

Comments from	Responsibility/role	Comments	Response
English Heritage	Statutory consultee	No formal response. Suggest that Appendix B: Further reading includes 'By Design' and 'Manual for Streets'.	No response required. Appendix B has included the suggested further reading documents.
Natural England	Statutory consultee	<p>The content of draft SPD is welcomed and praised.</p> <p>It is suggested that the draft SPD makes reference to the visual quality element and local character of an area. An areas local landscape character should also be referenced.</p> <p>Another suggestion made is that public communal open space in high density developments should be connected with any existing green networks and public transport routes. Also ensure that no loss of community public space occurs within an area unless an excess of resource is identified both as per PPG17.</p> <p>Suggestions are made that the draft SPD includes energy efficiency, the use of onsite renewable energy and the prudent use of resources is of key importance to the government, this is detailed by the Energy White Paper, PPS22, the</p>	<p>Comments made by Natural England have been considered – below is the response to each point raised:</p> <p>This is outside the scope of draft SPD. Therefore, no amendments to the draft SPD are required.</p> <p>The draft SPD is focused on private amenity space and not public open space. This is outside the scope of draft SPD. Therefore, no amendments to the draft SPD are required.</p> <p>The draft SPD refers to the adopted SPD on Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.</p>

		<p>emerging Climate Change PPS and the 'Code for Sustainable Homes'.</p> <p>Natural England would like the draft SPD to make reference to Town and Village Design Statements and Concept Statements. Further information on these documents can be found on the website.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of draft SPD. Therefore, no amendments to the draft SPD are required.</p>
Environment Agency	Statutory consultee	<p>Reference made in Appendix D: Checklist for design principles should be amended to the requirements of PPS25 in relation to the location of development and design of the development including the use of sustainable drainage systems wherever possible.</p>	<p>Appendix D has been amended to include the suggestions made.</p>
East Midlands Regional Assembly	Stakeholder	<p>The document is appraised as being excellent. Amendments are suggested to make reference to the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8). The draft SPD is in general compliance to policies within RSS8 and my making reference would strengthen the SPD.</p>	<p>The draft SPD has taken on board the comments made and relevant policies have been referred to within the Introduction (page 3).</p>
Leicestershire Constabulary	Stakeholder	<p>In principle draft SPD is supported. Minor amendments have been suggested to the</p>	<p>As suggested amendments have been made to the draft SPD this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Text alterations to courtyard parking in the Parking

		<p>document to strengthen aspects on safety and security.</p> <p>Police Liaison Officer has suggested that public car parks should meet the standards as required by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) Safer Parking (Park Mark) scheme.</p>	<p>provision section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Text alterations to natural surveillance in the Safety and Security section. - Appendix A has included further definition of safety and security. - Appendix B has included the suggested further reading documents. <p>This suggestion has been included in Appendix D – Checklist of design principles under safety and security.</p>
Highways Authority	Stakeholder	<p>Concerns have been raised to the use of images and reference to the City Council's SPG on Vehicle Parking Standards.</p>	<p>On doing discussions with Highways Authority to resolve their concerns with reference to guidance on highways and parking standards.</p> <p>Therefore, no alterations required to the draft SPD.</p>
British Waterways	Stakeholder	<p>British Waterways feel that exceptional cases for shorter distances should be legitimate circumstances.</p> <p>Council should safeguard private amenity as it is important, and ensure that sufficient flexibility exists within the guidance, in all sections, to ensure that creativity, the efficient use of land and the character of the waterway corridor is not stifled by uniform</p>	<p>Comments have been taken into consideration, however it is felt that no alterations will be made to the draft SPD as each planning application should be considered on it's own merits.</p> <p>Amendments to 'Exceptional cases for shorter distances' have been made to state that if exceptions are made it should ensure and demonstrate that the local context has been considered, and that outlook/private has been safeguarded from adverse impact to existing and future occupiers. This change is to the central and inner residential area.</p>

		standards nor by the rigid application of such standards.	
Leicestershire County Council	Stakeholder	No comments on the draft SPD	No response required
Rescue Service	Stakeholder	Have asked for clarification if the draft SPD has made particular reference to student accommodation.	A response was sent to Rescue Service stating that the document does not refer to student accommodation. Therefore, no amendments are required to the draft SPD.
Network Rail	Stakeholder	No comments on the draft SPD	No response required
Development Control Committee (18 th September 2007)	-	Requested that planners use the guide to assist in making a balanced decision and not apply to the SPD rigidly. Particular reference was made to Appendix E: Private amenity standards that providing 5 square metres of amenity space for flats is unrealistic and that the SPD should take a balanced view.	This draft SPD is designed as a guide for Planning Management & Delivery to determine planning applications based on its own merits. The SPD will be monitored and reviewed on a yearly basis to assess its impact in providing private amenity space.
Development Control Committee (18 th September 2007)	-	Requested clarification to current enforcement cases for house extensions in light of Appendix G: A guide for house extensions.	In response to comments made each enforcement case would be taken on its own merits.