads, parking, doctors, schools etc) cannot withstand the additional influx of people. 3. Employment in the town is negligible – residents would have to find work outside / causing commuter nightmare. 4. Need further evidence / clarification as to why a showground is needed, for 	<p>Extensive development area identified is so intrusive on Market Harborough / Lubenham / Foxton – these place will lose their charm & identify & destroy the landscape forever.</p> <p>Plan attached - showing area never to be developed (for private / commercial use or any road route).</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>which is strongly opposed. So many empty / partially built new developments & the town infrastructure can't withstand any more.</p>		<p>what purpose. In current climate – is it necessary. May create a few jobs / a couple of times per yr – does that justify the cost? What will it be used for & how often?</p> <p>5. All current development should be completed / these & all empty homes occupied first, before any new ones are started. How can you be sure of demand otherwise & town will continue to look like a building site for foreseeable future.</p>	<p>The NE of Market Harborough doesn't seem included in any thoughts of planning – but has a better road system, access to the bypass. What consideration has been given to this?</p> <p>Why should so much dramatic development take place on the SW side? Why aren't homes being built nearer to employment opportunities (reduce carbon footprint).</p> <p>None of the options sympathetically considers the 'Green' issues – digging up the countryside seems easy option. Surely more imaginative ways of living in a beautiful / green town.</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Nithsdale Crescent, MH) PC021	Option A as; - a separation area between Lubenham and Market Harborough needs to be retained,		Traffic is already an issue in Harborough and any proposal is likely to make this worse, the town centre is not large enough to cope.	
(The Woodlands, MH) PC022	Option A; but without the bridge over the canal		The old A6 is already overused and dangerous, additional dwellings will have an impact. Access from the Woodlands to the A6 is difficult and will be more so, the bridge over the canal is undesirable. A western bypass for the site is required.	
(Saxon Close, MH) PC023			Expect to see a 20 or 50 year plan for Market Harborough, after which various options like strategic development areas can then be assessed. One of the main issues is traffic congestion, given the strategic position of the town and a ring road would seem to be a requirement.	
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC024	Option A as; - meets core strategy objective to provide 1000 homes, - provides a self-contained, self supporting development - does not require a link road and	Option G - there is no need for a showground, this could be housing land instead	The land between Lubenham and MH should be left as fields	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	dangerous access on Lubenham Hill			
(Rugby Close, MH) PC025	Option A Other options would impact negatively on Lubenham. A provision can be left for future growth.	Option G	Types of community facilities – a cinema allocation should be provided	Development should take place to north and not to the south
(Cromwell Crescent, MH) PC026	Option A because: - less negative impacts on Lubenham than B, C & D - a provision can be left for future growth	Option G because; - option F is on the showground land	The types of community facilities that could be provided – HDC should provide a cinema allocation.	General consensus / logic appears to be that development should take place to the north not the south (of the SDA area)
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC027	Option A because: - There is limited evidence that Market Harborough requires more than 1,000 houses, particularly given unsold properties in other developments; - Lack of infrastructure (education, health, policing) to support more than 1,000 houses. - Keeps the area of separation between Market Harborough and Lubenham - The development will not impact negatively on existing	None	The Airfield Farm site has some provision for healthcare / community. But, there does not appear to be adequate support.	Area of separation to remain as it is between Market Harborough and Lubenham. There are traffic issues with the proposed Link Road – access and safety, increased volume and size of vehicles.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	properties.			
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC028	Option A as; - minimal residential impact - infrastructure mainly already in place	Against showground proposal as may be used as a car boot sale	Take the residents views seriously No need for so many additional houses in the market town	
(The Woodlands, MH) PC029	Option C - less traffic and environmental impact - does not intrude tranquillity of canal walk which is treasured locally - vehicular bridge over the canal would destroy this unique local amenity - provides for better distribution of traffic north and south of town, less congestion	None stated		Objects to proposed demolition of footbridge and construction of vehicular bridge over canal in the Airfield Farm Application
(Lubenham) PC030	Option A because; – Any access roads onto the A4303 would be dangerous & spoil the character of the road at both access points (both within sensitive landscape character areas) – Access onto the A4303 is unnecessary especially if an A6 link road is built north of the site in the future. – top of Lubenham Hill is a	Option G – help employment without prejudicing the show ground	An access road at the top of Lubenham Hill would be especially dangerous with the amount of traffic generated by the development Through traffic in Lubenham now is excessive, proposals B,C & D are bund to worsen the situation / cause deaths (Lubenham have campaigned for yrs for a link road to the bypass)	An area of beauty which forms a gateway to MH to the west of the development / over the ridge of the hill would be spoilt by any development / access road. [Plan included showing area of Beauty / not to

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	gateway into MH and should not be spoilt – an access road would be unsightly and dangerous			develop]
(Green Lane, MH) PC031	Against all proposals due to traffic impact			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC032	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complies with the core strategy to offer a contained community - would reduce demand on stretched facilities in town - uses the least amount of green space and preserve the character of Market Harborough - other options would reduce the separation area and have a dangerous access onto Lubenham Hill 			
(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC033	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can deliver up to 1400 if showground dropped thus meeting housing requirement to 2028 - scale of development would enable viable facilities on site - 'broadly acceptable' in landscape terms - not impact on separation between MH and Lubenham - single developer would avoid piecemeal development of 		Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - climate change should be taken into account in future planning applications - impact of flood risk on the 'Harborough bowl' - none of options should go ahead without by-pass funding - loss of important open space - impact on ecology and 	Map attached showing proposed accessible parkland for benefit of ecology, wildlife, recreation, watercourses and containing a community orchard.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	several sites across SDA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - avoid potentially dangerous link road which would be irresponsible planning - restore bid for bypass from A6 to west of Lubenham. Option A strengthens argument for this - no further development will be required in MH till 2028 - large area of agricultural land retained - no bridge over canal required as there are already 2 exits onto Leicester Road. 		wildlife and on the Canal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - map attached showing area which should be turned into park - no protection fro neighbouring properties overlooking building site for 16 years - commercial site at Lathkill Street more suited to housing - right to family life and quality of life will be affected 	
(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC034	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can deliver up to 1400 if showground dropped thus meeting housing requirement to 2028 - scale of development would enable viable facilities on site - 'broadly acceptable' in landscape terms - not impact on separation between MH and Lubenham - single developer would avoid piecemeal development of several sites across SDA - avoid potentially dangerous link road which would be irresponsible planning 		Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - climate change should be taken into account in future planning applications - impact of flood risk on the 'Harborough bowl' - none of options should go ahead without by-pass funding - loss of important open space - impact on ecology and wildlife and on the Canal - map attached showing area which should be turned into park 	Map attached showing proposed accessible parkland for benefit of ecology, wildlife, recreation, watercourses and containing a community orchard.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - restore bid for bypass from A6 to west of Lubenham. Option A strengthens argument for this - no further development will be required in MH till 2028 - large area of agricultural land retained - no bridge over canal required as there are already 2 exits onto Leicester Road. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no protection fro neighbouring properties overlooking building site for 16 years - commercial site at Lathkill Street more suited to housing - right to family life and quality of life will be affected 	
(Foxton) PC035	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - other options have an adverse impact on Lubenham - like the idea of the bridge over the canal – attractive community area beside the marina - 1000 homes should be committed whilst leaving a provision for more if required 	<p>Option G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitably located - showground will provide a buffer between development & Gartree - Option F is on showground land 	Has the proposed Lubenham Hill access been tested?	Development to the north, no development in the south (map)
(The Woodlands, MH) PC036	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the 'least bad' of the options - delivers a huge part of the core strategy - should wait and see demand for property for the 1000 before building more and other options may become available - maintains separation area - minimises impact on landscape - does not result in excessive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to Option E - Commercial options should be replaced by housing proposals 	MH already has a shortage of social amenities and suffers from traffic congestion.	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	urban sprawl - does not require dangerous access at Lubenham Hill			
(The Woodlands, MH) PC037	Option A as; - delivers a huge part of the core strategy - should wait and see demand for property for the 1000 before building more and other options may become available - the 'least bad' of the options - delivers a huge part of the core strategy - maintains separation area - minimises impact on landscape - does not result in excessive urban sprawl			
(no address given) PC038	Option A			
(Knoll Street, MH) PC039	Option A - fulfils the brief and creates a new village without too much disturbance to current residents			
(Farndale View, MH) PC040	Option A			
(The Woodlands, MH) PC041	? Insufficient consideration given to the access and ingress from The Woodlands to the main road.			
(Market	Option D(i) with changed second	Options E & G together.	1. Linden Homes development	(Plan attached

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
<p>Harborough)</p> <p>PC042</p>	<p>exit on to Harborough Road not Lubenham Hill.</p> <p>- am against an exit onto Leicester Road at the proposed site, but if needed why can't the existing bridge over the canal be re-built? Access from the road would not be difficult / far less construction than the indicated site with such a steep gradient from road to other side of canal.</p>	<p>A supermarket or retail park here would prevent so many residents of the new development driving the MH town centre.</p>	<p>should allow a green strip separating existing development from new houses.</p> <p>2. The road from Leicester Rd to Great Bowden should be closed, or have strict traffic calming measures enforced, so that traffic goes to the A6 & to the station via the A6 (due to concerns about excess traffic through Foxton & especially Great Bowden)</p> <p>3. With such a large development - developers have the opportunity to build in a community energy generation facility, either by ground source heat pumps of some suitable renewable technology</p> <p>4. Roads must have a proper cycle lane built in.</p> <p>5. Gutters & driveways should be porous to reduce run-off.</p> <p>6. Should insist that the</p>	<p>illustrating; road closure, canal bridge / roundabout, Harborough Road roundabout, green separation strip)</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
			highest energy efficiency & water saving measures be included in detailed plans.	
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC043	Option A as; - self contained area which is accessible - does not impact on the Lubenham & MH separation area			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC044	Option A - delivers 1000 houses needed for the core strategy - planned as a village with facilities to support it, this would have less impact on the town facilities that are stretched - ensures the separation area from Market Harborough & Lubenham	Option G		
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC045	Option A because: 1. It uses land which is not attractive compared to the other options. It provides an opportunity to link existing and planned development and its ease of access via the A6 and bypass. 2. It will not significantly impact upon the gap between the town and villages to the north and west.	No preference	Options are limited by previous erroneous decisions not to spread development throughout Harborough.	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	3. It is mostly self-contained and will not overwhelm existing severely stretched resources. 4. It would not mar the other entrances into the town 5. providing further development elsewhere in the town means that development does not completely alter the structure of the town which would occur if development were focused in one place.			
(Kibworth) PC046	Option A			
(Kibworth) PC047	Option A as; - least detrimental to a market town becoming a housing estate			
(Lubenham) PC048	Option A - least intrusive - Enables the new settlement to remain compact and should enable it to have its own identity that will be able to remain individual. - It provides for some separation area from other parts of Lubenham Parish, however it does not provide adequate separation nor protect the village from heavy increases in traffic	The showground proposal should be removed – it has not been delivered with the current application and should be given to additional housing to help fund a bypass Option F - already earmarked for development and does not take additional land or Greenfield sites – should	- The separation area between Lubenham & MH has not been defined - traffic routes have not been considered in relation to the whole area and neither for the showground - footpaths are not included on the maps and so haven't been considered - Gartree is an isolated area with no amenities and will be affected – provision for Gartree residents should be	- Consultation process is flawed due to information being provided changing and one option was withdrawn - Other options put forward have been dismissed without investigation - The

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All other options provide a link road that will increase traffic through Lubenham, the road through Lubenham is already dangerous - A new Lubenham bypass should be considered from the Innovation Centre/B6047 to beyond Lubenham (sketch map provided) - The position or need for a link road was not consulted on in the core strategy process – the inspectors comments suggest consideration but not where 	<p>be agreed to help fund a bypass</p>	<p>enhanced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - biodiversity and environmental issues needs to be considered - no study to identify the need for this development - transport links to the train station need to be considered - high speed broadband is essential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reconsidering o the showground site was removed from the consultation - A bypass was discounted as non deliverable by officers without further investigation - The bridge over the canal is not necessary for Option A
<p>(The Woodlands, MH) PC049</p>	<p>Option C as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the bridge over the canal should not be built as it; encourages north to south traffic into the town centre which is currently unacceptable, removes a secure and well used layby, may increase fly tipping, it would destroy the tree lined entry into MH, the bridge size will spoil the conservation area. - A southern access provides easier access to, supermarkets, parking, schools, and has more remit for attracting its own facilities including a 	<p>Option G as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the showground should be completed before any housing 	<p>Wish to see a western link road, taking traffic down the western edge of the site, not through the site as proposed</p>	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	supermarket			
(Lubenham) PC050	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less intrusive on the area of separation between Lubenham & MH - Shortfall in total housing requirement could be made good by using the 2 commercial sites (referred to as Hallam / Davis land) – the provision of an agricultural showground so close to the town seems undesirable / unnecessary. 			
(Foxton) PC051	<p>Option B because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is the least worst option; - Discount Options A and D as they will necessitate further development at a later date, thus extending disruption and possible development in other local green sites; - Option C does not have a bridge over the canal, which is necessary to avoid congestion at the other access. 	<p>A showground and industrial site would be detrimental to the area because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual impact - proximity to conservation village - noise pollution (motor cross on the Harrison land can be heard in Foxton) - increased traffic - Buildings used for B2 and B8 uses would be very unattractive 'boxes' - noise impact and resulting loss of sleep and mental health issues for inmates of the 	<p>Core Strategy should have considered impact on Foxton.</p>	<p>Provision of public transport is unlikely to be a viable option and discourage use of the car. Vehicle traffic will increase dramatically. Road links are essential to prevent traffic using Foxton as a cut through. Traffic calming measures such as sleeping policemen are unlikely to solve the problem. Lack of facilities for young people in the</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
		<p>neighbouring prison</p> <p>Option F is least bad due to limited road frontage and therefore visibility. Only B1 should be permitted.</p>		<p>proposed development will inevitably lead to increase in anti-social behaviour in Foxton. Residents of the new development may fish in the canal, but may not be aware of the impact of fishing on breeding seasons. Great care must be taken over design and architecture. No further development should be allowed north of Gartree Road, ensuring a break between the development and Foxton.</p>
<p>(Clarke Street, MH)</p> <p>PC052</p>	<p>No preferred option;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concerns over canal bridge and closure of Gallowfield Road - the marina and hotel should be discouraged – this will detract from the canal basin - the link road proposed will become a rat run, traffic and education access problems already exist in the town 	<p>Option E & Option G;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the showground should be up and running already - the access at Gallowfield road should not be closed and instead a new roundabout made, access to the 	<p>All footpaths should be kept open.</p>	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - multi-storey car parks should be considered for the town to ease parking issues - the High Street should be changed, the pinch point removed, pavements narrowed, on street car parking removed & pedestrian crossings light controlled - a new secondary school needs to be considered 	<p>showground from the estate should be pedestrian access only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to Option G should be through Gallowfield Road, not the estate – light engineering and manufacture uses should also be included, not just offices. 		
(no address given) PC053	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Against bridge over the canal - Question over 2nd access point if not the bridge - Existing roundabout will struggle if Gallowfield Road was to be closed 			
(Marston Trussel) PC054	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets CS requirement - minimises community impact - provides for future growth without over committing to housing requirements 	<p>Option G</p> <p>Favoured due to its location and adjoining showground. Option F closer to Gartree.</p>	<p>Cost-benefit analysis of the SDA access to the south of the site</p>	<p>South of the site should be protected – no development needed till post 2028.</p> <p>Community facilities (leisure park with cinema, ASDA supermarket, bowling, gym) should be located near Leicester Road.</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Brookfield Rd, MH) PC055	<p>Option A because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delivers 1,000 houses; 2. Delivers additional facilities incl primary school; 3. Acceptable in landscape terms; 4. Disruptive to fewest people; 5. Does not impact on separation between Market Harborough and Lubenham; 6. Options B, C and D are considerably more disruptive to Harborough people; 7. Major problem with access to Lubenham Hill with B,C and D as Option (i) crosses a sensitive area and Option (ii) is dangerous. 	Support showground and additional employment site	Impact of excessive and over rapid development on secondary schools, doctors etc	
(Lubenham Hill) PC056	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complies with Core Strategy & offers potential for a self-supporting, compact community like Great Bowden. Avoids stretching existing facilities in town & preserves the character & personality of our market town. - takes least amount of green space to provide a compact result. Avoids loss of sensitive landscape at the southern end, main entrance to the 	<p>Option A offers proposals for amenities, green spaces & employment within its plan. Suggest using the area allocated for a showground to fulfil any shortfall in required housing allocations or business / employment opportunities.</p> <p>Leicestershire is a large county and we question the appropriateness of</p>		

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>town which also provides a strong / clear area of separation with Lubenham</p> <p>- safest option from a road safety point of view. Other options B-D all exceed the housing allocation (& potentially 2-3,000 cars accessing per day) and are well in excess of the Linden Homes proposal (127dw / est. 200 car per day). The implications for safety on the Hill & access at the point proposed (cars / construction traffic) onto a blind summit, give us grave cause for concern.</p>	<p>placing a "county" showground so close to the Northants border – would it not be better placed more centrally / thus giving easier access.</p>		
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC057	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complies with Core Strategy - Community in its own right with own facilities - Less impact on green space - Retains separation between Lubenham and MH 	<p>Option G</p> <p>Would provide employment and showground</p>		
(Thorpe Langton) PC058	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Its capable of expansion if economic requirement is there – Access to the A6 & road to Lubenham is essential – Design of environment is vitally important (Harborough planning have allowed some hideous 			

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	structures near station / Rockingham Rd Ind Estate) – Think ‘Poundbury’ & don’t allow 3 storey houses – Does not want to be an estate – it is a small town it will need new focus & facilities			
(Adamswood Close, MH) PC059	Already objected to this development. If forced Option A because; it has less impact on the canal corridor & recreational amenity.		Road bridge over the canal considered totally inappropriate to the area – due attention needs to be paid to the embankment & watercourse that runs parallel to the canal feeding into the R. Welland.	Involve the River Welland Trust.
(Lubenham) PC060	Not in favour of any of options – if pressed Option A because; - Lessens the danger of a ‘rat run’ to the A4303 & increased traffic flow through Lubenham - Agricultural Showground should be a major objective & would ameliorate any development - if second access is required (from the A6) my preference in the following order; 1,2*, 3 or 5 (*if it meant Greenacres would go it would not be a bad thing – but tricky) no map attached showing labelling of link rd 1/2*/3/5	Option G	A link road (mooted circa 1995) from the Airfield development cross country to link to A4303 at Marston Trussell junction / lay-by - would take all residential / commercial & showground traffic beyond Lubenham.	Green field space between M Harborough & Lubenham should be protected / not developed in any way.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Lubenham) PC061	Option A	Option G	A link road (suggested sometime ago) from A6 following the gas line to link to A4303 at Marston Trussell lay-by would take all residential /commercial & showground traffic away from Lubenham.	Essential that green field between Lubenham & Market Harborough is protected & not used for residential or commercial development. This has happened already in Great Bowden & should not happen to Lubenham.
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC062	Option A - well thought out and self contained - provides required number of houses with local infrastructure - does not restrict development in other parts of town as B,C and D could.	Options F and G Permanent employment sites preferable to a site used for a few days a year	Given traffic volumes along Gallowfield Road down to Lubenham, consider a link road is not required at this time	
(Lathkill St, MH) PC063	Option A because; -other options are too close to Lubenham & impact on a sensitive landscape area -proven deliverability in terms of access & 1000 houses to meet CS	Option G because; - showground can still be delivered - like idea of recreation & leisure facilities for the community (good location for a cinema) - Good location for future employment	Can access to south of SDA be delivered? – believe Davidsons don't have access for a spine road through Linden Homes scheme & western link road is outside the SDA area. Have Highway implications been considered for either of	No development to south of SDA area. South to remain green space with provision for link road and housing post 2028. (Plan attached)

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
		- infrastructure solution could close off an accident black spot at B6047 cross roads	these access points, & visual impact of spine road coming over western ridge considered?	
(Great Bowden) PC064	<p>Option D because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It embraces the town (not like option A that sticks out like a carbuncle) - It covers all & more of the potential housing need for foreseeable future, reducing pressure (& costs) of planning elsewhere - Includes an immediate link to Lubenham Rd reducing northbound pressure of access to M1/station - It is much much better landscaped 	<p>Option F because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's further back from the road (old A6) - Would oush the showground further back - ? the showground & employment area are suitable neighbours for Gartree Prison! 	<p>Yes;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic routes / flows & management 2. Education provision – particularly secondary level 3. The need to promote more multi-storey housing to prevent urban sprawl 4. Current amount of unsold property in / around town 5. How the town centre will cope – bearing in mind the High St has a semi-permanent traffic problem now 6. Provision of additional public transport 7. The allocation (& amount) of development gains funding 8. Facilities in the town to cope with so much extra development (e.g. cinema, private gym / leisure, railway station parking) 9. Whether the SDA plan is any way 'fit for purpose' 	<p>Ideally move <u>all</u> development south nearer the town.</p> <p>[Plan included showing area to keep open)</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
			10. The ability of HDC to control development according to agreed plans.	
(Foxton) PC065	Option A - but only if houses are required	Option G To allow for development of showground	600 empty houses in MH. No secondary schooling, not eco-friendly. Ruining countryside. Congestion is already a problem in MH.	An unnecessary, badly thought out development. Wider green space needed between Gallowfield Road and northern edge to retain separate identities. Development should be nearer Lubenham for access to M1. Against development in one block – smaller packets. Development should be nearer MH to avoid island effect. ROWs must be preserved.
(Gartree) PC066	Option D as; - fewer houses - more open space	Option G as; Leaves option of showground and does not involve changing the road layout	Lack of consideration for traffic off site. More roundabouts and traffic lights needed.	
(The Woodlands, MH)	Option C - omits the bridge over the canal in	Option E	More thought needs to be given to traffic movements	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC067	a conservation area		rather than hoping people will walk or cycle	
(Kibworth Harcourt) PC068	<p>Option C because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It doesn't include the second access bridge over the canal (always believed this would be a disadvantage as it would mean volumes of traffic crossing the new bridge into the lay-by off Leicester Road. As volumes increase this could lead the need for another roundabout so creating a traffic bottle neck on Leicester Rd north of St Lukes Hospital) – Delivers the entire housing requirement for MH removing the need for development allocations elsewhere in town to 2028 – Biggest advantage is inclusion of a link road to the A4303. Which despite modelling exercise already carried out, if constructed to distributor road standards, could see much of the east-west traffic through town (currently using A6/ B6047 Leicester Rd, town centre, A4303 Coventry Rd). Some of this traffic is HGV which adds to 	<p>Options E & G; Double advantage of showground (agricultural shows & events) and employment areas. using Harrison land helps deliver employment without prejudicing the delivery of the showground.</p> <p>Harborough is a rural area & the showground would provide outlets for showing agricultural heritage & current farming practices to the public. Closeness to major tourist attraction (Foxton Locks) gives location added bonus to be a venue for livestock. If after consultation, this venue is appropriate to host the Leicestershire Show, it would be an excellent site, with good transport (A6, A508, A4303) and would bring tourism</p>	A new traffic Impact Assessment using the larger housing numbers should be carried out.	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>congestion / wear & tear on town centre infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preference is for option (i) – least effect on existing residential area on Lubenham Hill - Provides a comprehensive scheme, which can be worked up in detail as part of the ongoing master planning process, to deliver an appropriate amount of open space / local facilities in a well managed process that once overall scheme agreed can evolve with time as the development progresses. 	<p>visitors to the area.</p> <p>Important to understand the consequences of closing off Gallowfield Road at the crossroads. In principle I'm in favour, so long as the new route off the Airfield farm roundabout ensures free and easy access back onto Gallowfield Road.</p>		
(Lubenham) PC069	<p>An SDA should never have been approved in the first place.</p> <p>Option A – only option for those living in Lubenham because of the effect on; traffic / noise / character / gateway to MH / separation between Lubenham & MH</p>	<p>No traffic figures offered on showground.</p>	<p>Past 30yrs 3 child deaths in road traffic accidents between MH & Lubenham – the road is deadly. Any access onto the road between Lubenham & MH will make it more dangerous, a matter of great seriousness for decision makers.</p>	<p>Exception wildlife in the area because of ponds / river / canal. Country park leading to canal.</p> <p>[Plan included showing area of country park]</p>
(Farndale View, MH) PC070	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conforms to the core strategy and would not exceed projected housing needs - alternative options are an 			<p>Essential to provide an area of separation between the allocations and present built area of</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>extension to the town and include locations with a marked negative environmental impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the core strategy states that the SDA should provide a new community and have a distinct identity – options B, C & D are at odds with this - the area of separation should be retained - the proposed road would be incapable of fulfilling the function of relieving traffic as a through link road 			town. Option A is capable of this.
(Harcourt Street, MH) PC071	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the impact on surrounding communities will be minimal 	<p>Option G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the cross roads is dangerous and this deals with that - good location for recreational and leisure facilities alongside employment - don't want to see development encroaching towards Gartree 	How would an access on Lubenham Hill be integrated? The access over the western ridge does not fall within the SDA	No development to south. Wish to see community facilities including a tennis club, cinema, and bowling. Marina sounds nice and would be pleasant walk from basin to the development.
(The Woodlands, MH) PC072	<p>Option C as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delivers link road without adding further traffic to the town centre - avoids a bridge over the canal - the bridge would impact on; the 	<p>Object to all as none make provision for additional traffic</p>		Noise pollution needs to be decreased on the B6047; the 30mph limit to be extended, improved

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	tranquillity of the waterway, have to be raised in height adding visual and noise pollution, trees would have to be removed, a cutting would have to be made, tree removal would cause noise, contravene the conservation area			road surface, plant more trees, reduce traffic speeds on existing 40mph section, consider other speed monitoring methods
(Great Bowden) PC073	None at all. Planning permission was originally for a showground / part industrial. Whose decision was it to alter this?	Option G – if carefully designed. Showground / part industrial as per original agreement.	So many houses will ruin the lovely town of MH. Traffic is already becoming a problem in the town – how many extra cars are envisaged after this development? Welland Park / Robert Smyth schools are bursting at the seams – who will build a new secondary school? (not the developers!). More sensible to build a school on this site (SDA site) & pull down Welland Park school & build more houses in the existing residential area. The development opposite the railway station was ill conceived – don't make the	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
			same mistake again.	
Great Bowden) PC074	None. I object to all additional housing at the site.	Option F & G	Public opinion	<p>Concern about the amount of houses – whether Affordable or Executive type.</p> <p>More junior schools ok but has thought been given to – secondary education & how these schools will cope with the influx of children.</p> <p>Existing medical practises have a job to coping with present population – how much thought has been given to this problem.</p> <p>Traffic a big concern – would it be restricted from using minor roads as a ‘rat run’ (as in Gt Bowden)</p> <p>Planning provision for showground /</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
				industrial use – why as soon as this is given, are the goal posts moved?
(Great Bowden) PC075	No preference stated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great Bowden already used as a cut through for traffic avoiding the town centre - Extra housing will have a detrimental effect on child safety in the village schools 	
(Lubenham) PC076	Option A - provides the requirement for the SDA & leave an option open for the future (if needed)	Option G - this needs another option open		Protect green areas to the west of the whole proposal.
(Farndale View, MH) PC077	Option A as; I do not feel that all the development should take place in one area & it provides its own public services. Green belt between MH and Lubenham should be maintained With options b, c and d the road junction is badly positioned at the top of Lubenham Hill.			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC078	Not in favour of any of the options, but Option C is closest. Put the road in first from the showground to the west of Welland Lodge. Access is required from	Allow and encourage Options E, G and F in that order.	The sewer on Lubenham Hill has generated complaints over many years about inefficiency and smells. This is because the sewer from Coventry Road	Land north of the lay-by between the B6047 and canal is highlighted as being owned by the Town

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>many directions: Knoll St; Brookfield Rd and two links onto Leicester Road (at showground roundabout and by Kirby's Hillcrest Farm new bridge). This area (between the canal and B6047 part of Hillcrest Farm) is owned by Town Charities and might be amendable to allowing the canal bridge to go across)</p> <p>Access onto the A4304 at the top of a blind summit has to be a disaster. I feel the area does need just a road round the brow of the hill from the Airfield site in the same place where the WW2 road from the Airfield reached the Harborough Road, Lubenham. It is the safest junction site.</p> <p>From the junction looking back to Harborough there should be no visible housing until the Lubenham semis called the Black and Whites are reached.</p> <p>The B6047 lay-by should be kept two-way, providing parking for the canal leisure use and preventing travellers parking there. One bed affordable apartments could be built in a block amongst the trees.</p> <p>Buildings should be below the crest</p>		<p>to Brookfield has too shallow a fall, with subsequent developments putting a strain on the system.</p>	<p>Charities and a possible location for a canal bridge.</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>or shielded by mature trees. The school should be on the eastern side of Lubenham Brook in the corner behind Knoll St with play areas and parking closer to the canal embankment. Another footbridge over the canal and into Woodlands would open the canal up for leisure use.</p>			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC079	Option A			
(Kings Head Place, MH) PC080	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -other options are too close to Lubenham & impact on a sensitive landscape area -proven deliverability in terms of access & 1000 houses to meet CS 	<p>Option G because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - showground can still be delivered - like idea of recreation & leisure facilities for the community (good location for a cinema) - Good location for future employment - infrastructure solution could close off an accident black spot at B6047 cross roads 	<p>Can access to south of SDA be delivered? – believe Davidsons don't have access for a spine road through Linden Homes scheme & western link road is outside the SDA area.</p> <p>Have Highway implications been considered for either of these access points, & visual impact of spine road coming over western ridge considered?</p>	<p>No development to south of SDA area. South to remain green space with provision for link road and housing post 2028. (Plan attached)</p>
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC081	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the 	Option G	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached. No development to</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>sensitive landscape area to a greater extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain 		<p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre</p>
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC082	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain 	<p>Option G</p>	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p> <p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached.</p> <p>No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre</p>
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC083	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to 	<p>Option G</p>	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p> <p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached.</p> <p>No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club,</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain			cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC084	Option A - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain	Option G	Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography. Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA	Map showing where development should go attached. No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC085	Option A - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present	Option G	Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography. Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA	Map showing where development should go attached. No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provision for future development can remain 			be useful and ease congestion in town centre
(Gallow Field Road MH) PC086	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain 	Option G	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p> <p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached.</p> <p>No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre</p>
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC087	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain 	Option G	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p> <p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached.</p> <p>No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC088	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain 	Option G	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p> <p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached.</p> <p>No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre</p>
(Gallow Field Road, MH) PC089	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stand alone scheme with deliverable access - other options adversely impact on Lubenham and the sensitive landscape area to a greater extent - unnecessary to commit to putting infrastructure network under increased pressure at present - provision for future development can remain 	Option G	<p>Access points under B, C and D need more consideration given land control and topography.</p> <p>Access over the western ridge does not fall within SDA</p>	<p>Map showing where development should go attached.</p> <p>No development to south. Would like to see community facilities, tennis club, cinema and bowling. Out of town supermarket would be useful and ease congestion in town centre</p>
(The Woodlands, MH)	Option A as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - uses less open countryside - less effect on existing 	Option G as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retains the showground intact 	The bridge over the canal should be reconsidered. It should be re-sited to the	The area south of the airfield should be protected.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC090	residential properties - maintains an area of separation between Lubenham and Harborough - has a chance of developing into a separate community - benefits of a link road would be minimal		northern entrance to the lay by. This would remove the need for a further junction and allow the footbridge to remain.	
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC091	Option A as it is; Most consistent with the current development of the area.	Option E		
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC091	Option A as it; – Satisfies the housing provision element of the Core Strategy with least impact on overall district. – Delivers much needed additional facilities	Option E		
(Welford, Northants) PC092	Option A as; - satisfies the housing allocation of the town, no more than 1000 dwellings are required - provides new facilities for the town - does not have a link road to Lubenham Hill and potentially dangerous access	The reserved showground could be used for future housing needs.	The land to the south is less sensitive landscape and better suited to development	The land off Lubenham Hill should be protected to act as a buffer. If approved, future development in this area may breach the ridgeline.
(LE16 7RQ)	None , because; - consultation just validates joining	None stated. - showground / B class	“When are planners going to plan how the area should be developed?”	Plan attached showing; Harborough West bypass /

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC093	up developers schemes & allocating some planting along one side.	development should not be allowed to be part (of SDA). Showground was "ruse" to get the development of used agricultural land consent. It should be nipped in the bud.	Only good scheme on display was Option F or similar.	showground / residential & other uses / pedestrian & cycle way to town / future Lubenham bypass.
(Arden Way, MH) PC094	Option A as; - only viable option for an over-stretched, over-stressed and over-crowded town			
(Connel Close, MH) PC095	Option A - good scheme, suitable access - other options do not benefit Lubenham in any way - link road can be implemented at a later date	Option G Allows for showground. Recreational, entertainment and leisure facilities good idea. Could be well accessed mixed-use scheme that includes employment space. Option F too close to Gartree.	Visual impact of road over western ridge.	Protect south of the site. Develop north with commercial space close to Leicester Road
(Fairfield Road, MH) PC096	Option A - the negative impacts of development on Lubenham through the other options will be increased - a provision can be left for future growth	Option G	Types of community facilities. Cinema allocation should be provided.	Development should take place to north, not to the south.
(Knoll Street, MH) PC097	Option A - provides the needed homes with			

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(The Woodlands, MH) PC098	little impact on surrounding area Option A, but without the bridge		Development should be targeted to the south of MH rather than the north-west. This would help with traffic congestion and provide easier access to the M1, A14 & M6	
(Northleigh Grove, MH) PC099	Option A but without the bridge as; - the minimal option, although against all development in the area - against the canal bridge	Option E; - additional business development should centre around Innovation Centre	Lack of strategic planning for transport, schools and health.	The area outside of Option A should be compulsory purchased for a community woodland to prevent further development
(Rugby Close, Market Harborough) PC100	No options are acceptable because; - MH is already at capacity from a traffic point of view. 1000 dw = 2,000 extra cars! – this will cause gridlock, damage to roads, deter shoppers. - less people will be able to afford a new house (due to; double dip recession, reduced / stopped immigration) - less land to take rain water safely, could result in serious flooding. (House flood insurance / mortgage availability problems are already manifesting themselves)	None (see comments to Qu1.)		All area (SDA) should be protected – No areas developed. More development requires more infrastructure e.g. schools, doctors, dentists, police. No doubt like roads these would not be put in first!

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	Compounding these problems is grossly irresponsible – who will ultimately be responsible for the residual damage you could be causing?			
(Turnpike Close, MH) PC101	Option A More in keeping with local environment	Option G		
(Hilltop Close, MH) PC102	Option A because; - Delivers the 1,000 homes needed by the Core Strategy and has least impact on residents (least bad option)		Like to see a “major” supermarket to the north of Market Harborough. This could stop the need for journeys through the town to the existing sites.	
(Leicester Road, MH) PC103	Against all proposals due to traffic impact		The town can't cope with current transport problems, a western bypass is needed	
(Lubenham) PC104	Option A because; – Supplies 100 homes & is less detrimental to the area – Access points mean a rat run from the site (SDA) to the A4303 would not happen. – Leaves room for the showground (although option G might be an asset I prefer it to option F which infringes on the showground)	Option G ; doesn't encroach on showground.	Please do not spoil the lives of the people already living here – we outnumber the total of all the proposed buildings. A road out onto the A4303 would be a massive mistake – which once taken would never be connected.	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	Any development will have a massive impact on the Foxton Road, Lubenham with additional traffic & this must be addressed before building starts			
(Lubenham) PC105	Option A - the smallest development option - no access to A4304	Option G - more contained area		
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC106	Option A as; - potential to fulfil all core strategy requirements - no new residents will be at risk from unacceptable traffic dangers - Option A allows the SDA to grow naturally and help a community to form. Other options are not joined up and facilities would be isolated - Allows flexibility for future housing requirements. Further potential expansion could be to the north in the showground area, in other areas or to the south east of Harborough - Avoid the lack of unity in appearance that would happen if different builders use their own styles. A single developer is more likely to produce a	Options F & G as; - the showground may no longer be suitable in future once the residential element is complete. The showground could then be used for future housing development if required.		Option A could enable a link road, with the preferred option being the alternative towards Lubenham. This would avoid a junction on Lubenham Hill. The fields below Option A should be protected. New employment opportunities should be provided as well as a primary school, nursery, food shop, and medical centre. A new cycling route into town should also be provided.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>successful, integrated and coherent development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A link road could be built if and when needed. The link road would only serve residents and not relieve pressure on the town centre 			
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC107	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new village type community created with own facilities - avoid piecemeal development elsewhere in the town - the current separation area needs to be retained - a marina and hotel would be an asset to the area - the provision of 1000 houses would satisfy the requirements of the core strategy 	<p>Options F & G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both require further consideration, more specific ideas need to be developed 	<p>If, due to the commercial development to be provided, a link to the M1 is necessary, this should be provided by improving existing roads west of the site and Gallowfield Road. This would avoid the need for a link road directly onto the A4304.</p>	<p>Development should be on the Airfield Farm site only.</p>
(Connel Close, MH) PC108	<p>Option A because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - none of the other options benefit Lubenham in any way - it's a good scheme on its own with suitable access - provision for a future link road can be implemented 	<p>Option G because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The showground could remain (committed site) - idea of recreational / leisure / entertainment facilities for the community is a great idea. This could be a well accessed mixed use scheme that includes employment. 	<p>A road coming over the western ridge providing access to the south of the site & the associated visual impact.</p>	<p>Protect the south of the site completely – no development only open space with provision for link road.</p> <p>Develop the north with commercial space located close to Leicester Rd.</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
		- Option F too close to Gartree (prison)		
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC109	Option A - only option that specifies the facilities to be provided, the development should be self sufficient to prevent any detrimental impact on the town - can't agree with Highways that an access from a link road would be safe	Option G - landscaping will be challenging for both options but makes sense to provide both the showground and business opportunities	Areas between the town and surrounding villages should be protected so they can keep their own identities Secondary education hasn't been provided	
(Foxton) PC110	Option A - other options have an adverse impact on Lubenham - like the idea of the bridge over the canal – attractive community area beside the marina 1000 homes should be committed whilst leaving a provision for more if required	Option G - suitably located - showground will provide a buffer between development & Gartree Option F is on showground land	Has the proposed Lubenham Hill access been tested?	Development to the north, no development in the south (map)
(The Woodlands, MH) PC111	Option C because: - the canal bridge would create more traffic and noise on the B6047, bringing more traffic alongside our property [The Woodlands] and the path which the kids walk to school. Traffic calming measures on the B6047 would make options b and D more acceptable in terms of B6047	Whichever minimises traffic congestion / noise along the B6047		

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	congestion. Option A is by far the worst option and will make the bottle neck into the town far worse.			
(Lubenham Hill) PC112	Favour Option A because; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Least visually intrusive / avoids compromising the 'green wedge' between Lubenham & MH - Avoids potentially dangerous intersection on / at the bottom of the hill down into Lubenham - Suggests showground is not necessary for the town & development could continue on that site to provide the number of houses the town needs - Bridge over canal – not any great problem 	Option G as closet to the road. Leave option F for residential land for when option A site completed.	1. Uncertain that traffic issues fully considered, particularly relating to the use of the road to Foxton, and the road off this to Lubenham with the intersection to A4303. Traffic related to showground would probably mean far larger / unsuitable vehicles (from M1) using the roads.	Green wedge between MH & Lubenham should not be compromised.
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC113	Option A Less impact on look, approach or facilities of town.			Favours protecting Lubenham and its greenfields from development. This approach to town is aspirational.
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC114	Option A because; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complies with CS whilst maintaining the integrity of MH Retains distance between Lubenham & MH enabling them to keep their identities	None stated.	None.	Protect as much of the sensitive landscape as possible. Much made of link

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>- has potential to become a village community / with own facilities (doctors, shops, schools) & not put extra pressure of MH services</p> <p>- Uses less green space and the sensitive landscape to the southern / main entrance to the town is not adulterated.</p>			<p>road – hard to see how road as described in options B/C & D would satisfy this requirement / function as one / be suitable for through traffic / HGV's, when it travels through a densely built up area (has speed bumps). If link road is necessary – an appropriate "A" class road is more desirable / acceptable and more green space will be safeguarded.</p>
<p>(Lubenham Hill, MH)</p> <p>PC115</p>	<p>Option A because best for the town but; Road needs to come out onto Harborough Road Lubenham and not Lubenham Hill – safer option.</p>			<p>A weight limit needs to be imposed in the town centre to protect the market town. Whilst planning new roads around the town – surely sensible to complete a ring road around the town. When A14 closed – traffic / HGV's queuing on</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
				roads unsuitable for weight / volume of traffic.
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC116	Option A as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uses the least amount of green space to meet housing requirements - Preserves the character and identity of Market Harborough and Lubenham - Avoid dangerous link road to Lubenham Hill - Compliant with the Core Strategy 	Option G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on local amenities and services - No need to develop housing beyond minimum requirement 	
(No address given) PC117			Objection to the manner of advertising the consultation period.	
(Lubenham) PC118	No preferred option stated , but with the following comments on each; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option A - This is the only application submitted by one developer that meets the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was only accepted and has not been fully considered or consulted upon in its final form - Question over the problem of assessing the bridge - Does not deliver a link road to 	No preferred option stated , but with the following comments on each; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option E - Showground should be built as per planning condition - Further traffic study for showground plus housing is needed - An agricultural show would have an adverse impact on 	Comments regarding the consultation process; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the consultation is flawed as it doesn't cover the whole rural area or District - land elsewhere around Harborough is not considered - A planning application already exists - The consultation was not advertised enough in local media, not enough time was allowed 	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>the A4304</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delivers housing elsewhere to meet the core strategy requirements - The landscape assessment is not easily available - No explanation of how existing services will be expanded to the SDA - Option B - Difficult to manage timescales and infrastructure delivery - Link road will provide a dangerous access – and more traffic modelling required - Option could be developed after 2028 - Open space should be integrated and separate from housing - Further traffic modelling is a necessity - The separation area between MH & Lubenham is a requirement - Option C - Development options workshop was not a public meeting and therefore this option has limited value - Link road is not preferred 	<p>housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option F - Employment facilities would be necessary as there is not enough employment in town - Increase in heavy traffic to A14, M1 & M6 - Option G - Addition employment is required - Land to the south of Harborough is better suited due to access to road and avoids the town centre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The process considers only Greenfield sites - The population figures used are out of date, the new government administration has a more realistic approach to immigration and so smaller population figures should be used - The development options changed during the process (removal of option E) - The Masterplan should be in compliance with the core strategy – as a link road was found as desirable during the hearing, the core strategy should be amended and consulted upon - The housing density at 30 dph bears no resemblance to that of The Woodlands nearby, of 2-3 per hectare - The value of the Lubenham NP is questionable due to the SDA being within the Parish boundary 	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excluding the bridge would increase traffic elsewhere - Option D - Link road is not preferred - Both potential link road accesses are dangerous - Open space only advantage of option D 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No mention is made of compliance with the Localism Bill - The need for 350 dwellings per annum is not mentioned - Work is still ongoing to calculate housing needs – it is stated more housing may be required, but could be less is required 	
(Farndale View, MH) PC119	Option A			
(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC120	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets requirement to 2028 (1400 if showground is abandoned) - community could support its own facilities and not put further pressure on town - broadly acceptable in landscape terms - not impact on separation of MH and Lubenham - single developer involved there avoiding piecemeal development - avoids potentially dangerous link road. Council should bid for another arm of bypass as best 	Options F and G. Both make sense given location alongside Innovation Centre and employment development. No case or momentum for showground. Houses should take priority.	2 concerns: Impact on the ‘Harborough bowl’ and its floodplain. Likely to be a significant increase in the risk of flooding along the Welland in MH; and Dismissal of bypass issue. Makes no sense to contemplate these options with out this north west bypass. MP should be briefed and government funding sought. Link road would be dangerous and irresponsible.	MH has pressing need for more recreational space. Plan attached shows area that should be set aside permanently as accessible parkland.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>way of dealing with traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No further development will be required to 2028, and agricultural land will be retained - Bridge over canal not required, already 2 existing exits onto B6047. Bypass or exit onto Gallowfield Road then to B6047 would be safer alternative. 			
<p>(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC121</p>	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's capable of delivering 1000 / CS housing allocation and up to 1400 if the plan for an agricultural showground is abandoned. - additional facilities relating to healthcare & education would be viable and not put additional pressure on town centre facilities. - Its "broadly" acceptable in landscape terms - would not impact on the separation area between MH & Lubenham - a single developer is involved & this will avoid piecemeal development of several sites across the SDA (as per Farndon Fields / St Marys Road) - avoids potentially dangerous plan to have a link road through the 	<p>Options F & G both make sense for employment. They would sit alongside the Innovation Centre / existing employment established off the new roundabout on Leicester Rd. any concerns about design are irrelevant in light of buildings in place but some judicious planting of trees would help ameliorate the harness / openness of the site.</p> <p>Options F&G will similarly require access (see *) – which is not considered in the consultation document.</p>	<p>1. Impact of further development on the NW rim on the "Harborough bowl" and its floodplain. A plan of the floodplain / showing likely impact of the development was on display at the events but wasn't part of the documentation / written material / website. Appears that there is likely to be a significant increase in the risk of flooding to areas along the course of the river Welland – an official commented that flood management arrangements would have to be build into these schemes to slow down the flow of surface water into the river.</p> <p>2. the bypass has been</p>	<p>Pressing need for more recreational space for MH increasing population. Long term some 35ha of land between Lubenham Hill and the edge of the development should be set aside permanently as parkland (Plan attached showing parkland area).</p> <p>Parkland area should contain; Community & leisure facilities, a community orchard, an arboretum, and</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>development from the Leicester Road (B6047) to A4303. A link road would be irresponsible / avoided at all costs – instead restore bid for another arm of the bypass (as originally proposed) from the A6 roundabout to a point west of Lubenham. Safest way to handle traffic N / E and W anxious to avoid bottleneck in town centre. Option A adds weight to the case for this extension to the bypass – arguably no development should take place in SDA unless and until bypass forms part of the strategy.</p> <p>- no further development will be required in MH until 2028 and beyond & a large area of agricultural land will be retained with the benefits that flow to the; environment, wildlife, countryside</p> <p>- will not require a bridge over the canal. If bypass is constructed there could be an exit from the estate to the NW via Gallowfield Rd by means of a roundabout. If no bypass, an exit onto Gallowfield Rd leading to an improved junction with a roundabout where Leicester Lane from Gt Bowden to Foxton via Gallowfield Rd crosses the</p>	<p>No case for a show ground on this site, scheme has been on the back burner for a decade & even Leicester Agricultural Society have only expressed an interest. No momentum behind this project – believe William Davis would quietly abandon the idea if allowed houses instead. If more houses are needed they should take priority and become part of Option A on this site.</p>	<p>summarily dismissed on grounds of “no Government funding for the scheme” – no sense to contemplate these options without resurrecting the bypass for the NW of town. Options under consideration will add weight to bypass argument.</p>	<p>gardens & parkland with places of tranquillity, picnic areas, play areas, wild areas (to encourage birdlife / indigenous mammals / wild flowers), paths & trails and a dog exercising area.</p> <p>Stream which runs through the area could be landscaped & made a feature of the park.</p> <p>Community orchard should be readily accessible to local community – who should be encouraged to donate trees / seat / other furniture and share in the responsibility of care / maintenance.</p> <p>The benefits such places (proposed</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	Leicester Rd B6047 would be a safer alternative*. There is no need for a bridge over the canal through the conservation area: why create a third exit onto the Leicester Rd / B6047 when the existing will suffice.			parkland) can have in assisting recovery of ill / infirm should not be underestimated. Access to the park should not be restricted for pedestrians from; canal towpath, top of Gardiner Street, the existing footpath crossing the site from Brookfield Road, Lubenham Hill, and the new estate to the north. In this area a small car park could be provided.
(Gallowfield Road) PC122	Option A Development will have a village feel to it	Option G Really wants showground to go ahead.		
(Knoll Street, MH) PC123	Option A as; - offers a more traditional way of life in keeping with what we already have in Harborough	No preference		
(Edna Bowley Court, MH) PC124	Option C - Concerns relate to traffic implications on already congested town roads - Plan attached showing a direct			Foot and cycle paths need to be provided to aid movement of children to local schools.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>route from B6047 to A4304 with 2 accesses at both ends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers one access at Lubenham Hill to be dangerous - Road layout needs to be well thought out and planned from the start with main traffic routes in place before development begins 			<p>Linden plot could be a stand alone estate or there should be no right hand turns out of Linden plot</p> <p>Lay by on B6047 should be preserved for access to canal towpath and other footpaths</p>
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC125	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Least impact on existing residents of MH – Least impact on green land surrounding MH & keeps a distinct separation between MH & Lubenham – Provides for 1,000 houses needed – other option are for more. Why build more than absolutely necessary? – If it has it's own facilities (retail / health, school etc) it will be a more self contained community rather than a rambling estate connects to & putting further pressure on current facilities in MH 	<p>Option G – showground offers interesting prospect & least disadvantages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dotted line showing potential road link (option A) heads into the undeveloped land in the SDA area – seems like you fully intend to develop one of the other options in future! – If Central Government continues to insist we build more houses – wouldn't it be better to build new communities rather than attaching, large boring estates to a town already under pressure / trying to cope with services & traffic flows (even without dev. 	<p>Residents of SDA will want to access M1 / M6 travelling either through MH town centre or on Gallowfield Road. Can unfortunately see sense in a link road / connecting to A4303 – to stop traffic going through MH. Could existing Gallowfield Road to Lubenham be upgraded? – if not link road would need to be purely a <u>link</u> road not a winding estate road with</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
			On Farndon Rd, Clack Hill). More quaint villages / towns to provide for the housing quota not expanding boundaries to create featureless towns (as USA)	traffic calming measures. Junction of link road to A4303, towards brow of hill, would not be safe.
(Lubenham Hill MH) PC126	<p>Option A - only option that wouldn't inflict severe damage on the environment and the community. Other options are totally unacceptable. Reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. new development would have its own facilities rather than stretching existing facilities and creating large-scale traffic to enable new residents to go to and from the existing facilities. 2. gobbles up the smallest amount of open space – least damage to the environment. 3. preserves the essential separation between Market Harborough and Lubenham. 4. other options would impose undue stress on existing facilities, generate unnecessary traffic, use far more open space, blur the distinction between the town, country and village, and in addition, involve 			Top of Lubenham Hill, present boundary of MH, is an extremely sensitive point where development must be avoided & the character of the road / surroundings preserved (otherwise may as well just build all the way to Lubenham & incorporate it in the town- which would be a shame).

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	a dangerous junction with Lubenham Hill.			
(Knoll Street, MH) PC127	Option A - offers a contained village with own facilities - preserves MH as a market town - all option should include construction of a link road to take commercial traffic	Option G Allows for Showground		
(Spinney Close, MH) PC128	Option A as It will not ruin the area as much as the other options	Option G - like the idea of a showground	The route in from Lubenham to MH should remain scenic	
(no address given) PC129			Future residents will come off the M1 and when they arrive in Lubenham they are not going to travel through the town, but will turn right onto Foxton Road. Object to the lack of separation between my village and the development right up to Welland Lodge. There should be an area of separation between the main road and the development.	
(Lubenham) PC130	Option A because: - none of the other options benefit Lubenham in any way - it's a good scheme on its own with	Option G because; - The showground could remain (committed site) - idea of recreational /	A road coming over the western ridge providing access to the south of the site & the associated visual impact.	Protect the south of the site completely – no development only open space with provision for link

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	suitable access - provision for a future link road can be implemented	leisure / entertainment facilities for the community is a great idea. This could be a well accessed mixed use scheme that includes employment. - Option F too close to Gartree (prison)		road. Develop the north with commercial space located close to Leicester Rd.
(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC131	Option A as; - satisfies the criteria of the core strategy, provides the minimum 1000 dwellings and the potential for a future link road - a further 3-400 additional dwellings could be added to option A if required at a later date, however careful planning would be required - the potential link road could be gated or private access for services for public transport, cycling then traffic onto the A4304 would be considerably less. Also the canal bridge would not be required.	Option G as; Provides both employment and possibility for a showground. Needs careful planning.	- A western by-pass should be considered to divert traffic from the town centre. - Amenities and services should be provided before or alongside construction - A country park should be considered with access from Lubenham and Lubenham Hill	Map attached showing a protected area north of Lubenham Hill. This area should be considered as a country park.
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC132	Option A because; - it's a contained village - least impact / preserves character of MH			
(Lubenham)	Option A	No preference	Area needs to be brought 'up'	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC133	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the potential link road is too dangerous for Lubenham Hill 		<p>not 'down. 5 bed houses do not fit alongside greenacres, gartree prison and affordable housing in addition to industrial and commercial areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of facilities – where is the schooling, pressure on NHS services, green impact, pressure on shops, traffic impacts 	
(Lubenham) PC134	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the potential link road is appalling and not to be encouraged - unfortunate that HDC has adopted the Core Strategy with the SDA, there was a lack on consultation 	No preference	<p>Not enough thought on transport matters – there will be a large increase in traffic through Lubenham</p> <p>Not enough thought on infrastructure provision</p>	The green wedge must be maintained and the proposed link road is a disaster
(The Firs, MH) PC135	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - less strain on existing community facilities - destroys less green space - reduced impact on the character of the town 			
(no address stated) PC136	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It complies with the core strategy, and provides a contained area with its own facilities, - Uses the least amount of green 	<p>Option G as;</p> <p>The showground will leave a large area of green land available most of the time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vital majority of land is protected - Additional access on Lubenham Hill would be dangerous - The site needs protecting 	Area below Option A to be protected.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	land - Preserves the identity of Harborough and Lubenham - Dies not require a dangerous link road		for wildlife - No demand for housing in Harborough due to current unsold plots - All town facilities are at breaking point Hotel and facilities will detract from current basin and taken out	
(no address stated) PC137	Option A as; - It complies with the core strategy, and provides a contained area with its own facilities, - Uses the least amount of green land - Preserves the identity of Harborough and Lubenham - Dies not require a dangerous link road	Option G as; The showground will leave a large area of green land available most of the time	- Vital majority of land is protected - Additional access on Lubenham Hill would be dangerous - The site needs protecting for wildlife - No demand for housing in Harborough due to current unsold plots - All town facilities are at breaking point - Hotel and facilities will detract from current basin and taken out	Area below Option A to be protected.
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC138	Option A as; - maintains a clear separation area between Lubenham and MH - safeguards an important area of open space - a single concentration of	Option E as; - preserves the green area of showground whilst potentially developing employment areas	Archaeological and other landscape history	A small retail development should be included, particularly a food supermarket. A limited development would not

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>development (Option A) is more likely to see the community reach a size to allow the school to be built</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1000 dwellings will meet needs for years to come - Option A avoids a potentially dangerous access on Lubenham Hill from a link road 			<p>compromise the retail offering of the town centre. This should be on the Gartree Road north of the site.</p>
(Westfield Close, Market Harborough) PC139	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it uses the least amount of green space and avoids development on sensitive landscape at the main entrance to the town & in the southern end of the district. - offers a village community supported by its own facilities which in turn does not increase demand on doctors, road, schools in the town (already stretched) - helps to preserve the character & identity of MH and to keep separate from Lubenham 		<p>Any future development should enhance the district & not lead to sprawling ribbon development with no sense of character or charm.</p> <p>Any rights of way, bridleways and footpaths should be protected & not concreted over.</p>	
(The Pastures, MH) PC140	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it will become a more self-contained community 			
(The Pastures, MH) PC141	<p>Option A 'Village life'</p>			

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Logan Crescent, MH) PC142	Option A because; It would be most beneficial to MH not only in the immediate future but in the long run (only too easy to create ribbon developments & not to create a community). Poundbury is an example of the type of project that benefits area / residents. Distributes the onus of extra houses over different parts of the locale, not all in one place.			
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC143	Option A as; - complies with the Core Strategy - provide its own facilities and therefore not impact on the town - provide separation for Lubenham			
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC144	Option A for the following reasons: 1. It addresses the problem of pressure on local services and roads with the proposed provision of a school, shop, employment, recreation facilities and subsidised bus service. 2. Strip development along the entire west side of Market Harborough would generate further traffic, focused on the town centre or Welland Park	Suggest limiting the scale of employment premises at present given the state of the economy, but reserving further land should economic conditions improve.	Feel there is a lost opportunity to develop to the East and South East of the town, taking advantage of A6 capacity and possibly funding an A6/A508 link road.	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>Avenue.</p> <p>3. Additional development on the east side of the town with easy access to the A6 would mean additional traffic is less likely to drive through the town centre.</p> <p>4. Options A includes on-site facilities, unlike the Davidson's and Linden Home schemes. In reality it is unlikely that residents would walk or cycle into town from these sites, increasing traffic dramatically.</p> <p>5. Option A makes less demands on our countryside and uses an artificial landscape, created by levelling for RAF Market Harborough during the war years.</p> <p>6. Feel an opportunity has been missed by not focusing development to the East and South East of the town, which may have enabled the construction of an A6/A508 link road. Feel a link road from Airfield Farm to the A4304 would be of little benefit and the possible eastern access to the A4303 would be unsafe.</p>			

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Knoll Street, MH) PC145	Option A as; - offers a village way of life in keeping with what we already have	No preference		
(Knoll Street, MH) PC146	Option A as; - offers a more traditional way of life in keeping with what we already have	No preference		
(Knoll Street, MH) PC147	Option A as; - offers a more traditional way of life in keeping with what we already have	No preference		
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC148	Option A - allow for self supporting community - allows for Lubenham & MH separation - prevents urban sprawl and least damage to landscape		The economic environment – housing stocks in MH should have outlined when new houses were required i.e. a phased approach	Area north of Lubenham Hill to be a separation area
(Hill Top Close, MH) PC149	Option A - self contained community - avoids putting pressure on existing town facilities - uses least amount of green space - avoids sensitive landscape at southern end - preserves character of MH - would not impact on separation between Lubenham and MH	None stated Option A provides substantial job creation for the long term. Options that develop MH will increase competition for local jobs leading to unemployment/poverty and crime	Housing should be developed in line to reflect that this in a long term housing requirement. Badly thought out small sites should be avoided. Road traffic issues and safety should be considered seriously	Respect current separation between Lubenham and MH. Road traffic and safety. Development should be sympathetic with surrounding development. Development should

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
				be away from MH with own facilities.
(Riley Close, MH) PC150	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential for development of viable neighbourhood community supported by it's own facilities (school, shop, doctors) – Such a community would reduce impact on already stretched town centre facilities – Avoids extension of 'estate sprawl' preserving some character in the enlarged MH – Uses least amount of greenspace for development given potential for protection of sensitive landscape on a major approach to town – Allows space for the urgently needed west-east ring road to relieve the all too obvious traffic problems in the town centre. The so-called 'Link Road' will be at best a rat run for cars and will not reduce the pressure of commercial through traffic. Astonishingly this is a need which so-called Strategic Plans ignore! 	Provision of the showground will bring many benefits to MH in terms of its position in this important agricultural region of Leics. In addition potential for staging other commercial events (as per east of England Showground, the Great Yorkshire Showground)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of a west-east ring road 2. Restricting commercial vehicle access to the town centre. 	
(Lubenham)	Option A	None stated		

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC151	<p>The other options would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cover far more than SDA. Development should be shared with other parts of MH - drastically change Lubenham/MH environment and their differential - represent traffic safety hazard at exit/entry points 			
(Lubenham) PC152	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it delivers the majority of the housing required and is in an area which is largely acceptable. - it doesn't impact on any other separate residential village (e.g. Lubenham, Foxton) - it does not require traffic access onto Lubenham Hill at a dangerous access point. Lubenham Hill is already congested at peak time - doesn't create a 'rat run' round Harborough to A4303 - roundabout access already in position on B6047 	<p>Option G;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creates additional employment opportunities while still allowing delivery of showground proposal. <p>Careful consideration required for traffic access needs on surrounding areas.</p>	<p>The need for so much additional housing when there are already empty flats / houses in nearby developments.</p> <p>Why more development in the same area / west side of town as existing development at Farndon Road.</p> <p>The impact of so much development on such a small town.</p>	<p>The creeping erosion of green areas around town is diminishing the pleasure of living in these areas. There are areas within the existing town boundaries which are declining and which should be developed first.</p>
(Lubenham) PC153	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - least intrusive - creates least traffic problems - bridge over canal not a problem - Access to A4304 would create rat runs and dangerous 	<p>Option G</p> <p>Least intrusive and does not compromise Showground</p>	<p>Traffic in Lubenham very heavy when A14 is closed. Adding traffic from 1500-2000 dwellings would create real problems at rush hour.</p>	<p>Wide separation from Lubenham village must be main consideration. One or two fields is not enough to preserve</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	junctions			character
(Douglas Drive, MH) PC154	Option A because; - other options have an adverse effect on Lubenham - like idea of bridge over canal / attractive community area surrounding the marina - should commit to 1000 whilst leaving provision for more if required / at appropriate time	Option G because; - suitably located - showground will provide green buffer between development & Gartree - Option F appears to be on committed showground site	Can a road of the proposed magnitude be delivered at the top of Lubenham Hill? – is it possible / has it been tested	Development to the north – far more suitable in landscape terms.
(Wellend Park Road, MH) PC155	Option A - it will have more of a village feel to it	Option G - would also like a cinema, snooker hall and bowling alley		
(Howard Way, MH) PC156	Pleased that the free showground is on the cards	We must have a showground for the good of Market Harborough and area. This will be good for business and employment.		
(Westfield Close, MH) PC157	Option A - seems to offer a sense of village community rather than urban sprawl - community facilities need to be provided			
(Park Drive, MH) PC158	Option A but without the bridge	Support for showground (Option E)	Green space, footpath and walking and cycling	
(Lubenham Hill,	Option A	None		

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
MH) PC159	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in order to preserve village life/community Lubenham Hill very busy and dangerous, almost impossible to turn right into town. Particularly bad when A14 is closed.			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC160	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - important to maintain separate identities of MH and Lubenham, and for development to be self contained - Access onto Lubenham Hill from drive very hazardous. Speed of traffic an issue. 	None		
(Burnmill Road, MH) PC161	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has the potential to retain a community 'village' rather than amorphous - would not impact on the separation area 		Serious concerns over traffic heading east from the development & MH. Need to avoid traffic increase through Great Bowden	
(The Firs, MH) PC162	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - will help preserve character and identity of MH - avoids urban sprawl merging separate villages 	Option E		
(The Row, Slawston) PC163	Option A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets CS requirement and minimises community impact - provision for future growth without over committing to 	Option G Location makes sense and adjacent to showground. Option F close to Gartree	Cost-benefit analysis of the SDA access to the south of the site	South of the site should be protected – no development needed till post 2028.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	housing requirements			Community facilities (leisure park with cinema, ASDA supermarket, bowling, new gym) should be located near Leicester Road.
(Slawston) PC164	Option A - meets CS requirement and minimises community impact - provision for future growth without over committing to housing requirements	Option G Location makes sense and adjacent to showground. Option F close to Gartree	Cost-benefit analysis of the SDA access to the south of the site	South of the site should be protected – no development needed till post 2028. Community facilities (leisure park with cinema, ASDA supermarket, bowling, new gym) should be located near Leicester Road.
(Fieldhead Close, MH) PC165	Option A, but without the bridge; - provides a significant proportion of the required housing while leaving room for expansion if required at a later date - Less landscape impact - Should be able to provide a 'loop road' through the site, negating the need for a bridge over the canal - Not in favour of a link road with access onto the A4304	Option G as; - more flexible in allowing for the showground - neither option beneficial in landscape terms		

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC166	Option A			
(Leicester Road, MH) PC167	Option C as; - a link road is required to the south of the site - the bridge over the canal associated with Option A is not desirable			
(The Pastures, MH) PC168	Option A as it uses the least amount of green space for development and most closely resembles the current character and identify of Market Harborough.			
(Westfield Close, MH) PC169	Option A as; - provides a separation area between Lubenham and MH - prevents a dangerous junction at Lubenham Hill			
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC170	Option A because: Provides but doesn't exceed CS requirement - appears to deliver specific additional facilities not clearly stated in other options - develops the least attractive part of the area first - bridge over canal supported provided it's sensitively incorporated into the landscape /	None stated.	None	Protect; zone between Lubenham and Harborough; canal environs, and footpaths. Particularly like to see the area of green / open space between the brook & canal (as shown on options C & D)

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	has good provision for pedestrians.			become a valuable local amenity with access & planting.
(Knoll Street, MH) PC171	Option A as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complies with the core strategy - uses the least amount of green land - preserves the identity of MH & Lubenham - does not require a dangerous link road 	Option E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the showground would result in a large area of green land left unused most of the time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vital that the majority of land is protected - need to avoid a junction on Lubenham Hill - the area contains rare and special wildlife - there are unsold houses in the town, so there isn't the demand for housing - all the facilities in the town are at breaking point - there are not enough jobs in the town - the hotel and facilities will affect the basin and should be taken out of the plan 	
(Brookfield Road, MH) PC172	Option A as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delivers the required number of housing required in the short term, - it will have the minimum impact on the town, allowing smaller developments elsewhere - maintains the Lubenham and MH separation area - least impact on residents in the 	Option G as; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provides employment away from the town and suitable for industrial use - next to an existing commercial area, so will have a minimal impact - both other options 	Possible requirement for a primary school is mentioned, but there is no mention of a secondary school. The population of MH has doubled in the past 25 years with the same 2 schools trying to cope. This needs to be addressed.	Very against development on existing farmland, brownfield land should be targeted first and Greenfield left for farming. The SDA should be kept to a minimum.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>NW of MH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provides a self sufficient development as a 'new village' rather than an urban expansion of Harborough - negates the need for a link road and dangerous junction - maintains the countryside to the west of the canal - has received fewer objections than development at Lubenham Hill, part of options B, C and D 	<p>require development on Greenfield land, a showground is not needed and its use would be limited</p>		
(Foxton) PC173	<p>Option B or C as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both options provide a link road through, this is essential to mitigate traffic problems in surrounding areas due to the lack of access from the SDA to the M1, A1 and A14. - Both options provide sufficient housing for the plan period, thus removing the uncertainty of where the balance would be situated 	<p>Option F;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - however, there should be no further B2 development permitted due to noise, and B8 must be excluded due to the need for high buildings to deliver it 	<p>If the showground proposal comes forward, there are concerns over the noise to be generated. The development should be landscaped so it is hidden from view from the north of the site and the surrounding areas should be protected from light pollution.</p>	<p>Wish to see trees planted and green corridor provided on Gallowfield Road, from the Council depot to the prison</p>
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC174	<p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if larger development is required, this should happen incrementally in several stages where the impact of each stage can be discussed, considered and consulted upon 		<p>Stratford upon Avon has a 4 storey car park Market Harborough should use as a model, more parking in town is needed</p>	

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accountability through the consultation – if applying for permission for further stages is incumbent on competing the first stage well they will live up to their responsibilities - infrastructure requirements should be built by the half way stage, regardless of option chosen - option has less of an impact on parking and traffic - the link road proposed needs to be a property link road, aiding the A6 to A4304 traffic, not an estate road as planned 			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC175	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduce impact on current amenities in town - fits with adopted core strategy - have little or no impact on Lubenham - could provide a full bypass in future - does not require a dangerous junction at Lubenham Hill 			
(Husbands Bosworth) PC176	<p>Option A because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other options do not appear to comprehensively address traffic issues; - Option A does not impact upon 	<p>Option F as it has good road access and won't impact upon the showground.</p>	<p>Publishing reasons for the absence of a ring road would make the public feel more informed and confident in the SDA. Unsure why ring road</p>	<p>Area of separation should be designated from the back of Hill Top Close to the Lubenham Limits to</p>

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	separation area at Lubenham Hill; - Option A is self contained and will help to retain the rural character of MH - Option A would have less impact in terms of increased traffic on the town centre and A4304, although wonder whether a ring road to the south and west of the town should be considered. - Options B –D over-deliver on housing, when the economy may not support increased house sales and channel additional traffic onto the A4304.		not included in any of the options since it would keep traffic away from residential areas and make the town more accessible for business.	Development. Nature trails and agricultural landscape on the approach to MH at Lubenham Hill is a feature of the town and should be preserved. [Plan included showing proposed Area of Separation]
(Nelson Street, MH) PC177	Option A	Option G		
(Farndale View, MH) PC178	Option A because; – Only option that minimises the spread of housing into the ‘green corridor’ between MH & Lubenham. Upper Welland Valley is an important living landscape / needs to be protected – It satisfies the basic element of	Option G because; – It facilitates the showground proposal – Would be adjacent to both the showground and housing developments	Use of ‘brownfield sites’ and empty spaces on business parks (e.g. Airfield Farm / Innovation Centre, Northampton Road)	Suggest further development; – Along Windy Ridge – Hill crest Farm (Leicester Rd) / west side – Northampton Road

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<p>the core strategy (1000 houses), there is no evidence that the Council has considered significant developments in other locations. Large scale building already planned in many other parts of the town (Clack Hill, Windy Ridge, Farndon Fields, Northampton Rd)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater chance of viable local community services & facilities being provided if development concentrated on Airfield Farm area. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Larger Airfield farm site towards Gartree Prison <p>Protect area to west of MH to sustain green corridor between MH & Lubenham / Upper Welland Valley [Plan included showing areas to develop / protect]</p> <p>Review some places designated as industry / employment if they are unused now & are likely to remain so for foreseeable future Look elsewhere in the district e.g. Great Glen / east of Leicester</p>
(Farndale View, MH) PC179	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retains a separation area - provides retention of a wildlife corridor - delivers adequate housing and other facilities 	<p>Option G as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - delivers employment land - does not prejudice the showground proposal 		

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	- acceptable in landscape			
(Millers Gardens, MH) PC180	Option A - creates village life with own facilities, not reliant on existing town services - business to north ideal - showground not a good idea - if option D selected (2 nd choice), access (I) would be safer than access (II) - would make sense to link A4304 access (I) to Airfield Farm roundabout, in effect giving northern by-pass and all round benefits	Business use only	If housing requirements are government set, they should fund required by-pass and traffic management. Traffic will eventually throttle town operation/businesses. Run-off water needs serious consideration as Lubenham road is low lying and already floods.	Map showing preferred line of link road provided
(Lubenham) PC181	Option A - good scheme with own access - link road can be implemented later - none of other options benefit Lubenham	Option G Allows for showground. Recreational, entertainment and leisure facilities for local community would be welcome along with employment space.	Road over western ridge providing access to the south and the associated visual impact	Protect the south of the site. Develop north with commercial space close to Leicester Road.
(Knoll Street, MH) PC182	Option A - meets CS requirement of 1000 dwellings - B, C and D would put infrastructure network under undue pressure and increase negative impacts on Lubenham/area of sensitive	Option G Allows for showground and could deliver core strategy requirements, provide community benefits and improve highway issues to north of SDA.	How will access to the south be delivered re: land control and SDA boundary? Neither of the routes has been tested in highways, landscape or design function terms. Options are not substantiated in deliverability.	Option A has proven deliverability and visual, landscape and transport issues are minimised.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	landscape			
(Lubenham Hill, MH) PC183	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets CS 1000, unnecessary to put infrastructure under undue pressure through options B,C & D. - negative impacts on Lubenham of other options increased & sensitive area to south would be heavily impacted. - option A with provision for future growth in place should be pursued. - proven deliverability <p>Visual, landscape, transport issues are minimised.</p>	<p>Option G because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - showground could remain - provides various access points to the site <p>With careful design it could deliver the CS requirements, provide community benefits and improve highway issues to the north of the SDA.</p>	<p>How the access to the south will be delivered – referring to land control & SDA boundaries. Lindon Homes have not agreed to provide a spine road / are not required to do so. Davidsons are proposing a radical solution over the western ridge / outside the SDA boundary.</p> <p>None of the option have been tested in highways/ landscape / design terms – why are options that are unsubstantiated / undeliverable being considered (abortive work)</p>	Develop north / protect south. (Plan attached)
(Douglas Drive, MH) PC184	<p>Option A because;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets CS 1000, unnecessary to put infrastructure under undue pressure through options B,C & D. - negative impacts on Lubenham of other options increased & sensitive area to south would be heavily impacted. - option A with provision for future growth in place should be pursued. 	<p>Option G because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - showground could remain - provides various access points to the site <p>With careful design it could deliver the CS requirements, provide community benefits and improve highway issues</p>	<p>How the access to the south will be delivered – referring to land control & SDA boundaries. Lindon Homes have not agreed to provide a spine road / are not required to do so. Davidsons are proposing a radical solution over the western ridge / outside the SDA boundary.</p>	Develop north / protect south.

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proven deliverability Visual, landscape, transport issues are minimised. 	to the north of the SDA.	None of the option have been tested in highways/ landscape / design terms – why are options that are unsubstantiated / undeliverable being considered (abortive work)	
(Lubenham) PC 185	<p>Option A;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a cautious approach to any residential requirement - avoids conflict with the area of separation between Lubenham & MH - against an additional access on Lubenham Hill, this would generate more traffic through Lubenham - prefer to see plans for a Lubenham bypass 			
(Lubenham) PC186	<p>Option A as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is the smallest proposal in terms of house numbers and therefore generating traffic - option A does not require a link road with a potentially dangerous access point on Lubenham Hill - a separation zone should be kept between Market Harborough and Lubenham 		Lubenham already faces high traffic speeds through the village, making it difficult to cross the A4304. An access road will generate more traffic through the village and pedestrian crossing will need to be improved.	
(Foxton)	Option C	Option F	- Issue of noise concerns	All development

Name (Location)	Which of the four residential based options do you favour and why?	Which of the two commercial options (F or G) do you favour and why?	Are there any additional issues you feel have not previously been considered regarding the SDA?	Any further comments or map illustrations
PC187	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this will provide the link road, essential to mitigating traffic in surrounding settlements - does not have a bridge over the canal - provides sufficient housing for the plan period thus removing the uncertainty of where additional housing would be situated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no further B2 development close to the prison due to noise concerns - B8 development should also be excluded due to the height needed and landscape impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and hours for the use of the showground - Wish to see areas of high density development rather than uniform distribution – space should be used for trees and hedgerows 	<p>should be hidden in view from the north and all surrounding areas should be protected from light and noise pollution</p>

W:\plpolicy\Planning Policy\Development Plans\Harborough LDF 2006-2016\Allocations DPD\SDA Masterplanning\Options Consultation\Consultation responses\Summary of consultation responses.doc