

STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

Name of Organisation	Headline Comments	Supportive Y/N	Action on comments
Bosworth Battlefields Trust	Noted at Trust meeting of 22 nd June 2013.	Supportive as giving proper weight to battlefield conservation and to archaeology	Comments noted
English Heritage	Involved in funding of the CP and commented on drafts. As part of statutory obligations required to revise Battlefield boundary following discovery of location of battlefield.	Supportive	Comments noted. To be involved in Partnership Forum as appropriate.
Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council	CP cannot be enforced through the planning system as stands out of their remit.	Strongly supportive of a Partnership Forum	Ongoing liaison with HBBC Comments incorporated into development of Forum
Hinckley and Bosworth Tourism Partnership	Supportive of the plan and keen to be involved in the Partnership Forum	Supportive	Comments noted
Landlords (The Wynns), tenant and Estate Managers (Kings West)	Concerns about access, agricultural regimes, planning etc. Can see opportunities for collaboration and future funding.	Supportive	Comments noted. Kings West also attending meeting with NFU and English Heritage
Leicestershire County Council (LCC): Property Services	Consultation with landowner negotiations and related country park issues.	Supportive	All comments noted
LCC: Planning Archaeology	CP has limited implication in the planning process Registration of the Battlefield is more pertinent as it constitutes a designated heritage asset.	Supportive	Comments noted Planning archaeology involved in stakeholder meetings to clarify implications in relation to planning

APPENDIX C

Name of Organisation	Headline Comments	Supportive Y/N	Action on comments
LCC: Travel Choice and Access Team	<p>Local rights of way networks involve full consultation with users, visitors, occupiers and considers the benefits to the management of the land. It does not necessarily mean more routes.</p> <p>Access can be linked to agri-environmental stewardship schemes which offers payments to landowners to protect/ enhance the environment, wildlife and public understanding.</p> <p>Formal permissive paths can offer options to land managers to allow access without risk of formally creating rights of way.</p>	Indication not given	Comments noted
Leicestershire Footpaths Association	None.	Supportive	Comments noted
Leicestershire Promotions Limited	Supportive of the approach outlined in the CP	Supportive	No specific additional comments
Local Access Forum	Good opportunity to use the forum to look at the Rights of Way network	Supportive	Comments noted
Market Bosworth Parish Council	Makes sense to have plan in place to control future development as well as protect the existing landscape and historical features and which will enable management of the anticipated tourism in the area	Supportive	Comments noted

APPENDIX C

Name of Organisation	Headline Comments	Supportive Y/N	Action on comments
MIRA	Some concerns about the proposals as may impact on their development in the area	Supportive	Comments noted Meetings with MIRA, H&BDC and English Heritage to clarify areas of concern. Supportive and submitted information for inclusion into the CP.
National Farmers Union	Agreed that NFU would be main conduit for landowners. Concerns raised about boundaries, planning policies, agriculture regimes, access and rights of way, impact of increased tourists and management implications. Also confusion/ concerns about the role of English Heritage and H&BBC. Detailed comments on wording in CP received.	Supportive of forming a pilot Partnership Forum to discuss priority issues raised through the consultation process (car parking, rights of way, access)	Comments noted Extensive consultation and comments largely incorporated.
Natural England	Support the benefits of protecting the natural and archaeological evidence. Willing to support landowners in future stewardship schemes, subject to EU/ national changes.	Supportive	Comments noted
Ramblers Association			No comments received as yet
Richard III Society		Supportive	No specific additional comments received
Stoke Golding Parish Council	Can see opportunities in terms of managing visitors (have concerns about parking) and branding for the village – especially if funding attached. Benefits of having task and finish groups for projects.	Supportive	No specific additional comments received
Sutton Cheney Parish Council	Conservation Plan discussed at committee and have no further need for a special meeting to discuss any potential concerns	Indication not given	No specific additional comments received

