

## **Appendix D: Statement of Consultation**

### **Introduction**

1. This statement sets out how Charnwood Borough Council has engaged with stakeholders during the preparation of the Local Plan and identifies which bodies were invited to make representations; how they were asked; a summary of the main issues and how they were taken into account. This statement a requirement of Regulation 22 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

### **Background**

2. The Council has undertaken three rounds of consultation to inform the preparation of the Local Plan. The following consultations have been held, with weblinks to the respective Statement of Consultation summarising the outcome of these consultations:
  - Scoping and Issues (**Regulation 18 Consultation**) – July/August 2016:  
[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/regulation\\_18\\_consultation\\_new\\_charnwood\\_local\\_plan/Regulation%2018%20Consultation%20-%20New%20Charnwood%20Local%20Plan.pdf](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/regulation_18_consultation_new_charnwood_local_plan/Regulation%2018%20Consultation%20-%20New%20Charnwood%20Local%20Plan.pdf)
  - Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood (**Optional Consultation**) – April/June 2018:  
[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/towards\\_a\\_local\\_plan\\_for\\_charnwood\\_discussion\\_paper\\_april\\_2018/Towards%20a%20Local%20Plan%20for%20Charnwood%20port%20Low%20res%20A3%20map.pdf](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/towards_a_local_plan_for_charnwood_discussion_paper_april_2018/Towards%20a%20Local%20Plan%20for%20Charnwood%20port%20Low%20res%20A3%20map.pdf)
  - Draft Plan (**Optional Consultation**) - November/December 2019:  
[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/draft\\_charnwood\\_local\\_plan\\_2019\\_36/Draft%20Charnwood%20Local%20Plan%202019-36.pdf](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/draft_charnwood_local_plan_2019_36/Draft%20Charnwood%20Local%20Plan%202019-36.pdf)
3. The Council will undertake a fourth consultation, the Pre-Submission (**Regulation 19/20 Consultation**) in summer 2021 which will be the final round of consultation prior to the Local Plan being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.
4. All consultations have been undertaken in accordance with the legislative requirements and the Charnwood Statement of Community Involvement, which exceeds minimum consultation requirements.

### **Scoping and Issues (Regulation 18 Consultation) – July/August 2016**

5. This consultation was the initial step of plan preparation and sought views to establish local priorities to scope plan content. In total 16 consultees responded. The Statement of Consultation (September 2016) summarises the responses received and sets out the Council's response to individual comments:  
[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/regulation\\_18\\_statement\\_of\\_consultation/Reg%2018%20Statement%20of%20Consultation.doc](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/regulation_18_statement_of_consultation/Reg%2018%20Statement%20of%20Consultation.doc); and

[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/appendix\\_b\\_n\\_complete\\_responses\\_by\\_question/Appendix%20B%20Complete%20Responses%20by%20Question.docx](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/appendix_b_n_complete_responses_by_question/Appendix%20B%20Complete%20Responses%20by%20Question.docx)

6. A list of bodies/persons that were invited to make representations as part of the Regulation 18 consultation is at Appendix A. These include specific and general consultation bodies that are prescribed by legislation. Charnwood Borough Councillors and bodies/persons who registered to receive Local Plan alerts were also invited to make representations. All bodies/persons were notified by e-mail or letter.
7. In undertaking the Regulation 18 consultation, the Council's website was updated with details of the consultation and a dedicated webpage was created. The consultation document and associated questions were placed on Charnwood's consultation portal which enabled representations to be made online. Interested parties were directed to submit their comments via the online consultation portal, email or letter.
8. Responses highlighted that similar issues to those addressed by the Core Strategy 2011-2028 were likely to remain. The consultation asked 14 questions and a summary of the main issues raised pursuant to Regulation 18 were:
  - The issues facing Charnwood were generally similar to those addressed by the previous Local Plan although some changes are brought about by demographic changes.
  - Changing circumstances that require understanding were issues such as climate change, increased traffic, reduced services and the need for housing. The importance of new documents such as the Strategic Growth Plan was also identified.
  - There was a general preference that the strategy and plan period should continue to 2036, although there may be a need for this to be updated as needs change. There is a need for consistency with the plans of surrounding authorities.
  - In terms of further evidence required to understand the amount of development needed, evidence was thought necessary on services and facilities and the constraints on development, especially environmental issues. Traffic assessments were also highlighted as important.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the spatial strategy, evidence was thought needed on flood risk, infrastructure, transport and sustainability with a careful assessment of settlements required to determine the spatial strategy.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the transport strategy, the importance of comprehensive traffic assessments and modelling to inform the plan was emphasised.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the environment, a number of statutory requirements were highlighted. The importance of assessing various aspects of the environment and the need to assess the environmental capacity for development was highlighted.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the type, mix and tenure of homes needed, of housing need was highlighted as important and also the importance of providing of certain types of housing.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for the economy, various areas were identified for investigation including small and rural business, Watermead Regeneration corridor, retail and strategic warehousing.

- In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for community facilities and services, the need for accurate evidence of existing provision was highlighted.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to plan for infrastructure delivery, the need for understanding of the impact of development upon infrastructure, services and facilities was highlighted.
  - In terms of any other evidence needed to monitor and respond to a lack of delivery, the importance of ongoing monitoring was highlighted.
  - There was a mixed response to whether the Core Strategy Vision to 2028 should be continued to 2036, with some considering the vision could be continued whilst others believed that it should be re-assessed in the light of new evidence.
9. In terms of how representations made pursuant to Regulation 18 have been taken into account, it was recognised that a detailed and robust evidence base was required to inform the preparation of the Local Plan including assessments of the settlement hierarchy, housing growth, climate change, infrastructure, environmental issues, flood risk, economic development needs and more. The evidence base documents supporting the Local Plan are online: <https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/evidencebase>. The plan period was continued to 2036, although subsequently revised to 2037, reflecting the time taken to prepare the plan. Matters of cross-boundary importance have been considered as part of plan preparation which is demonstrated Statements of Common Ground. The Plan is supported by a monitoring framework to assess delivery and effectiveness on an annual basis and the vision has been amended as appropriate. In addition, the Council undertook two additional optional rounds of consultation (between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19/20 consultations) which provided further elaboration on the representations made pursuant to Regulation 18. The Regulation 18 consultation informed the preparation of the Towards a Local Plan consultation.

### **Towards a Local Plan for Charnwood (Optional Consultation) – April/June 2018**

10. This consultation sought views on key issues relating to the overall development strategy and scale of development required; considered the options for delivering the growth needed; and gave an opportunity to comment on part of the evidence base. In total 104 consultees responded. The Statement of Consultation (June 2018) summarises the responses received and sets out the Council's response to individual comments:
- [https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/towards\\_a\\_local\\_plan\\_for\\_charnwood\\_statement\\_of\\_consultation\\_june\\_2018/Towards%20a%20Local%20Plan%20for%20Charnwood%20Statement%20of%20Consultation%20-%20June%202018%20%28FINAL%29.pdf](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/towards_a_local_plan_for_charnwood_statement_of_consultation_june_2018/Towards%20a%20Local%20Plan%20for%20Charnwood%20Statement%20of%20Consultation%20-%20June%202018%20%28FINAL%29.pdf)
11. A notification letter was sent to 1,338 bodies/ persons contained on the Council's Local Plan consultation database and an e-mail alert was sent to bodies/ persons who registered to receive Local Plan alerts. A list of consultees invited to comment is published in Appendix A of the Statement of Consultation. The consultation was also publicised via the Council website, social media and press release.
12. Several infrastructure providers and statutory organisations responded to the consultation including Clinical Commissioning Groups, Highways England, Leicestershire County Council, Environment Agency, Sport England and Natural England. These bodies commented on how to improve the vision and on the key issues the plan needs to

address including infrastructure capacity issues. Responses also highlighted the evidence which will be needed to inform the Local Plan including Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Transport Assessments and Infrastructure Delivery Plans.

13. Responses were also received from Syston County Doctors Practice and Woodbrook Vale School highlighting capacity concerns and the impact of the settlement limits on future development of the School to meet increasing demand.
14. Many respondents raised concerns about the need and capacity for more housing developments in the Borough. In particular, respondents highlighted concerns about traffic and the availability and capacity of community infrastructure as well as the impact on agricultural land, ecology, heritage, air quality, flooding and the character and separation of villages. Concerns were also raised about recent developments and about increasing the housing target to ensure delivery.
15. Other respondents suggested that the Council should be taking account of the proposed standard housing methodology due to be introduced as part of the new National Planning Policy Framework and that a higher housing figure and variety of sites will be needed to ensure a sufficient supply of housing land. Respondents also highlighted that the unmet need of other authorities in Leicester and Leicestershire will need to be considered.
16. There were questions raised about the relationship between the Local Plan and the Strategic Growth Plan with respondents highlighting concerns about aligning the Local Plan to a non-statutory plan which is not complete and others raising concerns that the discussion paper is silent on the proposal for the proposed A46 extension, a proposal some respondents raised concerns about.
17. Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council, Melton Borough Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and Harborough District Council all responded welcoming on-going engagement under the duty to cooperate. Leicester City Council highlighted the need to work together to consider their unmet need for housing and employment and cross boundary infrastructure. Leicestershire County Council provided detailed comments on transport, education and strategic planning.
18. Overall, there was support for the proposed Areas of Local Separation and Green Wedges and the proposed Settlement Hierarchy, although there were some responses challenging the conclusions. A number of additional Areas of Local Separation were suggested and suggestions made about what should be permitted within these areas. The lack of a national planning policy on landscape designations was also highlighted in response to Green Wedges and Areas of Local Separation. There were also detailed comments provided on the Settlement Limits to Development as well as a request to consider the proposed limits in the Quorn Neighbourhood Plan and concerns about proposing limits before identifying future development locations. Responses were also received highlighting the need for the Local Plan to include housing targets for Neighbourhood Planning.
19. Several site appraisal and promotional documents were provided for potential development sites. The majority of these were already known to the Council through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment although a small number of additional sites were put forward. Agents and developers took the opportunity to provide additional

information about sites and work being undertaken to understand any constraints and opportunities or explore options for future development. There were also a number of site specific objections made.

20. The issue of student accommodation was raised by a number of respondents including concerns about the quantity of Houses in Multiple Occupation and purpose built accommodation and the impact they have on communities. However, there was also support for meeting student needs in a wider area and through purpose built accommodation. Suggestions were also made for further accommodation to be provided on campus. There was also a case made for removing all restrictions on Houses in Multiple Occupation to allow them to meet the needs of non-students.
21. Comments were received from the Forestry Commission about the need to consider the impact of development on ancient woodland and the Canal and River Trust about considering the opportunities and impacts on the river and canal network. The National Farmers' Union highlighted the need to consider the rural economy and CPRE suggested higher density housing in urban areas and raised concern about the amount of student accommodation, which could be meeting housing needs.
22. The Leicestershire Local Access Forum set out support for major schemes with planned infrastructure and highlight opportunities to improve flood affected routes and avoid air quality issues and East Midlands Airport highlight the need to consider the airport safeguarded area. A response was also received from the Education & Skills Funding Agency on planning for school places.
23. A preference for one or more of the housing strategies identified in the consultation document was included by some. This included support for urban concentration principles as it maximises existing infrastructure and minimises the need to travel but also concern about focusing development in too few areas or too few sites putting too much pressure on existing infrastructure. There was support for a new settlement approach from a small number of respondents who considered it to take the pressure off existing infrastructure but others raised concern about timescales and uncertainty of new settlements. There was support for more dispersed development to create choice and flexibility from some respondents but also concern about the ability to provide appropriate infrastructure for this pattern of development from others.
24. In addition to these key themes, there were a range of other issues raised by one or two respondents including comments or concerns about:
  - how the vision will be implemented;
  - how developments will be accessed;
  - how the needs of the elderly will be met;
  - the need to review the approach to rural communities,
  - the need to require a mix of homes including affordable homes;
  - the impact of internet shopping and need for car charging points;
  - challenges to assumptions about infrastructure delivery from small sites;
  - concerns about creating a sense of place in new developments;
  - the need for a vision for the future of the Great Central Railway;
  - the quality and design of development;
  - the need for adequate protection for the borough's theatres and other arts, community and cultural facilities;

- greater detail needed on the environment and landscape protection;
- reducing the impact of lighting on the countryside;
- supporting sustainable forms of transport including provision of more buses and safe walking and cycle routes; and
- detailed comments on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal.

25. Issues raised through the Towards a Local Plan consultation provided confirmation of the importance of issues related to the Local Plan and were used to inform further evidence studies, options for development and policy drafting for the preparation of the Draft Local Plan.

### **Draft Plan (Optional Consultation) - November/December 2019**

26. This consultation sought views on the Council's preferred options for a development strategy and planning policies, taking account of Government requirements set out in the NPPF; the Council's corporate priorities; the Local Plan evidence base; and comments raised during previous consultations. In total 434 consultees responded. The Statement of Consultation (March 2020) summarises the responses received and sets out the Council's response to individual comments:

[https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/statement\\_of\\_consultation\\_draft\\_charnwood\\_local\\_plan\\_2019\\_36/Statement%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Draft%20Charnwood%20Local%20Plan%202019-36%202.pdf](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/files/documents/statement_of_consultation_draft_charnwood_local_plan_2019_36/Statement%20of%20Consultation%20-%20Draft%20Charnwood%20Local%20Plan%202019-36%202.pdf)

27. A notification letter was sent to approximately 1,330 bodies/persons contained on the Council's Local Plan consultation database and an e-mail alert was sent to bodies/persons who registered to receive Local Plan alerts. A list of consultees invited to comment is published in the Appendix of the Statement of Consultation. The consultation was also publicised via the Council website; social media; press release; posters in libraries and community buildings; fliers containing key questions; information boards and consultation events at three locations in the Borough – the Council Offices (Loughborough), Glenmore Castle (Shepshed); and Syston Community Centre; and officer attendance at parish council events upon request. Approximately 100 people attended the three roadshow events.

28. In response to the vision and objectives, respondents suggested that there needs to be better integration of the policy areas covered by the Local Plan to achieve genuine sustainable development. It was also suggested that the authority needed to be more ambitious in relation to climate change, sustainable transport, design, health and provision of green spaces. Others suggested that there needed to be greater realism about what can be achieved through the Local Plan, for example in relation to car use. This highlighted the importance of an appropriate monitoring framework for the plan. Respondents highlighted a lack of vision for Service Centres and Other Settlements and a lack of explanation of the International Gateway and how this fits with the aim to protect the National and Charnwood Forest. The need to protect community identity is supported.

29. In response to the scale of development, North West Leicestershire, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Councils, Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council all highlighted the lack of flexibility built into the plan to respond to the

outcomes of the Statement of Common Ground with regard to the redistribution of Leicester's unmet housing need. Leicester City Council suggested that the Council should be planning for a higher housing target and that a low growth scenario is not consistent with the NPPF. Leicestershire County Council expressed caution and concern about the scale of housing highlighting that it does not appear to chime well with the Government's national ambition for housing delivery and they suggest a 20% buffer is applied to the housing numbers.

30. The responses from developers and agents generally shared this view that the scale of housing planned is insufficient. Concerns were raised that the unmet need from Leicester is not taken into account and it was highlighted that the Strategic Growth Plan is non-statutory and cannot be relied upon. It was argued that there is insufficient flexibility to secure the required five year supply of deliverable sites in the context of slow delivery of the SUEs and implementation rates. Respondents also suggested that the proposed scale of development will fail to meet affordable housing needs and not support economic growth.
31. It was suggested that the housing provision proposed was not consistent with NPPF requirements, was not been appropriately tested in the sustainability appraisal and was not justified by a published Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
32. The low growth scenario was supported by CPRE, a number of Parish Councils, Edward Argar MP and local residents. It was suggested by respondents that the additional homes proposed by the draft local plan for flexibility was not justified, would have unacceptable impacts on the environment and cannot be supported by infrastructure.
33. In response to the development strategy, the position of some settlements in the settlement hierarchy was questioned by some respondents. There was a grouping of respondents that suggest Cossington, Rothley and Queniborough should be in a lower tier of the hierarchy. It was also suggested by some that Anstey should be part of Leicester Urban Area, but there was general consensus for Syston being part of Leicester Urban Area. There was also a view that Cossington, East Goscote, Queniborough, Rearsby and Wymeswold are more sustainable villages than the remaining 'Other Settlements' in the proposed hierarchy.
34. In response to the distribution of development there were suggestions of unfairness and that the scale of development in some areas was out of proportion with the size of the settlement or the infrastructure available to support development. There appeared to be greater concern about infrastructure, flooding and settlement separation in Service Centres and Other Settlements, particularly in the south-east of the Borough, and more concern about transport and congestion in Loughborough. A new settlement was suggested as an alternative, with East of Loughborough and the Wolds given as potential locations.
35. It was suggested by some respondents that more development should be directed towards Loughborough (including suggestions for development at Cotes) and Shepshed. Others suggested more development should be directed to small villages and hamlets, Other Settlements and Service Centres. It was highlighted that very little development was proposed in the northeast of the borough. Others suggested there was too much development concentrated in parts of Loughborough, Shepshed, Syston, Service Centres and the Other Settlements.

36. Respondents questioned how the plan proposes to restructure Shepshed Town Centre and how regeneration will be achieved without allocating any new employment land there. Respondents highlighted inconsistencies in employment land provision figures. Respondents questioned the sustainability of the Strategic Growth Plan and the focus on the A46 expressway and others called for greater recognition of the International Gateway in the strategy.
37. Respondents highlighted a lack of clarity for Neighbourhood Plans and call for existing plans to be taken into account. There was a wish from some for the task of identifying sites to be undertaken by neighbourhood plan groups.
38. In response to housing sites, the Draft Local Plan proposed 70 new sites for housing development alongside the existing Sustainable Urban Extensions. The inclusion of the majority of proposed sites had been supported by the landowner, promoter or developer and a significant amount of supporting evidence had been submitted. Additional evidence had also been submitted for a large number of alternative sites assessed as part of the process but not proposed for allocation, to show how issues with sites could be overcome. Some respondents challenged the site selection process, the need for more small sites and the transparency of the assessment.
39. The promoters of all the larger proposed housing allocations submitted large amounts of supporting evidence for their sites which together with the evidence for smaller sites needed to be considered in detail and discussed with specialists within the Council as well as infrastructure providers, Leicestershire County Council and neighbouring authorities. The promoters of the land south west of Loughborough proposed a significantly different allocation boundary and the promoters of the site south of Loughborough promoted significantly more homes than identified in the draft local plan.
40. In total six landowners indicated that they were not willing to develop their site. These sites combined were proposed to provide land for 189 homes. No contact was received from owners of eleven sites, which are in total proposed to provide land for 409 homes. Further work was therefore required to confirm there is a willing landowner for these sites. In total at least 25 new sites were proposed for consideration.
41. A site in the Thurcaston/Cropston area has been proposed by Leicester City Council for burial space to meet the needs arising from within the City.
42. The Environment Agency highlighted concerns with HS38 (Fairway Rd, Shepshed) as there are 3 Environment Agency permit sites within 200 metres of the site (incinerator, car scrapyards and animal feed factory). They also identified concerns about toxic material associated with a proposed site, HS18 (Beacon Road, Loughborough) which may be a substantial barrier to the development of this site.
43. Concerns were raised in relation to individual proposed sites and the concentration of sites in Shepshed, Cossington, Wreake Valley villages and parts of Loughborough. This included a range of concerns about whether there would be sufficient infrastructure to support development, whether flood risk will be increased, how traffic will be managed and concerns about the landscape and biodiversity impacts. There was a lack of confidence that certain aspects of the planning system will work including confidence regarding flooding evidence and delivery of infrastructure.



44. In response to infrastructure provision, respondents highlighted the pressure proposed development will put on local infrastructure especially schools and health services. It was argued that many doctors' surgeries and schools are already oversubscribed. Concerns were also highlighted about the focus on bus access when the Council exerts no control over this service.
45. The West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Group commented that it believes further development in Shepshed, on the scale proposed within the draft local plan, would have posed a significant risk for Health Care provision in the area. The two current surgeries will require significant investment and there are potential site and workforce constraints to significant further expansion.
46. Leicestershire County Council Education highlighted significant challenges to meeting primary education needs in Barrow Upon Soar, Cossington and Hathern. They highlighted the need for new schools to support the development proposed at Loughborough, Shepshed and Syston. It was also highlighted that additional land would be required to expand schools in Queniborough, Quorn, Rearsby, Rothley and Sileby.
47. Leicester City Council highlighted that the preferred spatial development strategy for both the City and Charnwood directs growth to the north/north-west of the urban area of Leicester and therefore it will be important to ensure close working on cross boundary infrastructure matters. This issue was also raised by North West Leicestershire in relation to the International Gateway and by Leicestershire County Council Highway Authority in terms of transport in relation to both the City and North West Leicestershire.
48. Highways England highlighted the likely impact on the operation of the M1, specifically between M1 J21A and J24, and on the A46 of the development on the edge of Leicester, Loughborough and Shepshed.
49. Severn Trent Water did not raise any water supply issues but waste water treatment capacity at some sites will require reinforcement. Increasing capacity at Wanlip is already planned for but the additional allocation to Loughborough and Shepshed will mean increased treatment capacity will be required, as it will be at some of the Service Centres.
50. In response to other policy areas, there were a range of policy refinements proposed including from several specialist organisations. Some respondents also raised concerns about whether there are sufficient evidence to support the policies, whether policies were ambitious enough and also whether they were practical and viable.
51. Issues raised through the Draft Plan consultation were considered through further engagement with key stakeholders such as infrastructure providers and duty to cooperate partners and informed final evidence gathering and policy refinement for the preparation of the Pre-Submission Local Plan.
52. It should be noted that since the end of the consultation period in December 2019, the Council continued to receive representations regarding sites proposed in the Draft Plan raising issues including infrastructure, traffic, access, biodiversity, amenity and safety considerations.

### **Pre-Submission (Regulation 19/20 Consultation)**

53. The Council has prepared a Pre-Submission Local Plan for consultation in June 2021. An updated version of this report, setting out the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised will be produced prior to formal submission of the Local Plan.

## **Appendix A: Bodies and persons invited to make representations under Regulation 18**

Anstey Parish Council  
Bardon Parish Meeting  
Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Parish Council  
Barrow upon Soar Parish Council  
Beeby Parish Meeting  
Belton Parish Council  
Birstall Parish Council  
Blaby District Council  
British Gas Connections Ltd  
British Telecommunications Plc  
Broughton & Dalby Parish Council  
Burton on the Wolds, Cotes and Prestwold Parish Council  
Charley Parish Council  
Cossington Parish Council  
Costock Parish Council  
Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)  
Department of Transport  
East Goscote Parish Council  
East Leake Parish Council  
EE  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Gaddesby Parish Council  
Glenfield Parish Council  
Groby Parish Council  
Harborough District Council  
Hathern Parish Council  
Hickling Parish Council  
Highways England  
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council  
Historic England  
Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council  
Homes and Communities Agency  
Hoton Parish Council  
Hungarton Parish Council  
Kegworth Parish Council  
Keyham Village Meeting  
Kingston on Soar Parish Council  
Leicester City Council  
Leicestershire Constabulary  
Leicestershire County Council  
Local Enterprise Partnership  
Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council  
Lovesby & Cold Newton Parish Meeting  
Markfield Parish Council  
Melton Borough Council  
Mountsorrel Parish Council  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail

Newtown Linford Parish Council  
NHS Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland PCT  
Normanton on Soar Parish Council  
North West Leicestershire District Council  
Nottinghamshire County Council  
Npower Ltd  
NTL Group Ltd  
O2 (UK) Ltd  
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council  
Orange Personal Communications Ltd  
Powergen  
Queniborough Parish Council  
Quorn Parish Council  
Ratcliffe on the Wreake Parish Council  
Rearsby Parish Council  
Rempstone Parish Council  
Rothley Parish Council  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rutland County Council  
Scraptoft Parish Council  
Seagrave Parish Council  
Severn Trent Water  
Shepshed Town Council  
Sileby Parish Council  
South Croxton Parish Council  
Stanford on Soar Parish Council  
Sutton Bonington Parish Council  
Swithland Parish Council  
Syston Town Council  
The Coal Authority  
Three  
Thrussington Parish Council  
Thurcaston & Cropston Parish Council  
Thurmaston Parish Council  
T-Mobile Ltd  
Transco Plc  
Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council  
Ulverscroft Parish Meeting  
Upper Broughton Parish Council  
Vodafone and O2  
Vodafone Group plc  
Vodafone Ltd  
Walton on the Wolds Parish Council  
Wanlip Parish Meeting  
Western Power  
Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council  
Woodhouse Parish Council  
Wymeswold Parish Council  
Wysall & Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council