

## CHARNWOOD FOREST REGIONAL PARK : DRAFT VISION STATEMENT : STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Very lengthy comments have been summarised.

CF = Charnwood Forest

RP = Regional Park

LDF = Local Development Framework

BAP = Biodiversity Action Plan

GI = Green Infrastructure

LCC = Leicestershire County Council

NWLDC = North West Leicestershire District Council

Name	Comments by question number	Response
British Geological Survey	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Suggest adding 'recreation' after 'leisure' at bullet point 3. Note that more could be done to improve the footpath network.	Whilst 'recreation' might suggest more active pursuits than 'leisure', for most purposes the two words imply the same thing. Improvements to footpath and cycle networks are included at 5.1 of the Draft Vision Statement and this aspect will be developed in the CFRP Strategy.
	3. Agree	No response needed.
	4. Disagree. The boundary should be drawn more tightly, using the break in slope that defines the area characterised by stone walls, crags, vernacular buildings, stony ground etc. Particularly disagree with the south-west extension towards Thornton, this being seen as totally out of keeping with the Charnwood uplands. Notes that at Fig 015 of TEP study BGS, Open Spaces Society & Leics. Archaeological Society all place the boundary here further north and suggest should go with this consensus.	The working boundary for the RP is landscape character based and the presence of single features such as rock outcrops or woodland is not the sole reason for its definition. CF exists as a landscape character area in national and county level landscape character assessments. In both of these its extent is broadly similar to that proposed for CFRP. The CF Character Assessment identifies sub-areas of differing character within the wider CF area. For the purposes of the CFRP a fairly broad boundary is seen as being useful in creating linkages and obtaining funding.

	<p>5. For the statement to work there must be a sensible view of what defines CF and this must be kept to faithfully when deciding on the physical boundaries. If this is not done, CF will lose its distinctiveness.</p>	<p>Landscape character assessment provides a structured and consistent means of defining the area.</p>
<p>Country Land and Business Association</p>	<p>1. In trying to make the vision as short as possible a potentially conflicting view has been produced which omits some important factors. The terms 'enhance, protect and manage' imply different approaches.</p>	<p>A concise vision is essential. Detail will be developed through a CFRP Strategy. Enhancement, protection and management will be appropriate to different areas of CFRP, as is clear from the CF Character Assessment. Whilst the use of "management" in the Draft Vision Statement could imply "restriction" it isn't meant to automatically do so.</p>
	<p>1. The vision only covers the natural and cultural heritage of CF; it does not have anything to do with the economy or tourism, both of which are key to the area's future. The vision must include a clear vision for the enhancement of the economy, together with respect for the environment and landscape.</p>	<p>The Draft Vision Statement clearly acknowledges the traditional working landscape of CF, its importance for mineral working, the need to promote sustainable leisure and tourism, and the need to support agricultural diversification and woodland/rural economy uses. We will endeavour to make clearer links between the working landscape and our objectives in the revised Vision Statement.</p>
	<p>1. Welcome recognition that residents &amp; visitors have an interest in CF, but need to consider those travelling through the area.</p>	<p>This detailed point should be picked up as part of the CFRP Strategy</p>
	<p>2. Concerned that the objectives raise the environment to the top of the list. It is important that the value of the environment is taken in context – CF does not merit the degree of protection afforded to National Parks or AONBs. However, the landscape is distinctive and development should not be prohibited but planned so that it enhances the landscape.</p>	<p>The planning policies being developed through LDFs will permit appropriate development of high quality design.</p>

	<p>2. It is likely that development will change, in part, the character of various settlements. This change could be beneficial if it broadens the range of people within a community, creates employment, and/or maintains or creates the services that lead to a more sustainable settlement. The aim should be to make rural settlements sustainable. There should not be a policy of restraint which would prevent development beneficial to the locality and visitors. Policy should enable workspace to be provided for businesses that are not rural focussed but are appropriate to a rural location (eg software businesses in converted buildings).</p>	<p>The issue of rural diversification will need to be addressed through LDFs. It is not the intention to use CFRP as a restraint to development, rather to utilise it to benefit settlements and guide the design of development taking place there. Such a policy should not discourage the provision of appropriate employment which should be considered through Core Strategies and assessed on a settlement by settlement basis.</p>
	<p>2. Disappointed that final objective deals only with promotion of sustainable leisure and tourism. Needs to be a wider policy that refers to a sustainable rural economy which may include other industries suited to the rural area. A policy here might include CF branded products and encouragement of local marketing and value adding.</p>	<p>The Draft Vision Statement refers to agricultural diversification and woodland and rural economy uses as well as to leisure and tourism. Detailed proposals such as CF product branding will be developed through the CFRP Strategy</p>
	<p>3. It is important when considering landscape character, biodiversity, geodiversity, and habitat creation and enhancement, that it is possible to take forward a coherent policy that includes targeting of environmental stewardship resources from Natural England. The key external resource will be the Environmental Stewardship Scheme.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Natural England are represented on the Future of CF Steering Group and contributed to the preparation of the Draft Vision Statement.</p>

	<p>3. Whilst strategic green spaces and routes within CF can be enhanced this can only be done within their existing boundaries. It is unclear how access would be created more widely – there are several options. CLAB advise that the greatest merit is in achieving voluntary access agreements with landowners, especially where this can be matched in with development proposals. A strategic approach is better than an unlinked network.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Draft Vision Statement refers specifically to the creation of new green spaces and routes to remedy gaps in current provision. This proposal will be developed further by the RP Strategy and guided by the 6Cs Strategic GI Strategy due to be published late summer 2009. The preferred method of working is through voluntary agreements.</p>
	<p>3. Reference to agricultural diversification is welcomed, but this needs to be extended to diversification of the rural economy as a whole. In terms of diversification, agricultural and non-agricultural holdings need to be treated equally by the planning system.</p>	<p>Rural and agricultural diversification are important facets of the rural economy and diversification needs to be seen in its broadest context as per PPS7. Section 5 of the Draft Vision Statement allows for 'sustainable leisure and tourism development' and 'rural economy uses'. It is considered that this appropriately addresses the issue of agricultural and non-agricultural uses. The planning system must consider such matters on a case by case basis as the impacts of agricultural and non-agricultural enterprises can be very different.</p>
	<p>3. Diversifying the rural economy should concentrate on providing employment for people within the RP, increasing income to the RP, and providing facilities for those that come to the area. If the primary aim of economic development is environmental benefit then many applications will be questionable as investments.</p>	<p>Charnwood Forest is a relatively small area and cannot be seen in economic isolation. The Draft Vision Statement refers to environmental and economic factors giving a balanced framework for decisions to be made. These are not considered to be overly restrictive.</p>
	<p>4. Recognise that drawing a boundary is fraught with difficulty and therefore do not offer detailed comments. However, question whether some of the larger settlements/parts of settlements on the boundary should be included within the RP. Drawing the boundary to exclude these areas may have merit by focussing solutions on the rural areas.</p>	<p>For the purposes of the CFRP a fairly broad boundary is seen as being useful in creating linkages and obtaining funding. Since there is evidence in some settlement edge locations of pressures from casual recreation, sometimes including vandalism, damaging the environment, it is considered preferable to include these areas within the CFRP so that these issues can be considered holistically.</p>

	5. Concerned that RP proposals will not deliver any increased economic activity.	Whilst the aim of CFRP is not primarily to deliver increased economic activity, the Draft Vision Statement recognises the role of agricultural diversification, minerals, sustainable tourism and leisure, and rural economy uses.
	5. Concerned that planning policies will be introduced which will restrict development within CF and not benefit either the environment or the economy.	It is not the intention to use CFRP as a restraint to development, rather to utilise it to benefit settlements and guide the design of development taking place there. Such a policy should not discourage the provision of appropriate employment which should be considered through Core Strategies and assessed on a settlement by settlement basis.
	5. It is unclear why CF meets the criteria of an RP. The area is of distinct landscape character but it is nowhere demonstrated why this area has value to the whole region, rather than just to the county or the 6Cs sub-region.	There are no defining criteria for an RP. RPs have differing objectives suited to local needs and for CFRP the pressures of proposed sub-regional growth are a driving force. It is not considered that there is a need to demonstrate value to the whole region, although CF has national and international value in terms of its geology and includes wildlife habitats of regional and national importance.
	5. The vision needs to be much clearer about how the RP will look in 10-15yrs time. The brevity of the vision and supporting documents mean that it is unclear whether the RP will exist to prevent development or whether economic development will be encouraged for the wider benefit.	The RP recognises the need to balance a wide range of pressures and demands on CF and seeks to find solutions that will benefit both people and the environment. The Charnwood Forest policies being developed in LDFs will permit appropriate development of high quality design.
	5. The majority of attendees at the November 2008 stakeholder meeting were from backgrounds suggesting a leaning towards a planning policy restriction approach. The vision needs to be clear about what is intended to be achieved.	The stakeholder group represents a very wide range of organisations, including those with economic interests. Full lists of attendees at each of the three stakeholder events held to date can be found on the County Council's CF webpages.
	5. The real measure of success will be whether CFRP can draw in funding to encourage both environmental and economic development, and support a good public transport network.	RP status may help to bring in funding that would not otherwise be available.
East Midlands Geodiversity Partnership	1. Add 'industrial heritage'.	This should be included in the revised Vision Statement.

	1. Spell out landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity as these are the area's most crucial features.	These are given high priority in the Draft Vision Statement and will be dealt with in greater detail in the CFRP Strategy.
	1. Spell out in the Vision Statement the international significance of CF as one of the world's best localities for Precambrian fossils.	This will be covered in the CFRP Strategy.
	1. Spell out cities by name and don't use jargon terms.	We will aim to avoid jargon in the revised Vision Statement.
	2. Change word order to 'geodiversity and biodiversity'. Geodiversity is more important as it underpins biodiversity, landscape and much of the local economy.	Although geology clearly underpins everything, the approach to CFRP is landscape character based.
	3. At point 1, put geodiversity before biodiversity, add industrial heritage, add reference to international importance. Also add that, within limits, new buildings will be encouraged to use local stone to help preserve the area's character.	See responses to comments at 2. and 1. above. The detailed issue of using local stone in new buildings is a matter for planning policies in LDFs.
	3. Unclear what 'new access routes' refers to at point 3. New roads are likely to damage the landscape.	Access here refers only to pedestrian routes, cycleways and horse riding routes. The revised Vision Statement will be re-worded to make this clear.
	3. Point 6 should include reference to education, as well as leisure and tourism.	Reference to education will be included in the revised Vision Statement.
	3. Point 7 – restoration of minerals sites to geodiversity and biodiversity uses should have particular emphasis on creating new and existing habitats.	This more detailed point should be picked up through the CFRP Strategy.

	<p>3. Suggests an additional point (9) – <b>The geodiversity resources of the region have assumed great international importance as one of the leading sites in the world for Precambrian fossils. The area’s geodiversity will be developed with the specific aim of preserving and enhancing sites that yield the unique Precambrian fossils, working with the British Geological Survey, Charnia Research Group and Leicestershire &amp; Rutland RIGS Group. There will be a programme of work to enhance sites by providing suitable facilities (access, seats, toilets) for education and tourism.’</b></p>	<p>This level of detail is more appropriate to the CFRP Strategy.</p>
	<p>4. No strong views. It needs to include all the Precambrian geology, the area with Precambrian rocks close to the surface, and a reasonable buffer zone. Key features such as roads should be used for the boundary.</p>	<p>We believe these criteria are met by the proposed working boundary. Roads and other physical features are used for the boundary in places but are not always appropriate for a boundary based on landscape character.</p>
	<p>5. Geological and biological conservation are two of the most important features that need consideration, bringing in the tourist and education sectors as much as possible. We have lots of excellent attributes in these fields and need to do everything possible to conserve them and maximise their use without causing over-use and damage.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Forestry Commission	<p>1. Agree. It is In line with the Regional Forestry Framework.</p>	<p>No response needed.</p>
	<p>2 Agree especially in the areas of: Trees and People; Trees and the Environment; Trees and the Economy and Communication and Collaboration.</p>	<p>No response needed</p>
	<p>3. No specific comments</p>	<p>No response needed</p>
	<p>4. No specific comment.</p>	<p>No response needed</p>

	5. No other comments.	No response needed
FPCR for Wm Davis Ltd, Loughborough	1. The vision is appropriate to an area of high landscape quality and value, such as the recognised core of CF. It is not appropriate for all the areas shown within the proposed RP boundary.	<p>The CFRP boundary has been defined in terms of landscape character, not quality. All landscapes have character, although there are inevitably transitional areas at the fringes of landscape character areas. The CF Character Assessment identifies sub-areas of differing character within CF.</p> <p>The 'core' of CF does not have any formal recognition of its quality and value. CF exists as a landscape character area in national and county level landscape character assessments. In both of these its extent is broadly similar to that proposed for CFRP. The CFRP seeks to recognise the distinctiveness and 'specialness' of the whole CF area, but RP is not a landscape quality designation.</p> <p>The revised Vision Statement will seek to clarify the relationship between CFRP and growth in surrounding areas.</p>
	2. The objectives are high level and appropriate to an area of high landscape quality and value, such as the recognised core of CF. They are not appropriate for all the areas shown within the proposed RP boundary.	See response to 1. above.

	<p><b>3.</b> These are demanding aspirations and would be appropriate to an area of high landscape quality and value. They are not appropriate for areas of more ordinary landscape, existing developed areas of no special character, or for areas of major proposed development.</p> <p>The fringes of the urban areas do not exhibit typical CF characteristics and are likely to be identified as areas for sustainable development growth; they should not be subject to the same landscape protection policy constraint as those areas of acknowledged landscape character and quality. Such constraint will deter investment and delivery of regional development growth, and will devalue the policy appropriate to the core of the recognised CF.</p>	<p>See response to 1 above.</p> <p>The European Landscape Convention, to which the UK is a signatory, emphasises the importance of all landscapes, the need to respect landscape character and the need for an holistic approach to landscape planning, management and enhancement.</p> <p>The working boundary for CFRP has been defined in terms of landscape character, which allows for the inclusion of urban areas. Other RPs, and indeed National Parks, include fairly large settlements. RP is not a designation based on landscape quality. It is not the intention to use CFRP as a restraint to development, rather to utilise it to benefit settlements and guide the design of development taking place there. Such a policy should not discourage the provision of appropriate development which should be considered through Core Strategies and assessed on a settlement by settlement basis. It is not considered that CFRP would deter investment, but provide scope for greater diversity, including tourism and leisure, within different parts of its area.</p>
	<p><b>4.</b> The boundary extends into transitional areas, many of which are not of particular character or quality. The boundary should not include existing urban areas or those proposed for major development. The RP designation would elevate the value of these areas in policy terms above that which can be justified through a landscape assessment. The policy protection could provide an unnecessary extra constraint on the delivery of regional growth.</p>	<p>See responses to 1 and 3 above.</p>
	<p><b>5.</b> A ten page report was appended to the response form with detailed comments on the Draft Vision Statement and the landscape assessment used in defining the CFRP working boundary.</p>	<p>The comments on the Draft Vision Statement made in the report are reiterations of the comments made above. See responses to points 1-4 above.</p>

	<p>5. To determine the appropriateness of the boundary fpcr considered it necessary to review the Charnwood Forest Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (CFLSCA) carried out by TEP in 2008. The following points were made :</p>	
	<p>5. Para 4.27 of CFLSCA is queried. This states that '<i>... although it is unlikely much development will be proposed within Charnwood Forest itself, the surrounding development will have implications for the Forest.</i>' However, the proposed working boundary for CFRP includes areas with potential for housing growth and other identified development eg Loughborough Science park extension. The draft Charnwood Borough LDF has a Draft Core Policy (Policy 9, Charnwood Forest) which states that within the CF Policy Area (to be defined on the proposals map) development will only be acceptable where it is appropriate to a countryside location and to the special character of the area in terms of its landscape, ecology, cultural and built heritage, and where the recreational value is conserved and enhanced. Development which could adversely affect these special qualities will not be permitted unless a clear overriding need can be demonstrated and appropriate compensation works are proposed. If the CF Policy area was to become synonymous with CFRP this would clearly have a constraining effect on development.</p>	<p>Draft Core Policy 9 Charnwood Forest relates to the 2006 Charnwood Borough Council Core Strategy Preferred Options Report. This policy does not reflect the most up-to-date thinking towards Charnwood Forest and is not the subject of this current consultation. The particular concerns raised here are not applicable to this current consultation relating to the Charnwood Forest Regional Park. The Vision Statement will be redrafted to clarify the relationship between the Regional Park and development. Policies for CFRP will be defined through LDFs and this will be made clear in the revised Vision Statement.</p>

	<p>5. Whilst explanations are given in CFLSCA for some of the detailed choices of boundary, it is still difficult to follow the logic for the boundary shown, which covers large areas on the periphery of what most groups (ie stakeholder groups who responded to the boundary consultation) considered to be the Forest, particularly on the south and west of Loughborough.</p>	<p>The starting point for the boundary was a review of the LCC CF landscape character area. Chapter 7 of CFLSCA provides a boundary analysis and explains each of the proposed boundary changes. The proposed boundary is based on the review of the 1995 LCC CF landscape character area boundary, the county's recent Historic Landscape Characterisation work, desk and field study, and stakeholder consultation. The proposed boundary represents the synthesis of all these elements using professional judgement. However, landscape character area boundaries are inherently 'fuzzy' and character areas will inevitably include areas towards their margins which are transitional in character. To the south and west of Loughborough and Shepshed the boundary has been drawn less extensively than previously.</p>
	<p>5. Following on from the above comment, it is difficult to see why urban areas (parts of Loughborough, Shepshed, Quorn, Whitwick, Mountsorrel) which bear little resemblance to the characteristics of the CF landscape are included within the CFRP boundary, although it is acknowledged that paras 10.40 and 10.41 of CFLSCA contain some justification for this.</p>	<p>The 1995 LCC landscape character areas all include urban areas on the grounds that whilst these areas contain urban landscapes, they draw at least some of their character from the underlying landscape character areas.</p>
	<p>5. It is agreed that having a single agreed boundary would simplify policy. However, the adoption of the proposed CFRP boundary, including many urban fringe landscapes that differ in character from the core area of CF, for this purpose would extend policy protection to a much wider area than that previously recognised as of value, as commented above in reference to para 4.27.</p>	<p>See response to comments on para 4.27 above.</p>
	<p>5. Para 10.33 of the CFLSCA states, in terms of setting objectives for CFRP, <i>'the nature and special quality of the Charnwood Forest landscape means that objectives are likely to be similar to those of National Parks or AONBs'</i>.</p>	<p>This para represents TEP's opinion and was written before the Draft Vision Statement, which makes it clear that the objectives for CFRP are much broader than landscape protection.</p>

	<p>5. Following on from this, the urban fringe areas should not be subject to the same landscape protection policy as areas of acknowledged landscape character and quality. Such a policy will deter investment and the delivery of regional development growth and will devalue the policy in terms of the core of CF.</p>	<p>See response to point 3 above.</p>
	<p>5. The CFLSCA is contradictory and lacks the transparency required to justify the Forest boundaries. The proposed boundary does not appear to be based on a detailed appraisal of landscape character or on consultation feedback, but is motivated by a desire to increase the size of the Forest to justify a larger CFRP.</p>	<p>See response to comments on detailed choice of boundary above. LCC commissioned the CFLSCA are are satisfied that the character assessment and boundary proposal are fit for purpose. At no time did the study brief or subsequent discussions contain any remit to expand the CF character area. The brief was to review the 1995 landscape character assessment boundary and other CF boundaries in current use for various purposes, and to recommend a working boundary for CFRP.</p>
	<p>5. The individual character areas identified are quite large and contain varied areas of landscape, eg the Swithland area includes rural areas and recently developed urban fringe residential areas.</p>	<p>Landscape character areas are not determined by size and do not exclude built up areas.</p>
	<p>5. Following on from this, whilst the condition and strength of character assessments have value as an 'average' for the overall area, the recommended strategies are not always appropriate for individual sites or landscape areas.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the recommendations will not be applicable to every individual site area.</p>
	<p>5. The assessment does not justify why Whitwick, and an isolated area of open land to the west of Whitwick, should be included within CFRP as these areas neither exhibit the key characteristics of the Forest nor comprise a landscape quality or condition justifying their inclusion.</p>	<p>The boundary in this area is unchanged from the 1995 boundary and this is justified at para 7.18 of CFLSCA. This section of the boundary broadly follows the geological line of the Thringstone Fault.</p>

	<p>5. The assessment does not provide a clear justification why the land west of Shepshed should be included within CF. (It is acknowledged that a brief justification is included at para 7.15 of CFLSCA and that this does refer to the transitional nature of this area.) The A512 would provide a more robust boundary and the land to the west of Shepshed should be excluded.</p>	<p>The justification at para 7.15 is considered adequate.</p>
	<p>5. The Rothley Brook landscape character area should not fall within the CF boundary because of the urban influences that are one of its key characteristics and the recommended overall 'enhancement' landscape management strategy. Note that a response from LCC Chief Executive's Dept to the boundary consultation suggested that the boundary should be drawn further north in this area.</p>	<p>The LCC response referred to was an officer view and went on to suggest that the Rothley Brook valley should form part of a transitional CF 'buffer zone'. As with the preceding comment, the area in question is towards the periphery of the CF landscape character area and thus demonstrates transitional characteristics.</p>
	<p>5. If the proposed boundary is adopted as definitive for both CFRP and the LDF CF Policy Area then the objectives set out in the Draft Vision Statement and the possible 'landscape protection' policies would not be appropriate, being inconsistent with major development that could take place within the now expanded area. If the Vision and Objectives for CFRP are to be maintained then the proposed boundary of the Forest should be reviewed, and the major existing settlement areas and areas for proposed expansion excluded. This would be consistent with the character analysis carried out by TEP and with many views expressed during stakeholder consultation.</p>	<p>The Vision Statement will be redrafted to clarify the relationship between the Regional Park and development. Policies for CFRP will be defined through LDFs and this will be made clear in the revised Vision Statement.</p>
Friends of Charnwood Forest	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Agree	No response needed

	3. Query the reference to 'access routes' at bullet 3 – there is no need to improve or add any vehicular access routes	Access here refers only to pedestrian routes, cycleways and horse riding routes.
	4. Agree	No response needed
	5. Raise the question of the proposed administrative approach and who is in charge. With three borough councils involved there needs to be a uniform approach.	The borough councils, with the County Council and other organisations, have been working together over the past 18 months to ensure a consistent approach to policies within Local Development Plans. The administrative arrangements for a regional park have not yet been considered in detail. Issues of structure and governance will be part of the CFRP Strategy. In the immediate future the County Council will remain the central point of contact.
GVA Grimley for Jelson Ltd	1. The vision provides an overview of the purpose of the RP rather than a unique, locally distinct and aspirational account of its future. The vision as stated could be applicable anywhere.	A clear single sentence vision is considered essential. We will try to make this more locally distinct in the revised Vision Statement.
	1. The vision lacks any comment about the interaction of people within the sub-region to the RP, or the role and relationship of urban areas.	The vision clearly refers to the role of CFRP in benefiting those living within and visiting the sub-region. The Draft Vision Statement also refers to GI links to surrounding settlements. Details of these roles will be developed in the CFRP Strategy. The revised Vision Statement will seek to clarify the relationship between CFRP and growth in surrounding areas.
	2. No comments.	No response needed.
	3. No comments	No response needed.
	4. At 4.1 the Draft Vision Statement says that the RP boundary will be defined by each local planning authority. Why, therefore, has the working boundary been so thoroughly defined on a landscape character area basis.	The CF Character Assessment will form part of the evidence base for the LDFs of each of the local authorities. It is important that the local planning authorities have a consistent approach to policies in respect of CF and a commonly agreed CFRP boundary and the Future of CF Steering Group have been working towards this.

	<p>4. Suggest that a coherent and consistent approach to the definition of the boundary and application of planning policies would be aided by NWLDC, CBC and H&amp;BBC considering a joint Development Plan Document in the form of an Area Action Plan (AAP).</p>	<p>Whilst this approach could be considered, it would be some time before the preparation of an AAP could realistically be contemplated. A joint DPD is not the only means of achieving a consistent approach. There may be potential for a joint Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>A CFRP officer steering group has been working for some time to ensure a joint approach to CFRP. However, there will be unique aspects particular to each district with regard to the boundary. The steering group will continue to work to provide a solid foundation for cross-boundary partnerships which will benefit both the RP and individual LDF processes.</p>
	<p>4. Questions the validity of including significant urban areas within the RP given the SUEs proposed for Loughborough, Hinckley and Coalville. Whilst the RP will not prevent development it may impose additional constraints on development coming forward if the boundary and policies are not framed to accommodate growth. Consider that the boundary as shown will influence the urban form of settlements such as Coalville, contrary to the intention of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. Request that the boundary should be set to take account of current and future growth requirements and exclude the urban areas, to ensure the regional growth strategy can be accommodated.</p>	<p>It is not the intention to use CFRP as a restraint to development, rather to utilise it to benefit settlements and guide the design of development taking place there. However, individual growth requirements will be dealt with by the relevant districts through their LDFs.</p> <p>The working boundary for CFRP has been defined in terms of landscape character, which allows for the inclusion of urban areas. Other RPs, and indeed National Parks, include fairly large settlements.</p>
	<p>4. Urban fringe sites and SUEs already located within the National Forest have to contribute to National forest tree planting targets, landscape connectivity and public accessibility.</p>	<p>These requirements are not in conflict with the objectives of CFRP and could be complementary to the provision of associated green infrastructure.</p>
	<p>5. No comments</p>	<p>No response needed</p>
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd	<p>1. Given the importance of the area's mineral working heritage (past and future) and the contribution this makes to the CF landscape and communities, the vision should also include industrial heritage.</p>	<p>A valid point which should be used in revising the Vision Statement.</p>

	2. Landscape character needs to be given scope to evolve; it is not sustainable to simply 'retain' landscape character. The area will need to accommodate development in the form of communities, minerals, water resources, open space and recreation.	The CF Character Assessment identifies recommended landscape management strategies for each of the seven sub-areas that it identifies - conservation is the recommended approach in only three of these, with enhancement recommended for a further three and restoration/creation for the remaining one. The vision recognises that CF is a working landscape and that this traditionally includes mineral working in some parts of the area.
	3. No comments.	No response needed
	4. There are significant sites on the edge of the proposed boundary which are likely to be important by extending or adding to the quality of the Regional Park core area - Garendon Park (Loughborough), Proctors Park (Quorn/Barrow), Soar Valley, Watermead Country Park, Castle Hill Country Park, Bagworth Heath Woods.	GI links are an important element of the vision and may extend beyond the formal CFRP boundary. This concept will be developed further by the Strategy
	5. The areas listed above could have a key role in providing relief from visitor pressures for the core area of CF.	See response to 4 above.
Leicestershire & Rutland WI	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Agree	No response needed
	3. No comments	No response needed
	4. Agree	No response needed
	5. No other comments	No response needed

<p>Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>1. Disagree on the grounds that the vision :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does not convey the 'specialness' of CF</li> <li>• assumes the establishment of an RP which the LRWT considers that the stakeholder group does not support</li> <li>• does not suggest that wildlife is worth conserving for its own sake</li> <li>• uses the jargon term 'Three Cities Sub-Region' which is meaningless to most people</li> </ul> <p>LRWT has developed its own idea of a vision as follows : <b>Our vision is for a Charnwood Forest that has a healthy environment, rich in geology, wildlife and wild places, with opportunities for people to learn about and enjoy the beautiful and exceptional landscape. It will be a place where wildlife can move through it freely and not be confined to a few special sites, and natural processes are allowed to function, in other words a living landscape.</b></p>	<p>The CFRP proposal gains its status from the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. As AONB status is no longer an option and RP represents the best opportunity now available to recognise and protect the special character of CF</p> <p>There is no evidence from the current consultation for a lack of stakeholder support for CFRP.</p> <p>The vision needs to be spatial and strategic. However, the revised Vision Statement will seek to convey more of the 'specialness' of CF and to avoid the use of jargon. It will also include reference to education.</p>
	<p>2. The objectives imply that landscape character is the main focus. LRWT believes that this approach will not do nature conservation justice and that the elements of the objectives (landscape character, biodiversity, geodiversity, cultural heritage, settlement character) should be listed separately.</p>	<p>The approach to CFRP is landscape character based. This approach is not intended to devalue any of the other elements of the objectives. The Strategy will need to deal with each of these elements separately.</p>
	<p>2. Suggest that final objective should be <b>to promote leisure, tourism and education, where compatible with other objectives</b></p>	<p>Reference to education should be included in the revised Vision Statement.</p>
	<p>2. Point out the difficulties of using the term 'sustainable' unless qualified</p>	<p>Noted. This should be addressed by the Strategy.</p>
	<p>2. Note that conflicts exist between the different objectives and these will have to be addressed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The conflicts between different uses are one of the reasons for seeking to create CFRP as a means of taking an holistic view. We will seek to clarify this point in the revised Vision Statement.</p>

	3. A few of the bullet points are actually embellished objectives.	We will address this in the revised Vision Statement.
	3. Queries how exactly certain elements will be achieved.	The detailed means of achieving individual elements of the vision will be developed through the Strategy and Action Plans.
	4. Have no strong views on the boundary which does not differ much from the CF boundary used by LRWT.	Comment noted.
	5. LRWT is disappointed that the landscape and settlement character assessment is very much a people-centred document and does not properly reflect the role of natural processes and biodiversity.	Landscape and settlement character studies tend to be people centred. The landscape character approach is recognised and has credibility in the planning system. We see this study as being only one of a number of baseline documents with the LRWT's own 2008 nature conservation study being complementary to it.
	5. Also concerns about the sub-areas described on the landscape character assessment sheets which have little relevance to geology and ecology and are therefore seen as having potential for confusion. Point out some factual errors in the study.	Noted. The study is landscape character based and the areas defined therefore reflect a combination of factors.
	5. The document confirms LRWT's concern that the multi-objective approach of the RP will mean that the importance of biodiversity and geodiversity are lost. A Geopark designation would be preferable because of its stronger focus on nature.	A multi-objective approach is seen as being essential to address the complex issues affecting CF. LCC and BGS met in March 09 to discuss options for World Heritage Site and Geopark status.
	5. Note that an RP designation would give no additional protection and that some of the text of the landscape and settlement character study overstates the potential benefits.	Although CFRP is not a protective designation, it offers an opportunity to take an holistic view of the area's planning and land management. The Charnwood Forest Character Assessment is an evidence base document which may be used by districts councils within the LDF process.
Leicestershire Industrial History Society	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Agree	No response needed
	3. See comments given at 4 below	See response given at 4 below

	4. Suggest looking again at the reasons for dividing Ratby village.	The boundary runs through a number of settlements, where only part of the settlement has a landscape character association with Charnwood Forest. For various purposes it is necessary to draw the boundary as a line on a map, but landscape character area boundaries are not in reality so clear cut and the intention always has been that the RP boundary should be fuzzy and flexible.
	4. Would also include Swannington Common and New Swannington using the old Leicester & Swannington Railway Line as the boundary.	The character area boundary in this area broadly follows the line of the Thringstone Fault.
	4. Note that historically the old line of the A50 marked the edge of CF	The boundary now proposed is based on present day landscape character and may therefore not correspond with historic boundaries
	5. No other comments at present.	No response needed
Loughborough Naturalists' Club	1. Agree, but would prefer 'and future generations' to be added to the end	A valid point which should be used in revising the Vision Statement.
	2. Agree	No response needed
	3. Leisure and tourism – local visitor pressure will need regulating, particularly at certain sensitive sites and during the breeding season eg in recent years the two car parks at opposite ends of Swithland Wood have intensified pressures on the SSSI leading to a loss of plant species and nesting bird species.	Comment noted. This detailed point should be picked up through the CFRP Strategy and Action Plan.
	3. Planting – every effort should be made to plant trees typical of CF and of local provenance. This has not always been the case in the National Forest part of CF.	Comment noted. This detailed point should be picked up through the CFRP Strategy and Action Plan.

	4. Agree. However, believe that the integrity of the Park will be lost if development just outside the boundary is not required to blend with the surrounding countryside.	<p>Planning policies in LDFs should aim to minimise the visual impacts of development upon sensitive landscapes, such as CF. The Draft Vision Statement refers to the need for development with a direct relationship with CFRP to reflect local landscape and settlement character and integrate with the CFRP.</p> <p>Effective planning should ensure that the RP boundary does not represent a barrier to other GI projects in adjoining areas. Opportunities to extend green corridors into and out of the RP should be encouraged.</p>
	5. No comments	No response needed
Loughborough Regeneration Charnwood Borough Council	1. No comments	No response needed
	2. No comments	No response needed
	3. No comments	No response needed
	<p>4. Concerned that the boundary around Loughborough is too extensive and will bring potential conflict between the aspirations of CFRP and the legitimate expansion needs of Loughborough. The boundary extends beyond Snells Nook into an area which includes Holywell Park (Science Park) and the proposed extension to the Science Park and university campus, promoted in the recently published CBC Core Strategy and Science Park Development Plan document. These developments are fundamental to the regeneration of Loughborough and the local economy. It seems clear that the RP will influence the scale and nature of any development and it will be best if already identified development possibilities are excluded from the Park boundary. The same arguments could apply around the S edge of Loughborough.</p>	<p>The working boundary for CFRP has been defined in terms of landscape character, which allows for the inclusion of urban areas. Other RPs, and indeed National Parks, include fairly large settlements. It is not the intention to use CFRP as a restraint to development, rather to utilise it to benefit settlements and guide the design of development taking place there. Such a policy should not discourage development which should be considered through LDFs and assessed on a settlement by settlement basis.</p> <p>The revised Vision Statement will seek to clarify the relationship between CFRP and growth in surrounding areas.</p>

	5. No comments	No response needed
National Farmers' Union	1. Agree – appreciate the acknowledgement that this is a working landscape for agriculture.	No response needed
	2. Agree – agriculture will be important to the Park and hope that strategy and planning policies will support agricultural development and farm diversification which supports the farm business.	The rural economy is an important matter for planning; this includes both agriculture and diversification. LDFs will need to accord with PPS7 which encourages diversification.
	3. Especially like 7 <sup>th</sup> bullet point at 5.1 of document. Would like to see agricultural development and renewable energy projects on farms encouraged. Retention of grassland for dairy herds within the Park will depend on planning permission being granted for new slurry stores compliant with NVZ regulations	Government initiatives on anaerobic digestion may reduce the number of slurry stores required, although there are possible highways access issues with anaerobic digesters.  The encouragement of renewable energy would have to be supported by detailed landscape assessment. The Charnwood Forest Character Assessment (2008) did not look specifically at this issue. The most appropriate way for it to be addressed is as a Core Strategy policy.
	4. Unable to comment on boundary, but would like to see a position reached where (as with the National Forest) landowners and farmers want to be inside the boundary, not outside.	No response needed
	5. Pleased to see reference to land managers and farmers at 6.1.	No response needed
Natural England East Midlands Region	1. Agree. Natural England has been directly involved in the development of the Draft Vision Statement. The vision represents a consensus among key stakeholders. Giving an overview within a single sentence is inevitably a broad brush approach but more detail is spelt out in the supporting objectives.	A single sentence vision is needed to clearly define the main purpose of the RP. The remainder of the Vision Statement provides supporting detail which will be developed further by the Strategy.

	<p><b>2.</b> The objectives cover NE's overall environmental interests remit but the links with the 6Cs Growth Point could be made more implicit, as nearby new development might contribute to developing and strengthening green infrastructure.</p> <p>The heart of the CF area has a significant concentration of SSSIs. Strengthening GI connections between these sites could make them more resilient to visitor pressures and climate change.</p> <p>The challenge will be achieving the right balance, allowing appropriate sustainable development nearby that will be able to contribute towards establishing and enhancing CFRP as the focal point of a sustainable green infrastructure (GI) network. Securing the right quantity, quality and connectivity of the GI network will be a critical factor.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The importance of the 6Cs Growth Point should be picked up in the revised Vision Statement.</p>
	<p><b>3.</b> The 'devil will be in the detail' and for each of the eight bullet points more detail now needs to be worked up and developed with support from relevant key stakeholders, to produce a Strategy, together with an Action Plan that might roll forward on an annual basis. A wider Steering Group needs to be established to take these proposals forward, possibly with sub-groups handling specific aspects.</p>	<p>The production of a Strategy and Action Plan is proposed as the next step in the CFRP project. The Steering Group will be widened as this develops. LCC and the British Geological Survey (BGS) are meeting in March to discuss specific geological matters.</p>
	<p><b>3.</b> Agri-environment grant schemes managed by NE should be a significant mechanism for achieving long term sustainable environmental management in CF.</p>	<p>Noted, and will be picked up by Strategy and Action Plan.</p>

	<p>4. Note that the working boundary now put forward represents a consensus view informed by previous stakeholder consultation, but that there remain some areas where there are still differences of view.</p> <p>Agree with the boundary as a starting point for CFRP. Account also needs to be taken of adjoining GI assets at a wider scale in particular strategic linked corridors which it will be crucial to maintain and strengthen. The 6Cs Green Infrastructure Strategy currently in preparation will be an important complementary piece of work in looking at CFRP</p>	Comments noted. The proposed boundary is a working boundary which is anticipated to have a degree of flexibility and fuzziness.
	5. CF's unique geological heritage has led to suggestions that it should be put forward as a Geopark There should be further investigation on whether this proposal has any merit.	As at 3. above, LCC met BGS in March to discuss World Heritage Site (WHS) status and Geoparks. It is proposed to pursue WHS in the first instance.
	5. NE supports the principle of establishing CFRP and is keen to play a key role in its establishment. Due to Growth Point development pressures it will be desirable to establish CFRP as soon as possible	Noted.
Ramblers' Association	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Agree	No response needed
	3. No comments	No response needed
	4. Suggest that some pockets on the borders could be included.	Unable to respond without knowing which areas are being referred to, but the boundary is proposed as a working boundary with a degree of flexibility.
	5. No comments	No response needed
Shepshed Town Council	1. No comments	No response needed
	2. No comments	No response needed

	3. No comments	No response needed
	4. No comments	No response needed
	5. Thank you for sending document. Please invite to next stakeholder meeting.	STC is on the 2009 stakeholder database and so will continue to receive updates and meeting invitations.
Swithland Parish Meeting	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Agree	No response needed
	3. OK	No response needed
	4. Agree	No response needed
	5. Budgets need to be observed and costs contained.	The handling of budgets will form part of the consideration of issues of structure and governance, which will be part of the next stage of the development of the CFRP project.
The Garendon Park and Countryside Protection Group	1. Agree, but with the addition of <b>'take an overarching view about sustainable livelihoods within its boundaries; allowing low impact dwellings for forest workers'</b> .	Policy on matters such as housing development will need to be developed through LDFs. These are being developed to include specific CF policies.
	2. Would like to see thought given to inclusion of a vibrant dynamic countryside with local craftspeople working for the local economy. Suggest that sustainable employment could include combined heat and power schemes using forest products.	The Draft Vision Statement acknowledges the importance of CF as a traditional working landscape. Policy on matters such as economic and infrastructure development will need to be developed through LDFs, which will include specific CF policies.
	3. The sharp distinctions between urban and rural should be made fuzzier and allow the inclusion of large areas of urban settlements given over to urban green spaces with direct efforts made to develop wildlife corridors. Tree planting should not be restricted to parks only.	For various purposes it is necessary to draw the boundary as a line on a map, but the intention always has been that the RP boundary should be fuzzy and flexible. This is one of the reasons why the boundary as it currently stands is referred to as a working boundary.  GI links are an important element of the vision and may extend beyond the formal RP boundary. This concept will be developed further by the CFRP Strategy and by the 6Cs Sub-Region Strategic Green Infrastructure Strategy due to be published late summer 2009. It will also be addressed by masterplans for Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs).

	4. Disagree. Would like to see Garendon Park within the RP as it seems perverse to place part of it in and the majority of it outside.	The proposed CFRP boundary is landscape character based and Garendon Park was assessed as being more closely associated with the adjoining Langley Lowlands landscape character area than with Charnwood Forest. The CFRP working boundary follows the southern edge of Garendon Park and Garendon Park is entirely outside CFRP.
	5. Understand the overwhelming desire to protect the feel and look of existing communities, both human and natural. Change must recognise and include the future role of livelihoods and trading activities within these communities. The market should not be relied upon to defend the earth	Issues of housing, economic and infrastructure development will be dealt with via policies in LDFs, which will include specific CF policies. The CF Character Assessment will help to provide a part of the policy evidence base.  Land management issues are not subject to planning control. The RP concept can help to guide desirable land management practices.
The National Trust	1. Agree	No response needed
	2. Agree	No response needed
	3. No comments	No response needed
	4. Agree with the majority of the boundary but feel it should follow the line of the existing boundary to the north between Shepshed and Loughborough, taking in part of Garendon Park and the Temple of Venus. Suggest that there is a small disused road bisecting the Park, which could be used as a fixed feature along which the boundary could run.	This section of the boundary underwent thorough discussion before the current proposed line was drawn. There are two roads, neither of which appear disused, so it is unclear which one is being referred to.
	4. Also feel that the boundary should be a permanent agreed boundary and based on historic evidence and as agreed by stakeholders	The proposed working boundary is based on present day landscape character and has been subject to stakeholder consultation. There is felt to be a need for a degree of flexibility to the boundary, for example to accommodate situations where land management projects logically need to extend beyond a line on a map
	5. No comments at this stage	No response needed
The Woodland Trust	1. Agree. Particularly welcome the statement that the CFRP will be managed for the benefit of residents in the Three Cities Sub-region.	It should be noted that the RP will also be managed to benefit residents within its boundary, and other visitors.

	2. No comments	No response needed
	3. Would like to see explicit reference at bullet 1 to the protection of ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees	This is a detailed point which will be picked up through the CFRP Strategy and Action Plan, and also through LDFs.
	3. Would like to see a commitment to restore any ancient woodland which has been cleared and replanted with conifers. WT are already doing this at Martinshaw Wood.	A valid point and one that should be picked up when a detailed Strategy and Action Plan for the park is developed, rather than in the Vision Statement.
	3. With reference to bullets 2 and 4, strongly supports the use of habitat creation and enhancement focussing on BAP priority habitats so as to achieve habitat connectivity and biodiversity benefits. It needs to be stated that this is a key strategy for enabling biodiversity to adapt to climate change and should be applied at a landscape scale not restricted by administrative boundaries.	As above, this will be picked up as work is developed in more detail.
	3. Support proposals at bullet 3 re development of sub-regional green infrastructure network. Would like to see this as a key driver for woodland creation within CF. Would like to see the regional park adopt WT's Woodland Access Standard.	Noted. This element of work will be guided by the 6Cs GI Strategy due for publication late summer 2009. There are a number of greenspace access standards which might be appropriate and the adoption of one of these will be a matter for the Strategy.
	4. No comments	No response needed
	5. No comments	No response needed
Woodhouse Parish Council	1. Broadly agree, but reservations about funding which may not materialise in the current economic climate and how this might affect the vision.	The RP umbrella will help organisations to work in partnership, maximising the value of their individual contributions and the range of funding opportunities available. Whilst the current economic climate might delay the full realisation of the scheme, the RP is seen as a long term project within which contributing projects can move forward at different times and different rates. Not all of the potential projects would necessarily require a lot of money.

	<p>2. Concerned that there could be a contradiction between objectives one and two, and objective three. If there is further promotion of tourism LCC Highways should plan accordingly, taking measures to alleviate parking problems and secure the safety of vulnerable road users. Need to guard against tourists destroying what they come to see.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>3. Woodhouse and Woodhouse Eaves are already surrounded by a network of public footpaths – these may be more in need of protection than enhancement. It is not clear exactly what works would be done.</p>	<p>There will clearly be variations in what is appropriate in different areas. Detailed proposals will be developed through the Strategy and Action Plan. This response is perhaps an example of where something could be achieved for little cost</p>
	<p>4. The Council agrees with the proposed working boundary and commends the work done by TEP and others in producing the Character Assessment.</p>	<p>No response needed.</p>
	<p>5. Query from one Parish Council Member as to how much the whole exercise has cost</p>	<p>We are unable to provide details of how much officer time has been spent on this project, which involves County Council and district council officers and members of other organisations and is related to the councils' planning remits. The cost of the CF Character Assessment by TEP environmental consultants was £29,956, with funding being contributed by the County Council, The National Forest, East Midlands Regional Assembly and east midlands development agency.</p>
<p>Individual response Loughborough resident</p>	<p>1. Would not want to see 'enhancement' and 'promotion' that would attract more visitors and reduce opportunities for peace and quiet and observing nature.</p>	<p>Projected sub-regional growth will inevitably bring more visitor pressure. The proposed RP gives an opportunity to manage this.</p>
	<p>2. Depends on definition of 'sustainable leisure and tourism' – what is already existing should not be destroyed in order to achieve a higher footfall.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
	<p>3. Depends on the definitions of 'enhanced', 'sustainable' and 'sustainable leisure and tourism'</p>	<p>These definitions should be made clear in the Strategy.</p>

	4. Boundary appears to be OK.	No response needed
	5. No comment	No response needed
Individual response Glenfield resident	1. Agrees	No response needed
	2. Agrees	No response needed
	3. Agrees	No response needed
	4. Disagrees. The minor road boundaries should be followed up to Osgathorpe to take in the high ground. Castle Hill Country Park south of the A46 should be included. The SW corner should be further extended. Royal Tigers and Centenary Woods should be added and probably Bagworth Woods and Grange and Battram Woods at Ibstock.	The working boundary for the RP is landscape character based and the presence of woodland is not the sole reason for its definition. However, the intention always has been that the RP boundary should be fuzzy and flexible, and that there should be linkages with green infrastructure assets in the surrounding areas.
	5. No other comments	No response needed
Individual response LCC employee	1. Agrees	No response needed
	2. Agrees – the objectives are straightforward	No response needed
	3. The eight bullet points are straightforward; nothing stands out as controversial or not fitting for the area.	No response needed
	4. Proposed boundary seems to work well using some of major roads/rail lines as boundaries and excluding larger settlements which are not in keeping with the small villages of the character area.	No response needed
	5. No other comments	No response needed

Joint individual response Coalville residents	1. Agree – wholeheartedly support the proposal	No response needed
	2. No comments	No response needed
	3. No comments	No response needed
	4. Agree – there should be a working boundary for the Park with efforts to try to reduce the expansion of current built up areas into the Park.	The role of the RP is to help protect the unique qualities of CF, but also to recognise that it sits within a major area of growth. The role of the RP is not to restrict growth. Any allocations and development will be determined through the LDF process. This should ensure that if development does need to take place within the RP, it is as complementary to this location as possible.
	5. Concerned that NWLDC are planning to expand into the Park area, with particular reference to proposals in the Strategic Development Plan for building on the Greenhill Farm land on the edge of Coalville. Would like NWLDC to stop all plans to build within the Park, on the grounds that this would be an irreversible change and that there are other locations available.	An RP does not give any special protection to the area, but planning policies will take a landscape character based approach to ensure that any built development is appropriate to its setting in terms of siting, layout and design.  The Greenhill Farm site is a suggestion from a landowner rather than a NWLDC proposal. This matter will need to be resolved through the NWLDC LDF.
Individual response Whitwick resident	1. Agrees	No response needed
	2. Agrees – pressures on the landscape could erode areas of outstanding beauty	No response needed
	3. No comments – seems to cover all the important issues	No response needed
	4. Unable to comment on most of the boundary but suggests that it would be appropriate to include Swannington within the boundary because of the historic interest of the incline/railway and the potential visitor attraction of the windmill.	The character area boundary in this area broadly follows the line of the Thringstone Fault. This historically interesting area is of course within the National Forest

	5. Supports the aims of the Park, to protect and enhance the special characteristics of the area	No response needed
Individual response British Columbia resident (ex Leicestershire)	1. Agrees, but recommends adding that benefits extend to native flora and fauna as well as people. Suggested text 'The CFRP will enhance, protect, manage and promote the natural and cultural heritage features of CF for the benefit of the park's native flora and fauna, and those people living within and visiting the Three Cities Sub-region.'	The enhancement, protection and management of the natural heritage will benefit the area's flora and fauna.
	2. The Draft Vision Statement includes some vague statements. The meanings of the term 'geodiversity' and phrase 'enhance settlement character' are queried. There is suspicion of the objective to 'promote sustainable leisure and tourism' ; the exact meaning of this needs to be clarified with more detail. The statement is written in planning jargon – the language of the final version should be more accessible to the general public.	We will try to avoid the use of jargon in the revised Vision Statement. Where it is necessary to use specialist terms in the interests of precision, these should be clearly defined in the Strategy.
	3. Many excellent details in this section and concurs with all of it, especially prioritised corridors to maximise biodiversity and habitat connectivity, co-operative enhancements with the National Forest, maximising public transport, walking and cycling, and restoration of minerals sites. Makes the point that walking trails must be protected from the impacts of bikes.	Noted.
	4. Strongly agrees.	No response needed
	5. Wishes success for project and urges all local authorities involved to support the RP. CF was an inspiration for the respondent as a child. It is literally priceless and should be taken care of for future generations to be inspired by it too	No response needed

Individual response Whitwick resident	1. Agrees	No response needed
	2. Agrees	No response needed
	3. No further access routes are needed, only good maintenance of existing ones.	The need for good maintenance of existing routes is recognised. It is considered that there are certain areas where new routes could improve non-vehicular access to the area and connect existing rights of way.
	3. There should be no further planting or building on agricultural land as this will be needed for future food production	Built development will be dealt with through LDF policies. Tree planting does not need planning approval.
	4. Undecided	No response needed
	5. No comments	No response needed
Individual response Stoney Stanton resident	1. Agrees, but would also like to see more wildflowers planted.	Habitat creation and enhancement should increase the native wild flora of CF
	2. Agrees – but see comment at 3 below	No response needed
	3. Would not want to see mechanical transport allowed on the paths through Bradgate Park (except for invalid/mobility vehicles).	Noted.
	4. Agrees – the boundary shows good vision. Please protect the Forest's wonderful trees.	Noted. The protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees are detailed points which will be picked up through the CFRP Strategy and Action Plan, and also through LDFs.
	5. Wishes the proposed Park success	No response needed
Individual response LCC employee	1. Agrees, definitely.	No response needed
	2. Agrees, certainly	No response needed

	<p>3. Spatial planning and land management are clearly the key, but wider economic and social planning context need to be reflected. Suggests an additional bullet point : <b>'The development of the Park will reflect and seek to enhance the existing economy and communities of the Forest, recognising it will continue to be a working landscape where mineral extraction, waste disposal and water resources are important activities as well as agriculture and recreation.'</b></p>	<p>The Vision Statement recognises the importance of CF as a working landscape, and includes reference to the working and restoration of mineral extraction sites. Reference to water resources will be incorporated in the revised Vision Statement</p>
	<p>4. Mostly agrees and realises the boundary is indicative rather than absolute. Suggests should follow the old A6 through Rothley to Quorn, to be consistent with its accurate following of other transport routes elsewhere. Also, may be more consistent to have all of Woodthorpe included, all of Bardon Industrial Park excluded and all of Bardon Quarry included.</p>	<p>Roads and other physical features are used for the boundary in places but are not always appropriate for a boundary based on landscape character.</p> <p>For various purposes it is necessary to draw the boundary as a line on a map, but landscape character area boundaries are not in reality so clear cut and the intention always has been that the RP boundary should be fuzzy and flexible.</p>
	<p>5. Good to see the development of access routes and connecting green spaces, and marketing the Park, are well covered.</p>	<p>These aspects will continue to be developed through the Strategy.</p>
<p>Individual response Loughborough resident &amp; independent geo- conservation project worker</p>	<p>1. Vision statement seems appropriate, given that the Park's ability to access major funding will probably be dependent on a link with surrounding development and its capacity to serve increasing numbers of people. However, the area is very small in relation to existing and potential future visitor numbers. Queries if comparison has been made with similar areas in terms of area to surrounding urban population.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No comparison has been done but this might be a useful means of emphasising the pressures on CF.</p>
	<p>1. Given the national and international importance of CF, the word 'protect' should come first in the vision. 'Promote' needs to be clearly understood to mean awareness raising and education, rather than advertising in order to increase visitor numbers and attract funding.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	2. Agrees with objectives one and two, but would like to see these extended to a 'buffer zone' around CF	The working boundary is already drawn fairly broadly, but is intended to be fuzzy and flexible to allow CFRP projects to extend beyond the boundary where appropriate.
	2. Concerned that objective three implies active promotion of the area (see comment at 1. above). Suggests re-wording as <b>'To ensure that all leisure and tourism activity within the Park is sustainable'</b> or <b>'To promote and allow only sustainable leisure and tourism activity'</b>	The objectives as re-worded would be unrealistic.
	2. Education and awareness should be included, particularly in relation to the nationally unique and internationally significant value of the area's geology which underpins everything else	Reference to education should be included in the revised Vision Statement.
	3. Point 1 is generally acceptable, but who decides what is 'appropriate new development'? Does not consider the planned Science Park between the University and the M1 to be appropriate for several detailed reasons, including landscape character, visual intrusion, traffic generation, and proximity to sensitive woodland areas. The wording needs to be tightened to ensure that only built development of very limited size can take place within CFRP.	The question of 'appropriate' development cannot be dealt with through the CFRP objectives, but is an issue for planning policies in LDFs.
	3. Point 2 is acceptable.	No response needed.
	3. Point 3 - more green space sounds good but how can it be achieved? What is actually needed is protection for green space within the Park and more alternative green space provision outside its boundaries	This issue will be dealt with through sub-regional and local GI Strategies, and through LDF policies.

	3. Point 3 - options for developing additional access routes into the Park are limited. Increasing access routes may result in an unsustainable increase in visitor numbers, especially if these come from surrounding large new housing developments	Although options for new routes are limited, there are places where the connectivity of existing routes can be improved. The aim will be to encourage visitors to access the area using non-vehicular means.
	3. Point 3 - Links need to be made from existing and new housing to other sub-regional and local GI assets, but not necessarily via CFRP	Noted. CFRP is only one element of sub-regional GI.
	3. Point 3 - an additional point is needed to deal with traffic control/diversion in relation to the existing high level of commuter traffic through CF	Noted. This should be picked up within the Strategy and Action Plan.
	3. Point 4 is acceptable	No response needed.
	3. Point 5 is acceptable, but the case of the Science Park raises doubts that this will be properly applied. Current plans for the Science Park should be scaled down or its location altered. Consideration should have been given to access by public transport, walking and cycling, not just proximity to the university and motorway.	The type and location of development such as the Loughborough Science Park are matters to be considered through each district/borough LDF, using the CFRP Vision Statement. Any development within the Regional Park will need to ensure that it is of high quality design in keeping with its landscape and settlement setting within the Park.
	3. Point 6 – doubts as to whether those parts of the park best suited to leisure developed would be those closest to proposed new housing in surrounding areas. A better permissive path network, very careful selection of sites for leisure development and greater emphasis on developing and promoting other GI leisure areas outside the park may be better.	Comment noted.
	3. Point 7 - OK	No response needed

	3. Point 8 – concerned that a 'brand' will result in over-promotion of the park over too wide an area. Emphasis must be placed on raising awareness of the park's special character.	Comment noted.
	4. The boundary is acceptable but not ideal. Ideally there should be a buffer zone all around the Park where only limited development is allowed. This would give more protection to the Park itself and an aesthetically pleasing boundary area, as well as encouraging improvements to surrounding areas. The boundary should therefore be as expansive as possible.	As response at 2. above - the working boundary is already drawn fairly broadly, but is intended to be fuzzy and flexible to allow CFRP projects to extend beyond the boundary where appropriate.
	4. If the Park is to be linked to other GI assets, Garendon Park must be considered as one of these. It may be easier to include it within the Park boundary so that it benefits from the protection of the RP.	Linked GI assets do not need to be formally part of the Park. As a Registered Historic Park and Garden, Garendon benefits from statutory protection not afforded by the RP designation.
	5. Park management needs to be holistic – this approach has not happened with recent developments at Beacon Hill where a public viewpoint with rock outcrops has been fenced off and converted to heathland.	Comment noted. The intention of CFRP is to achieve an holistic approach.
	5. Queries what is meant by 'a degree of flexibility' in the boundary. What is the extent of this, who decides and why? Is this a get-out clause which could scupper everything else that the Draft Vision Statement seeks to achieve?	Whilst for practical purposes it is necessary to define a boundary line on a plan, there may be instances where, for example, land management projects logically need to extend beyond that boundary. There is no intention for flexibility to be used as a 'get-out clause'. We will aim to clarify this point in the revised Vision Statement.
	5. Too many loopholes in the Draft Vision Statement. Need to continue to seek legal protection and statutory designation for CF as soon as possible, alongside the RP option.	Comment noted. However, there are no realistic options for statutory designation at present.

	5. Need to take pressure off CF by developing alternative green areas and leisure facilities within easy travelling distance of major settlements.	Comment noted. The 6Cs GI Strategy will cover this issue, although not specifically in terms of seeking to reduce pressure on CF.
	5. Development of a better network of permissive routes could help take pressure off those areas of CF that are currently most heavily used.	Noted. The Draft Vision Statement refers to the need to remedy gaps in current provision.
	5. Vision Statement should specifically mention the nationally unique and internationally significant value of CF's geology, which underpins everything else.	Although geology clearly underpins everything, the approach to CFRP is landscape character based and seeks to provide an holistic approach to the planning and land management of the area. The specific geological importance of CF will be addressed within the Strategy and Action Plan.
	5. Expansion of Loughborough University is a threat to CF. The university should perhaps consider a second site, which could also form an alternative location for the Science Park. RP plans need to be considered in conjunction with all other planning permissions.	See response to question 3, point 5 above.
	5. Queries how the aspirations of the Draft Vision Statement are implemented and policed.	Proposals for a governance structure for CFRP will form part of the Strategy.
Individual response LCC employee	1. Agrees	No response needed
	2. Agrees	No response needed
	3. All good points, but care should be taken not to limit existing use of the area for established activities such as rock climbing and the annual Charnwood Hills Race.	Comments noted. There is no intention to limit existing activities.
	4. Proposed boundary seems appropriate. Will this mean a stop to plans such as further quarrying around Bardon Hill and housing developments within the boundary?	A Regional Park is not a protective designation. Development within the boundary will be guided by policies in district/borough LDFs and the county Mineral and Waste Development Frameworks which are being developed to include specific CF policies.

	5. A great idea but only if the creation of the Park carries any weight – see comment at 4 above.	An RP is not a statutory designation but offers an opportunity to take an holistic approach to the management of an area. LDFs will include specific CF policies
	5. Development of rock climbing, cross country running and mountain biking should be encouraged. A change in attitude by district councils and police is required. How about some of the trails in The Outwoods being opened up for mountain biking?	Rock climbing, cross country running and mountain biking are all activities compatible with the RP concept. Detailed proposals will emerge through the Strategy and Action Plan
Individual response Quorn resident	1. Acknowledges the benefits of county/district councils having a joint long term strategy for CF, but questions whether the case has been made for an RP. What purpose will the Park serve other than to encourage inappropriate 'people-friendly' facilities? Is this Charnwood being slotted into a top-down view of what's good for society? The Park's creation needs to be justified to the public.	The policy origins of the RP lie in the Regional Spatial Strategy, which has been subject through consultation to outside scrutiny. Since Summer 2007 three stakeholder group meetings have been held to consider the future of Charnwood Forest.  The RP will enable an holistic approach to be taken to the planning and management of the area.
	2. Dubious about the potential balance of deployment of the objectives. The third objective could lead to inappropriate change to the existing Forest infrastructure. For example, at Fineshade Forest in Northants natural, low impact and free facilities have been replaced by expensive car parking, shopping and eating facilities, and childrens' play facilities, under the auspices of the River Nene Regional Park.	Noted. All regional parks are different and have differing objectives suited to local conditions and needs.
	3. No comments.	No response needed.

	<p>4. Acknowledges the difficulties of determining a boundary and that attempts have been made to consult stakeholders. The boundary needs to be justified to the public before being ratified. Queries why the boundary runs through the centre of Quorn and why it completely avoids Coalville. The process and logic used needs to be explained to the public who fund the work. Believes this can be done inexpensively given the will.</p>	<p>The boundary is a working boundary defined through landscape character assessment. The landscape character approach is recognised and has credibility in the planning system.</p> <p>The boundary runs through a number of settlements, where only part of the settlement has a landscape character association with Charnwood Forest. For various purposes it is necessary to draw the boundary as a line on a map, but landscape character area boundaries are not in reality so clear cut and the intention always has been that the RP boundary should be fuzzy and flexible.</p> <p>The Charnwood Forest Character Assessment (2008) is available on the LCC website and includes a chapter on boundary analysis.</p>
	<p>5. It is thankfully concise.</p>	<p>We will continue to aim to produce concise and readable documents.</p>