### Summary of Responses – Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Respondent / Representation &amp; Respondent Number</th>
<th>Summary of Comment / Issue</th>
<th>HBBC Response Summary &amp; Action / Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Not specified      | C B G Saddington (12/15450) | In summary:  
The respondent states that a number of letters have been submitted to the Borough Council in response to the Barwell SUE and the Earl Shilton bypass.  
The respondent notes of attendance at the developers’ exhibition for Earl Shilton and states that at the meeting the plans were already agreed and questions what the consultation was meant to achieve.  
The respondent states that a form was submitted showing an (unspecified) diagram and states did not receive a reply or acknowledgement.  
Similarly the respondent attended the exhibition for Barwell (22nd December 2010). The respondent states that further letters were submitted including “ideas / criticisms / warnings etc” and states that no reply was received and state the Council seems to ignore awkward questions / ideas to the contrary and carry on regardless.  
The respondent again questions the point of asking for further comments in response to the SUE. The respondent states “If you are serious about comments I suggest you read the letters I sent to you or do you invite comments so you may claim that interest has been shown regarding your ‘carbuncle’. ”  
The respondent concludes that the names of those who supported the SUE should be available for public scrutiny which should focus minds for any subsequent planning. | The exhibition referred to was a pre-application exhibition held by the developers of the Earl Shilton SUE undertaken in September 2013 and did not form part of the Publication of the AAP by the Borough Council.  
All consultation responses are considered throughout the preparation of the AAP. The nature of planning requires the Borough Council to consider and balance all of the issues and concerns presented in response to the draft Plan and to identify the most appropriate solutions and revise the plans accordingly.  
The Consultation Statement (July 2013) (AAP 02) made available alongside the Pre-submission AAP(AAP 01) provides a summary of how the masterplans and the AAP have been prepared in consultation with residents and stakeholders. Paragraph 2.19 makes reference to the 2010 consultation summary which sets out the process and outcomes of the exhibitions undertaken in 2010. The outputs from the process informed the ‘preferred options’ for the SUEs presented in the Consultation Draft AAP (2010) (AAP 10). |
| Not specified      | Mr S John (015/06844) | There has been a lack of consultation. The only information has been presented by the developers who obviously have a vested interest supported by HBBC. This is not a balanced approach. This development is so huge and unpopular that only a vote of existing inhabitants of Earl Shilton will give it any validity and a platform of full consultation.  
There has been no participation of people in Earl Shilton, they don’t want a development of this size it is not proportional. The people of Earl Shilton do not know the viability of any alternatives as none have been presented. One has to question whether any have actually been pursued. | The Borough Council does not accept there has been a lack of consultation nor the participation in Earl Shilton.  
The Consultation Statement (July 2013) made available alongside the Pre-submission AAP provides a summary of how the masterplans and the AAP have been prepared in consultation with residents and stakeholders. In summary, the following stages of consultation have been carried out in the preparation of the AAP:  
- The Area Action Plan Options for Earl Shilton and Barwell settlement centres and sustainable urban extensions were presented at a series of public exhibitions in Barwell on the 4th and 5th of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Respondent / Representation &amp; Respondent Number</th>
<th>Summary of Comment / Issue</th>
<th>HBBC Response Summary &amp; Action / Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr. J Richards (031/CU0829)</td>
<td>There is a great scepticism about the Earl Shilton SUE proposal throughout the town, just as there is in Barwell concerning the SUE the Borough Council imposed on that community. As with Barwell, the Borough Council has failed to engage local residents in Earl Shilton and proactively seek their opinions on a matter of great importance to them.</td>
<td>December 2009 and in Earl Shilton on the 11th and 12th December 2009. The exhibition material was then displayed at the Borough Council Offices until 8th January 2010. Feedback was requested during these sessions and was taken into account when refining the Masterplan Options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stakeholder Design Workshops were held on 2nd and 3rd March 2010. The purpose of these events was to bring key stakeholders together and engage them in the design process through a series of interrelated masterplanning exercises in order to inform the preparation of the preferred option for each masterplan.

- The Area Action Plan Preferred Options for Earl Shilton and Barwell settlement centres and sustainable urban extensions were presented at a series of public exhibitions in Barwell on 8th and 9th October 2010 and at Earl Shilton on 15th and 16th October 2010. Feedback was requested during these sessions and is being taken into account in the development of the Area Action Plan.

- The Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan Preferred Options Document was the subject of a six week period of consultation in January and February 2011.

The Consultation Statement (July 2013) made available alongside the Pre-submission AAP provides a summary of how the masterplans and the AAP have been prepared in consultation with residents and stakeholders. In summary, the following stages of consultation have been carried out in the preparation of the AAP:

- The Area Action Plan Options for Earl Shilton and Barwell settlement centres and sustainable urban extensions were presented at a series of public exhibitions in Barwell on the 4th and 5th of December 2009 and in Earl Shilton on the 11th and 12th December 2009. The exhibition material was then displayed at the Borough Council Offices until 8th January 2010. Feedback was requested during these sessions and was taken into account when refining the Masterplan Options.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Respondent / Representation &amp; Respondent Number</th>
<th>Summary of Comment / Issue</th>
<th>HBBC Response Summary &amp; Action / Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G Kent (035/01565)</td>
<td>For this consultation to be meaningful and effective, it should have been carried-out in an inclusive, thorough and honest way with regular feedback of the results and no predetermined outcome. However, the reality is that the process has failed on all of these counts. Some examples are detailed below: -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph No. 1.11 Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>In order to be effective, the consultation process would have needed to encourage and facilitate the participation of all residents. This would have required frequent communication of new or modified documents along with some indication of the content/changes and a means of access and response that was suitable for (at the very least) the majority of residents. Furthermore, there would have needed to be regular feedback of residents’ comments and the HBBC/Developers responses, in order to give confidence that the consultation process was meaningful and effective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The HBBC consultation process failed badly. The process adopted was that HBBC gradually compiled/modified/updated documentation on the HBBC website without adequate notice to interested parties. Furthermore (speaking as someone who uses computers as a major part of my job), I would describe the required navigation of the website in order to find the documentation as tortuous. There were no instructions! Even when the documentation was found, there was no attempt at providing descriptions, cataloguing or indexing to enable the residents to find those documents of immediate relevance. If my memory is correct, there were eventually several hundred documents (many with meaningless names) listed over 13 pages! This consultation system also meant that the many residents without a computer were effectively excluded from the process, since the only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please see the responses above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see the responses above.

The Council did not update documents on the Borough council’s website without notice given to interested parties. Consultation processes and draft of the AAP have been subject to a range of consultation methods and notification in conformity with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement. Specifically, the methods used to notify residents and stakeholders of the Consultation Draft AAP are set out in paragraph 3.3 of the Consultation Statement (July 2013).

It is unfortunate that the respondent found the website difficult to navigate, however the Borough Council provides the navigation link to the AAP webpage on all notification material during each formal consultation stage. During both the Consultation and Pre-submission periods, a link was provided on the homepage of the Council’s webpage.
alternative was to frequently visit Council Offices to try to locate and absorb relevant documents and compose responses – an impracticable task. In summary, the system was such that only the most determined of residents with their own computer and a willingness to devote an excessive amount of time could effectively engage with the HBBC documentation system. It would be educational for the Planning Inspector to attempt to use this site to try to access documents as residents had to, but it appears that HBBC have now removed access (despite the fact that this would be helpful for residents trying to respond to the AAP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Respondent / Representation &amp; Respondent Number</th>
<th>Summary of Comment / Issue</th>
<th>HBBC Response Summary &amp; Action / Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alternative was to frequently visit Council Offices to try to locate and absorb relevant documents and compose responses – an impracticable task. In summary, the system was such that only the most determined of residents with their own computer and a willingness to devote an excessive amount of time could effectively engage with the HBBC documentation system. It would be educational for the Planning Inspector to attempt to use this site to try to access documents as residents had to, but it appears that HBBC have now removed access (despite the fact that this would be helpful for residents trying to respond to the AAP).</td>
<td>for a period of at least 4 weeks to the AAP consultation page which included all of the consultation documents and a link to the earlier masterplanning documents. The documents are not removed from the AAP webpages post consultation. All of the consultation documents are also made available at various deposit points throughout Borough, including the Barwell and Earl Shilton libraries and the Borough Council offices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the very beginning, Barwell residents had expressed their opposition to a Barwell SUE for the obvious reasons of existing traffic congestion, loss of precious green fields, lack of spare infrastructure capacity, etc. Furthermore, when questioned about the proposed “Regeneration of Barwell Centre”, all that Councillors and Developers were offering were little more than cosmetic improvements, which would be far outweighed by the detrimental effects of a SUE. Despite their failure to convince the residents, Councillors and Developers persisted in claiming that the overwhelming majority of residents were in favour of the SUE proposals. This dishonesty led to the residents organising a large public meeting at which it was agreed to call for a Parish Poll on the issue of whether or not Barwell residents were in favour of the 2500 house development. Even before the Poll took place, the Chairman of Barwell Parish Council stated in a packed Annual Parish Meeting of 30 April 2012 that if the residents voted against the development, the Councillors would continue to support the SUE. Given the restrictions in the number of Polling Stations and opening times, the turn-out for the poll was comparable to that at any election and the result was 63 residents in favour of the development and 1600 against.

Subsequently, the Developers were invited to attend a Public Meeting in order to discuss the residents views, but disappointingly they declined (email Jackie Nally, Associate Director, Lexington Communications, to Geoffrey Kent dated 22 January 2013).

In February 2013, the residents of Barwell were plagued by a Populous telephone survey asking loaded questions (e.g. Would you like a new school?), with the aim of eliciting responses which would somehow enable the sponsors of the survey to claim that the majority of residents were in favour of the proposed SUE. It took considerable time and effort (including the involvement of our MP David Tredinnick), before the Developers were persuaded to confess that they were the sponsors of this incident.

Even when detailed submissions (including questions) were provided by residents during the consultation process, with a clear request for a response, no responses were forthcoming. This was demoralising and left a strong impression that the production of submissions was pointless.

Despite the fact that Traffic Congestion was always a strong argument against a Barwell SUE, the consultation on this subject took place very belatedly, by which time it was clear that the Developers and Councillors were advanced in their commitment to the SUE. In fact, HBBC appeared to be desperate to give outline approval to the Barwell SUE, initially proposing that this be determined in a Planning Meeting in March 2013, despite the fact that the Highway Authority were still to complete their second report on the traffic problems. Subsequently, HBBC were forced to concede that they could not hold the Planning Meeting until the second Highway Authority report was produced.

Also, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) Joint Report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Environment & Transport Report of 24 January 2013 recommended that “ideally the [planning] application should not be determined in advance of an adopted Area Action Plan in order to secure the proper planning of the area and avoid the risk of the [Barwell] SUE being developed in isolation”. The respondent comments primarily in response to the consultation processes undertaken by the developers in relation to the planning application for Barwell and not the AAP.

The Consultation Statement (July 2013) made available alongside the Pre-submission AAP provides a summary of how the masterplans and the AAP have been prepared in consultation with residents and stakeholders. Paragraph 2.19 makes reference to the 2010 consultation summary which sets out the process and outcomes of the exhibitions undertaken in 2010. The outputs from the process informed the ‘preferred options’ for the SUEs presented in the Consultation Draft AAP (2010). Comments were sought on the Consultation draft and a summary of the comments and the Borough Council’s responses are provided in Appendix 2 of the Consultation Statement.

The respondent makes reference to identifying alternative locations for the SUEs. The principle for the provision of directions for growth of the SUEs is established in Core Strategy policies 2 and 3. To inform the Core strategy, a ‘Directions for Growth’ paper was prepared which appraised 8 areas to accommodate the growth in the Borough, from which the two allocations identified for the two SUEs were chosen. The locations were considered the most appropriate due to them having the least constraints to their development, but also the benefits associated with development providing a catalyst for the regeneration of their respective settlement centres. The AAP does not re-determine the location of the growth but provides a development framework to guide the Council, developers and others investing in the future of Earl Shilton and Barwell to 2026.

Also, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) Joint Report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Environment & Transport Report of 24 January 2013 recommended that “ideally the [planning] application should not be determined in advance of an adopted Area Action Plan in order to secure the proper planning of the area and avoid the risk of the [Barwell] SUE being developed in isolation”.

The respondent comments primarily in response to the consultation processes undertaken by the developers in relation to the planning application for Barwell and not the AAP.
Sensible advice, but at this stage it was clear that HBBC had behind closed doors committed with the Developers to approve the development without delay.

Shortly after receiving the Highway Authorities second report, HBBC Planning Meeting was re-scheduled for 23 April 2013. This decision ignored the LCC advice that the AAP should be completed before the Meeting!

Due to the significance of the Barwell SUE application, HBBC agreed to allow representatives of residents to make speeches at the Planning Meeting. These representations were well prepared and presented and provided what appeared to be compelling reasons to reject the Barwell SUE Planning Application. However, when the time came for the Councillors to make their decision, the Council Officers advised the Councillors that they had no choice but to give Outline Planning approval (on the grounds that the Developers would appeal against rejection and win at great cost to HBBC)! Hence, the application was always going to be approved and the representations on behalf of residents had been pointless!

This appalling situation raises questions for the Planning Inspector. How could the Council Officers allow the situation to develop whereby the residents views became meaningless and even the HBBC Councillors were denied the freedom to make their own decision on the application?

At what point had the Developers attained the power to force the application through?

Why had the residents’ opposition to the SUE been ignored?

Given the strong opposition to the SUE (including a large televised Protest March in Hinckley), why did HBBC not sit down with the representatives of the residents of Barwell, Stapleton and other affected villages, to explore more suitable locations for the SUE?

The Planning Committee decision of 23 April 2013 should be declared unsound (given the serious failings detailed above) and the Barwell SUE consultation process should be conducted in a proper, meaningful and effective manner. Residents and HBBC should work together to identify a suitable location for the SUE and produce an agreed development plan.

I have just logged on to Response Form, to respond to the development in Earl Shilton. The form is designed in such a way, I suspect many people, who are concerned about the disappearing fields around Earl Shilton, would have not completed the form, feeling that there is a lack of opportunity to clearly express their views. As a Sociology & Criminology Graduate, I can't help suspect that the form has been designed to be purposefully obstructive. My guess is that many

The Borough Council used a standard format for the response form to encourage respondents to apply the ‘Tests of Soundness’ whilst able to provide comments relating to a particular section/paragraph/policy within the AAP. The Borough Council provided two pages of guidance notes to provide assistance in completing the response form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Respondent / Representation &amp; Respondent Number</th>
<th>Summary of Comment / Issue</th>
<th>HBBC Response Summary &amp; Action / Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>R Montgomery (049/15612)</td>
<td>The documents indicate that consultation on the AAP commenced in 2009 but Stapleton residents were not consulted. Worse still our Parish Council was not one of the consultees, despite representing the adjacent villages of Stapleton, Kirkby Mallory and Peckleton, all of which are severely affected. I consider this to be illegal. Four years on the master planning does not seem to have changed or taken into account comments by many residents and local organisations from 2009 onwards. Furthermore, the AAP has been fundamental overtaken and superseded by the planning approval for the Barwell SUE granted in April 2013 which is not reflected in the AAP. As pointed out by the County Council and others this planning application should not have been determined prior to the approval and adoption of the AAP in which it sits. This may or may not be illegal but it makes nonsense of the planning process and democracy. Finally the approval of the Barwell SUE planning application demonstrates that democracy does not work in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. After 12 months of consultation and a 3 hour debate the planning committee simply voted down party lines ignoring common sense, the consultation and feelings of residents, the public and local parish councils. The Borough Council must accept that this AAP and the process adopted is simply unacceptable.</td>
<td>All Parish Councils throughout the Borough were consulted on the Consultation draft AAP and the Pre-submission AAP. Press releases and press notices advertising the Consultation draft were published in the Hinckley Times and Leicester Mercury. Developers are entitled to submit proposals for planning permission ahead of the adoption of Development Plans. The Borough Council has engaged with the developers of the Barwell SUE throughout the outline application process to assist in shaping the proposals to conform to the emerging Pre-submission version of the AAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Barwell Parish Council (25a/CU0959)</td>
<td>Barwell Parish Council welcomes regular on-going consultation with developers and other Local Authorities as building progresses to discuss issues as they arise. The Parish Council appreciates that issues will arise over the 15-year building programme, and requests that contact is maintained throughout to ensure that challenges can be overcome as soon as possible. Barwell Parish Council appreciates the work that has been undertaken through the Village Improvement Working Party, and hopes that this can continue to encompass changes to the wider area.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>