

**LEICESTERSHIRE, LEICESTER AND
RUTLAND**

STRUCTURE PLAN

1996 TO 2016

**STATEMENT OF DECISIONS AND REASONS
ON OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED
MODIFICATIONS**

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 1: Overall Strategy

Summary of Issues

1. A variety of amendments should be made to the clauses in the policy.
Six Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy is proposed to be deleted in accordance with the EIP Panel recommendation. However, consideration will be given to clarifying these matters when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Burbage Matters!. County Museums Service. Glenfield Parish Council. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. Northamptonshire County Council. Revelan Group. Sport England. The National Forest.
Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 2: Central Leicestershire Policy Area

Summary of Issues

1. The policy should set out arrangements to ensure co-operation and joint working between authorities in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.
2. There should be reference to the need for infrastructure provision to be in place before further development takes place.
3. The policy should not include specific figures for housing and employment.
4. The policy should take account of the Quality of Employment Land Study (QUELS) result.
5. The policy should reflect the dwelling provision recommended by EIP Panel.
6. The Central Leicestershire Policy Area would place a limitation on options for future development.
7. The employment provision in Blaby should be reduced.
8. The policy does not meet the strategic objective of promoting development in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.
9. The Three Authorities have been given "carte blanche" to amend the Explanatory Memorandum relating to the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.

Four Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. It is not appropriate to outline administrative arrangements in policy, however, consideration will be given to this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. Reference to infrastructure provision is made in Strategy Policy 3B and Strategy Policy 12. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. Totals for the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA) are set out in Housing Policy 1 and Employment Policy 1. This policy sets the strategic framework for development in the CLPA, so it is necessary to include housing and employment totals.
4. Not accepted. The QUELS study is intended to inform the revision of the East Midlands Regional Planning Guidance. Nevertheless, the policy is not inconsistent with the results of the QUELS study because Employment Policy 2 allocates additional land for employment in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.
5. Not accepted. The deposit draft Explanatory Memorandum refers in para 2.6 to the aim of locating 55 % of **new** development in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA). At the EIP, it was made clear that this was an aspirational target. It would also be unrealistic to apply the target to the total amount of

development over the Plan period. This is because the Plan's strategy for distribution has been unable to influence the distribution to date so only 42% of development in the first five years of the Plan period has been achieved in the CLPA. However, the distribution as set out in the Proposed Modifications would result in 53% of new development from 2001 being located in the CLPA over the remainder of the Plan period, close to the 55% target. This proposed distribution will also increase the quantity of housing in the CLPA over the whole Plan period from 28,025 (47% of the total) in the Supplementary Housing Report to 31,500 (50% of the total) in the Proposed Modifications. The EIP Panel recommendation that 19,000 dwellings should be allocated to Leicester could not be achieved if there were to be significant increases in housing provision in the rest of the CLPA outside Leicester. The dwelling provision recommended for the CLPA outside Leicester by the EIP Panel is therefore not accepted. Because of the significant under-achievement in relation to the 55% target for the CLPA in the first five years of the Plan period, the target could only be achieved if substantial amounts of additional greenfield land were to be released for housing within the CLPA outside Leicester. Such releases would undermine attempts to significantly maximise urban capacity and increase housing provision within Leicester.

6. Not accepted. Splitting the housing provision between inside and beyond the Central Leicestershire Policy Area has formed a central component of the overall strategy in the Plan from an early stage, reflected in the new proposed Strategy Policy 2. At the strategic level this will facilitate the most sustainable pattern of development overall for the Plan area. It is entirely appropriate that the Plan should set this strategic context, within which districts can consider a sustainable distribution of development at the local level consistent with national and regional guidance.
7. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as no modification was proposed to amend the employment total for Blaby.
8. Not accepted. The housing distribution proposed will ensure that over the remainder of the Plan period, from 2001, 53% will be located within the Central Leicestershire Policy Area, close to the aspirational target of 55%.
9. Not accepted. The EIP Panel has made specific recommendations regarding the Central Leicestershire Policy Area. The Explanatory Memorandum does not form part of the Plan. It explains but does not change the intention of the policy.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co, Blaby District Council, Burbage Matters, Cawrey Limited, David Wilson Estates, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Government Office for the East Midlands, Government Office for the East Midlands, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council House Builders Federation, Jelson Limited, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Devel, Miller Homes East Midlands, Redrow homes, Revelan Group, Roger Tym & Partners, Wheatcroft and Son Ltd ,William Davis Ltd.

A Brooks, Mr and Mrs Hall.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 3A: A Sequential Approach towards the Location of Development

Summary of Issues

1. Uppingham should not be listed as a main town. It has a population of only 4,000 and in other parts of the plan area would be treated as a Rural Centre. It puts Uppingham ahead of parts of Leicester in the sequential test. Uppingham should be included as Rural Centre.
2. Castle Donington and Barrow upon Soar should be named as main towns.
3. Policy should also highlight re-use of older buildings and brownfield sites.
4. Burbage should not fall within the definition of Hinckley as a main town.
5. The policy should make clear the relative priority given to previously developed land and land protected for amenity purposes, including parks, pitches and gardens.
6. Sequence not consistent with PPG3.
7. It is not appropriate for the sequential approach to place a limitation on options for future development.
8. The policy should refer to the need for infrastructure provision to be in place before further development takes place.
9. The policy should make clear how to treat previously developed land that may perform worse in sustainability criteria than greenfield land.
10. The policy should make clear in paragraph (c) that relative priority should be given to land that is or will be well served by public transport.
11. The policy should not give higher priority to greenfield land within the urban area than land adjoining the urban area.
12. Rural centres should not be included in the sequential search, as it fails to provide sufficient strategic recognition of rural needs or an appropriate mechanism to provide any identified needs.
13. Paragraph (a) of the policy should include reference to previously used land in Rutland adjoining the edge of Stamford.

Eight Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The main towns listed have a range of employment, shops services and other facilities and are relatively the most sustainable locations for development, having regard to local context in terms of the character of the area. They are designated according to the role they perform, rather than their population size. The Policy does not imply that land will be allocated to Uppingham ahead of Leicester, as the amount of new development to be provided in each district is set out in Housing Policy 1. It is a matter for each Local Plan to determine how this will be accommodated within its area, following the sequential approach set out in the policy.
2. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as no modification was proposed to amend the list of main towns.
3. Not accepted. The policy already refers to previously developed land and buildings. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
4. Not accepted. Burbage has always been considered to be within the definition of Hinckley / Earl Shilton. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
5. Not accepted. The factors to be taken into account in Strategy Policy 3B will enable the relative merits of sites which otherwise meet the requirements of the sequential approach to be assessed.
6. Not accepted. The factors to be taken into account in Strategy Policy 3B will enable the relative merits of sites which otherwise meet the requirements of the sequential approach to be assessed taking account of the guidance in PPG3.
7. Not accepted. The sequential approach has formed a central component of the overall strategy in the Plan from an early stage. At the strategic level this will facilitate the most sustainable pattern of development. It is entirely appropriate that the Plan should set this strategic context, within which districts can consider a sustainable distribution of development at the local level consistent with national and regional guidance.
8. Not accepted. Reference to infrastructure provision is made in Strategy Policy 3B and Strategy Policy 12. The detail of timing of infrastructure provision would be more appropriately dealt with in the Explanatory Memorandum and followed up in local plans in dealing with specific sites. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
9. Not accepted. The factors to be taken into account in Strategy Policy 3B will enable the relative merits of sites which otherwise meet the requirements of the sequential approach to be assessed.
10. Not accepted. The factors to be taken into account in Strategy Policy 3B will enable the relative merits of sites which otherwise meet the requirements of the sequential approach to be assessed.
11. Not accepted. The factors to be taken into account in Strategy Policy 3B will enable the relative merits of sites which otherwise meet the requirements of the sequential approach to be assessed.
12. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. The criteria

set out in Strategy policy 3B and 3C will ensure rural centres receive recognition and provide an appropriate mechanism to provide identified needs.

13. Not accepted. The EIP Panel concluded that unless or until a joint study such as that referred to in the deposit draft Explanatory Memorandum concludes that there is a case for development adjoining Stamford, there is no justification for including reference to such development in the Policy. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Burbage Matters, Burbage Parish Council, Carlton Parish Council, Cawrey Limited, Charnwood Borough Council, County Museums Service, Blaby District Council, CPRE Leicestershire, David Wilson Estates, Donnington Park Estates, Fisher German, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Government Office for the East Midlands, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, Miller Homes East Midlands, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Devel, Phillips Planning Services, Redrow Homes, Society for the Protection of Rutland, The Countryside Agency (East Midlands), Uppingham School.

A Brooks, Mr and Mrs Hall.

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Strategy Policy 3B: Suitability of Land for Development</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy should not include criterion (v). 2. The policy should include reference to forms of development falling outside standard classification, e.g. storage and distribution. 3. The policy should include criterion relating to impact on health of development. 4. There should be reference to the need for infrastructure provision to be in place before further development takes place. 5. The policy should include the criterion referring to “the capacity for development at transport nodes within good public transport corridors” recommended by the EIP Panel. <p>Five Representations of Support</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted. This criterion was recommended by the EIP Panel and is consistent with RPG8. It is important in assessing the relative merits of sites to take into consideration their deliverability. This will help to create certainty, and ensure sites are not allocated that may not be implemented within the Plan period. 2. Not accepted. This policy deals with most types of development. However, storage and distribution is one of a number of other types of development which have special circumstances that require exceptions to the sequential approach. Whilst the principles included in the criterion are generally accepted, such circumstances would be more appropriately dealt with in specific policies relating to that development, (see Proposed Modification to Employment Policy 8), rather than as an exception to this generic policy. This is the approach adopted by RPG8. 3. Not accepted. The impact on health of development proposals is adequately dealt with in other relevant controls. 4. Not accepted. Reference to infrastructure provision is made in criterion (ii) of the policy and Strategy Policy 12. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised. 5. Not accepted. There is no reference to transport nodes in RPG8, so such a criterion would be inconsistent with regional guidance. However, the policy would not preclude development at particular transport nodes, provided it meets the requirements for access by non-car nodes and the capacity of existing public transport as set out in criteria (i) and (ii).
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>Blaby District Council, Burbage Matters! County Museums Service, CPRE</p>

Leicestershire, Donington Park Estates, Environment Agency, Gazeley Properties Ltd, Glenfield Parish Council, House Builders Federation, J S Bloor (Measham) Ltd, John Littlejohn Ltd.

Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 3C: Rural Centres

Summary of Issues

1. The policy should be more positive regarding designation in local plans.
2. The policy should list specified locations.
3. The requirement for rural centres to contain all or most of the functions is too ambitious.
4. Reference to bus service needs to be clarified, and should not specify six days a week.
5. There should be reference to the need for infrastructure provision to be in place before further development takes place.

Four Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. The wording is intended to give a degree of flexibility to local planning authorities.
2. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel who considered that it would be more appropriate for the Structure Plan to provide a criteria-based policy that could be used as the basis for local plan designations. This would enable local planning authorities to make their own assessments of the suitability of settlements for rural centre designation.
3. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. It is necessary to be reasonably selective in assessing the suitability of a settlement for designation as a rural centre, and the criteria set out in the policy are considered to be reasonably rigorous in this respect.
4. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
5. Not accepted. The policy is specific in the functions and infrastructure required for rural centre designation. Reference to infrastructure provision is also made in Strategy Policy 3B and Strategy Policy 12. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co, Blaby District Council, Burbage Matters! Glenfield Parish Council, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, Miller Homes East Midlands, North West Leicestershire District Council, Wheatcroft and Son Ltd.

A Brooks, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 4: Greenfield Development

Summary of Issues

1. The phrase “unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise” is superfluous.
2. The policy should use the terminology “expansion of existing urban areas” rather than “urban extensions”.
3. The policy should allow for small urban extensions.
4. The policy should specify identified strategic sites.
5. Criterion (c) should include reference to committed development.
6. In criterion (e) the policy should state that the scale of contributions must be related to the development concerned, its location and existing provision.
7. Rewording of criterion (f) weakens it and introduces uncertainty.
8. There should be reference to the need for infrastructure provision to be in place before further development takes place.

Six Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel and recognises that the requirement for greenfield development to be carried out according to the policy should apply in most, but not necessarily all cases, in recognition of differing circumstances between districts.
2. Not accepted. “Urban extensions” is the term generally used in PPG3.
3. Not accepted. The scale of urban extensions required by the policy is necessary to maximise the benefits in terms of developer contributions towards facilities and infrastructure. However, there is also an allowance in the overall housing figure for smaller greenfield sites.
4. Not accepted. The approach is generally consistent with the EIP Panel recommendations in this respect. It is not appropriate for the Structure Plan to be site-specific. Specific locations will be identified in local plans.
5. Not accepted. Generally, local planning authorities will be required to re-assess existing local plan allocations without planning consent when reviewing local plans. In doing so, they would need to take this policy into account.
6. Not accepted. Reference to infrastructure provision is made in Strategy Policy 3B and Strategy Policy 12. The detail of the scale of contributions for infrastructure provision would be more appropriately dealt with in the Explanatory Memorandum. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
7. Not accepted. Phasing is a generally accepted term, and is the recommended mechanism as part of “plan, monitor and manage” as set out in PPG 3.
8. Not accepted. Criterion (g) addresses this issue.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co, Burbage Matters! CPRE Leicestershire, David Wilson Estates, Fisher German, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Glenfield Parish Council, Government Office for the East Midlands, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Devel, Miller Homes East Midlands, Redrow homes, Revelan Group.

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 5: Transport Objectives and Priorities

Summary of Issues

1. The policy fails to acknowledge the important role that motorway service areas play in maintaining highway safety.

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. It would not be appropriate for this policy to provide such a level of detail. This issue is addressed by Accessibility and Transport Policy 12.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Atis Real Weatheralls, Cyclists Touring Club (Leics District Assoc,), Glenfield Parish Council, Railtrack Plc.

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 6: Green Wedges.

Summary of Issues

1. In reviewing Green Wedge boundaries, district councils will need to assess the degree to which areas currently designated as such have been permanently damaged in ways which have affected their open and undeveloped character. Retain "The open and undeveloped character of Green Wedges will be protected and wherever possible enhanced". Retain "permanently" in the policy.
2. It is unduly onerous for Green Wedges to link up with urban open spaces; settlements adjoining urban areas are no longer separate; it is the open character and not the attractiveness of a Green Wedge which is important; the word "operational" is unclear and both retention and creation of green linkages are important. Need to replace "urban open spaces" with "urban areas", "adjoining the main" with "adjacent to"; delete "attractive" and "operational" and in the final paragraph reinstate "and".
3. Should include an additional category of development which could be acceptable. This is affordable housing for local needs adjoining settlements in accordance with the rural exception policies in local plans.
4. Green Wedges by their nature are of local importance. Amend wording in (c) by inserting "local and" before "strategic".
5. The original position that mineral extraction is presumed acceptable in Green Wedges subject to the test that no permanent damage would be caused should be reinstated.
6. In (h) it is not the availability that counts but the comparability and acceptability. A worse site should not be selected in preference to an otherwise better one in a Green Wedge. In (h) add "alternative" site outside .."in all respects acceptable".
7. In criterion (h) Park & Ride schemes will damage the undeveloped character of the Green Wedge and do not meet other criteria of the Policy. Delete clause (h).
8. Criterion (e) and (f) are essential purposes of a Green Wedge and should not be omitted, this is an issue that has not been debated.
9. The policy does not take account of the need that may exist for waste management facilities in urban fringe locations that would not compromise the policy aim of protecting the open and undeveloped character of Green Wedges.

Ten Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The wording is in accordance with EIP Panel recommendations. Reference to the protection of the open and undeveloped character of a Green Wedge remains in the third paragraph of this policy. The word 'permanently' is not required now that mineral extraction has been moved to the second

- grouping of acceptable land uses.
2. Not accepted. This is the wording recommended by the EIP Panel. Green Wedges can play an important role in linking the countryside and urban open spaces. It is important that planning policy helps to achieve this. The changes and deletions as suggested would not be in accordance with The EIP Panel recommendations and would do little for the clarification of this policy.
 3. Not accepted. The inclusion of this category would not be in accordance with the EIP Panel recommendations. Rural exception policy is for local plans to determine, taking on board the local assessments of housing, economic and environmental profiles of parishes and villages.
 4. Not accepted. The word 'strategic' will ensure that links are of a strategic rather than local importance, reflecting the strategic nature of Green Wedges.
 5. Not accepted. This would not be in accordance with the EIP Panel recommendations. Mineral extraction needs to be subject to greater restrictions given the nature of the operations.
 6. Not accepted. This would not be in accordance with the EIP Panel recommendations. National policy encourages any development to be located within urban areas if possible in the first instance, recognising that this is not always possible.
 7. Not accepted. As stated in the EIP Panel report (paragraph 3.7) it would be too restrictive to prohibit park and ride development in Green Wedges in all circumstances. The reworded policy can be compared to that covering Green Belts as set out in Annex E to PPG13 which confirms that park and ride is not inappropriate subject to a number of provisos. This policy gives a number of very strong provisos in the requirement for alternative locations outside Green Wedges to be considered first and the caveat relating to measures to minimise severance and adverse amenity effects.
 8. Not accepted. Criteria (e) and (f) are not functions of Green Wedges. Their inclusion within the policy is still considered important and therefore is now included in the preamble to the second part of the policy.
 9. Not accepted. Policy WLP8 of the Waste Local Plan recognises the importance of protecting open spaces and green areas as defined within development plans from the adverse effect of development unless there is an overriding need.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Friends of Ratby Action Group, Carlton Parish Council, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, Countryside Agency, Redrow Homes, Birstall Parish Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, North West Leicestershire District Council, Fisher German, Blaby District Council, Cawrey Limited, Burbage Parish Council, Burbage Matters and Government Office for the East Midlands.

Ms Sally Smart, Mr Brookes

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 7: Review of Green Wedges.

Summary of Issues

1. The Proposed Modification weakens the protection afforded to urban fringe populations by Green Wedges by a continual review in favour of development. Change policy back to original.
2. The designation of a Green Wedge south of Burbage should not be contingent upon a Greenfield urban extension. The only basis on which green wedges should be considered are the criteria specified in the EIP Panel's recommendations 3.35 (a) to (f). Remove the words ".. in the context of any Greenfield urban extensions in these vicinities which may be proposed."
3. A continual review in favour of development substantially weakens the protection afforded to Green Wedges and undermines the overall strategy for location and extent of Green Wedges. The original policy better represents the aims of Green Wedges.
4. Item 'q' omits Burbage.
5. There is no need for two references to Groby under criterion (k) and (l).

Ten Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. Green Wedges should not be regarded as a putative Green Belt. The policy is worded in accordance with the EIP Panel recommendations. It allows for review through local plans in order to take into account the sequential approach to new development in Strategy Policy 3A.
2. Not accepted. The EIP Panel suggested that if there were a case in principle for a Greenfield urban extension south of Burbage then this might justify consideration of a complementary Green Wedge. At present the land does not possess the attributes that would qualify it for consideration as a Green Wedge.
3. Not accepted. Green Wedges should not be regarded as a putative Green Belt. The policy is worded in accordance with the EIP Panel recommendations. It allows for review through local plans in order to take into account the sequential approach to new development in Strategy policy 3A.
4. Not accepted. The EIP Panel had some doubts as to whether the land to the South of Burbage can be said to possess the attributes that would clearly qualify it for consideration as a Green Wedge. They considered that the case for a new Green Wedge south of Burbage should be considered within the context of any greenfield urban extensions which may be proposed in the local plan.
5. Not accepted. Relates to two different Green Wedges.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modifications

List of Respondents

Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, North West Leicestershire

District Council, Fisher German, Blaby District Council, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, Cawrey Limited, Burbage Parish Council, Burbage Matters! CPRE Leicestershire, Wheatcroft and Son Limited and Revelan Group.

Mr and Mrs Hall.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 8: Separation of Settlements

Summary of Issues

1. Minor re-wording suggested, delete “material”; and delete “permissible” and reword “....development will be ***permissible*** only where it would not result in a material reduction in the degree of ***actual or visual*** separation....”.

Three Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy is worded as recommended by the EIP Panel. The suggested amendments do not materially improve the policy.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co. CPRE Leicestershire, Friends of Ratby Action Group.
North West Leicestershire District Council.

A Brooks.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 9: Development in the Countryside

Summary of Issues

1. The deletion of reference to Areas of Local Landscape Value removes ability of district councils to provide additional protection for landscape features of local importance.
2. The policy does not allow a local planning authority discretion whether to include a landscape character assessment in its Local Plan and is contrary to PPG7.
3. Agree with the EIP Panel that reference in fourth paragraph to an “overriding need” beyond government policy. Amend to require that a countryside location is necessary.
4. Listing types of development which may be acceptable automatically precludes other development however well justified.
5. In criterion (f) requirement to demonstrate overriding need for telecommunications development in the countryside is unnecessary and inconsistent with PPG8.
6. In criterion (g) renewable energy should have higher priority with general energy low down on priorities.
7. In criterion (g) should include example of wind turbines.

Ten Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel. It would not prevent district councils from providing additional protection for landscape features of local importance, particularly if justified by a landscape character assessment.
2. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel. PPG7 recommends landscape character assessments as a helpful approach to local planning authorities in reviewing their development plans. However consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. The reference to “overriding need” was recommended by the EIP Panel. The EIP Panel’s concern was that a requirement to demonstrate an overriding need for a development “in principle” goes beyond government policy. The policy has been amended to indicate that demonstration of a countryside location is necessary, as recommended by the EIP Panel.
4. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. It is considered appropriate to identify which types of development will be acceptable in the countryside in order to minimise unnecessary development in the countryside. Other types of development would be considered on their merits, as departures from the policies of the plan.
5. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel. It is

considered appropriate to require an overriding need in order to minimise unnecessary development in the countryside. PPG8 stresses the need to minimise impact of development and in particular the need to protect the best and most sensitive environments.

6. Not accepted. The order of items in the policy does not imply priority order. Resource Management Policy 3 encourages energy from renewable sources and takes into account the wider environmental benefits of using renewable energy resources. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
7. Not accepted. It is not necessary to give examples in the policy, however consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Carlton Parish Council, Countryside Agency (East Midlands), CPRE Leicestershire, Donington Park Estates, County Museums Service, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Glenfield Parish Council, Andrew Granger & Co., Harborough District Council, Ibstock Property & Minerals Service, Sport England, T-Mobile (UK) Ltd., Wheatcroft & Son Ltd.

Sally Smart

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 10: Mixed Use Development

Summary of Issues

1. In criterion b) the requirement for the “enhancement” of local, character is too onerous and should be reworded to refer to “seek protection or enhancement where necessary.”

One Representation of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Accept. Minor change to be made as suggested.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend criterion b) of the Policy to read:

“local character and distinctiveness of recognised importance, and its protection and *or* enhancement where necessary;”

List of Respondents

Railtrack plc and Government Office for the East Midlands.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 11: Good Design

Summary of Issues

1. In criterion a) the requirement for the enhancement is too onerous
2. In promoting sustainable drainage systems, the policy does not have regard to the problems of implementation.

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Accepted. Although this does not refer to a Proposed Modification, a small amendment to the policy would ensure it is consistent with other policies in the Plan and government guidance.
2. Not accepted. Relevant matters of implementation should be dealt with in the Explanatory Memorandum. Consideration will be given to this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend criterion (a) of the Policy to read:

“protects ~~and~~ **or** enhances the form and local character and distinctiveness of the built and natural environment;”

List of Respondents

Environment Agency, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Glenfield Parish Council, Government Office for East Midlands, House Builders Federation.

Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 14: The National Forest

Summary of Issues

1. The policy is contrary to the model policy set out in the National Forest Strategy.
2. The policy does not provide support for sustainable network to get to the Forest and necessary focussing of attractions to enable and enhance this network.

Three Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection, as it does not relate to the Proposed Modification.
2. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection, as it does not relate to the Proposed Modification.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Friends of Ratby Action Group, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, The Countryside Agency(East Midlands), The National Forest.

Mr A Brooks.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 15: Charnwood Forest

Summary of Issues

1. The requirement that development should “enhance” the character of Charnwood Forest is too onerous
 2. The policy goes beyond a landscape character based policy
- Six Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Accepted. A small amendment to the policy would ensure it is fully consistent with government guidance.
2. Not accepted. The first part of the policy is worded positively to allow development that meets the criteria set out. The special character of Charnwood Forest Area goes beyond its landscape character, so it is appropriate that the other factors are drawn into the policy.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend the second paragraph of the Policy to read:

“.....where it can be demonstrated to conserve ~~and~~ **or** enhance the character.....”

List of Respondents CPRE Leicestershire, Glenfield Parish Council, Government Office for the East Midlands, Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, North West Leicestershire District Council, The Countryside Agency (East Midlands), William Davis Ltd.

Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 16: Rutland Water

Summary of Issues

1. The policy does not provide support for a sustainable network to get to Rutland Water and necessary focussing of attractions to enable and enhance this.
2. Unless Wing Water Treatment Plant can be extended, further resources will need to be sought.
3. Existing areas of recreational is development defined too narrowly.

Six Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy requires focussing of development on existing recreational areas. Integrated and sustainable travel and transport is dealt with in general terms in Strategy Policy 5. The provision of a detailed network is a matter for the Local Plan, the Local Transport Plan and other local strategies.
2. Not accepted. This is not a strategic planning matter.
3. Not accepted. The detailed definition of recreational areas is matter for the Local Plan.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Anglian Water, English Nature, Environment Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Sport England.

Mr A Brooks, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 17 Junction 23a / 24 / 24a Area

Summary of Issues

1. The policy should be deleted as recommended by the EIP Panel.
2. Terminology in the policy should be defined.
3. The Explanatory Memorandum should take into account the results of multi-modal studies.
4. The deposit draft of the policy is relevant and should remain.
5. The policy should take into account the results of QUELS study.

Nine Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended that consideration be given to deleting the policy. It is considered that the policy should be retained as modified to provide greater certainty for the area concerned.
2. Not accepted. Consideration will be given to how the terminology is defined when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised. The Explanatory Memorandum will provide guidance for local plans in which exact boundaries are defined.
3. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to taking into account the results of the multi-modal studies in amending the Explanatory Memorandum.
4. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended that consideration be given to deleting the policy. The deposit draft policy is inconsistent with RPG8. It is considered that the policy should be retained as modified to provide greater certainty for the area concerned.
5. Not accepted. The Quality Employment Land Study is intended to inform the review of the RPG. However, the study recommendations generally support this policy.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co, CPRE Leicestershire, Derbyshire County Council, Donington Park Estates, Glenfield Parish Council, Hallam Land Management, Highways Agency, Leicestershire & Rutland Transport 2000, North West Leicestershire District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Developments.

Mr A Brooks, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 18: Green Belt

Summary of Issues

1. The policy should be deleted as recommended by the EIP Panel. Designation is unnecessary as the land that would be protected by green belt is already floodplain or protected by countryside designation. Designation could prejudice any future review undertaken as part of RPG8 review.
2. Green belt designation could restrict growth opportunities potentially available at East Midlands Airport.

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The Proposed Modification is intended to provide a firm, easily recognisable and defensible boundary relating to features on the ground, rather than the present one, which follows administrative boundaries. It is supported by both Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils. Land designated as green belt in adjoining structure plans is also in the floodplain. The relevant local plans in Leicestershire will contain the appropriate development control policies for the area concerned. At the time of the EIP Panel report, RPG8 was still in draft form. RPG8 has now been approved and allows for the review of the green belt boundaries in structure plans, including the case for adding land to the green belt. This policy is therefore consistent with RPG8. Any subsequent review of RPG will be reflected in future reviews of the Structure Plan or its replacement.
2. Not accepted. The policy will not restrict operational development at East Midlands Airport, as it does not fall within the general area proposed to be designated.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Derbyshire County Council, Donington Park Estates, East Midlands Airport, , Government Office for the East Midlands, Nottinghamshire County Council, Wilson Bowden.

Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Strategy Policy 19: Strategic River Corridors.

Summary of Issues

1. The policy does not identify all of the tributaries of the rivers listed or Sketchley Brook which goes into the River Anker (Warwickshire).
2. There is a conflict of priorities where River Corridors are also Green Wedges or for example Charnwood/National Forest. Just to be clear that is in addition to, not competing with other criteria. Add "their status as Green Wedges or Countryside and on other designations" after "above interests".

Nine Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The issue of adding "and their tributaries" was debated at the EIP and the Panel agreed with the Structure Plan Authorities that by adding this wording the policy would be diluted beyond the strategic purposes intended by RPG. If the tributaries need the same integrated approach to biodiversity and floodplain protection then they can be identified in local plans.
2. Not accepted. This additional wording is not considered necessary as this issue is covered by other policies relating to Green Wedges and the Countryside in the Structure Plan. If a strategic river corridor lies within a Green Wedge then any development proposals will be considered taking both designations and their accompanying policies into account. Also the suggested changes would not be in accordance with the EIP Panel's recommendations.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Environment Agency, English Nature, Carlton Parish Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, North West Leicestershire District Council, Burbage Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart and Mr Brooks.

Policy No.

Environment Policy 1: Historic Environment.

Summary of Issues

1. Would be beneficial to include information about recent schemes that are being employed nationwide by County Archaeology section.

Four Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. It is not appropriate to include this in the policy, however, consideration will be given to making reference to this when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Glenfield Parish Council, County Museums Service, Harborough District Council.
Ms Sally Smart

Policy No.

Environment Policy 3: Biodiversity Enhancement.

Summary of Issues

Eleven Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

None.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modifications.

List of Respondents

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Environment Agency, English Nature, Friends of Ratby Action Group, CPRE Leicestershire, Carlton Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council.

Ms Sally Smart

Policy No.

Environment Policy 3A: Protection of Important Species and Habitats.

Summary of Issues

1. The amendment to the EIP Panel's recommendation in relation to Habitats of International Importance misinterprets Reg. 49 of the Habitats Directive. Support the EIP Panel's recommended wording with suggested slight amendment.
2. The policy exceeds the EIP Panel's recommendations and runs contrary to the advice of English Nature, the RSPB and PPG9.
3. The word "local" should be inserted between overriding and need in relation to Habitats of Local Importance to ensure consistency with parts (I) and (ii) of this policy and Environment Policy 4.
4. Criteria iii) and v) c): Protection of Important Species and Habitats. A development plan policy should not be made reliant upon another document.
5. The policy appears to extend law relating to environmental protection, which is a matter for Parliament. It skips several important steps in 1994 Regulations and applies tests appropriate to Habitats of International Importance to other sites. Uncertainty about terms such as "national need" and "local need".

Five Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Accepted in part. The wording should be amended to be consistent with EIP Panel's recommendations. Do not accept other minor amendments as these were not recommended by the EIP Panel.
2. Accepted. The wording should be amended to be consistent with the EIP Panel's recommendations and national policy.
3. Accepted in part. Further modification consistent with the EIP Panel recommendation will ensure consistency with national policy.
4. Not accepted. The debate at the EIP and the subsequent panel report was very supportive of stronger links in the policy to Biodiversity Action Plans.
5. Accepted. The wording should be amended to be consistent with the EIP Panel's recommendations and national policy.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend section (i) Habitats of International Importance to read:

“Developments will only be acceptable where it would not adversely affect designated or proposed Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation or Ramsar sites, unless an overriding international need for the development can be shown to outweigh the sites' ecological interest and there are no alternative solutions available for that development **and the development is needed for imperative reasons of overriding public interest.**”

Amend the last sentence of section (iii) Habitats of Local Importance to read:

“unless an overriding ***national or local*** need can be shown to outweigh the ecological interest ~~and there are no alternative solutions.~~”

Amend the last sentence of section (iv) Species of Acknowledged Importance to read:

“and development will not be permitted unless an overriding ~~need~~ ***interest*** can be proven and there are no alternative solution”

List of Respondents

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Environment Agency, English Nature, Friends of Ratby Action Group, CPRE Leicestershire, Carlton Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council.

Ms Sally Smart

Policy No.

Environment Policy 4:Geology.

Summary of Issues

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

None.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council.

Ms Sally Smart

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 1: Pollution
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Three Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Environment Agency, Glenfield Parish Council Ms Sally Smart

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 2: Energy Efficiency
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Two Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Glenfield Parish Council Ms Sally Smart

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 3: Energy Installations
<u>Summary of Issues</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern about the balance between the detrimental effect of technology, such as wind turbines on residents, and the benefits of that technology for the environment. 2. The policy does not recognise the importance of the reduction in climate change the use of renewable energy sources produces. 3. The policy does not take account of policy 56 of RPG8. 4. The fourth bullet point is unclear. Four Representations of Support, one with a general comment.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy is in line with PPG 22, which states that Authorities will have to consider both the immediate impact on the local environment and their wider contributions to the reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.
2. Not accepted. The policy encourages the generation of renewable energy and gives particular emphasis to their wider environmental benefits.
3. Not accepted. The policy reflects locational criteria referred to in policy 56 of RPG8. There is no need for the Structure Plan to repeat RPG.
4. Not accepted. This is a matter for the Explanatory Memorandum which provides clarification of the policy and consideration will be given to clarifying this bullet point when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Terence o'Rourke plc, Harborough District Council.

Mr A Brooks, Ms Sally Smart,

Policy No.**Resource Management Policy 4: The Water Environment****Summary of Issues**

10.The policy does not address development that would impede the flow of flood water or affect the capacity of the floodplain to store water.

11.The policy should refer to archaeology.

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

10.Not accepted. Development that would impede the flow of flood water or affect the capacity of the floodplain to store water are examples of how development could increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. However, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

11.Not accepted. The effect of development on archaeology is adequately dealt within other policies of the Plan.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

English Heritage, Environment Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, Ibstock Property & Minerals Service

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Resource Management Policy 5: Agricultural Land</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy does not reflect advice in PPG7 that development of the best and most versatile land should not be permitted unless opportunities for accommodating development on previously developed land or within urban areas have been assessed. 2. The term “sustainability considerations” renders the policy vague, contrary to advice in PPG12 Annex A paragraph 16. <p>One Representation of Support.</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted. This wording was put forward by GOEM at the EIP and recommended by the Panel. The Policy should be read in conjunction with Strategy Policy 3A, which sets out the sequential approach to development and requires priority be given to development of previously developed land in urban areas before land in other locations. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised. 2. Not accepted. This wording was put forward by GOEM at the EIP recommended by the Panel. The term “sustainability considerations” is also used in paragraph 2.17 of PPG7. The policy should be read in conjunction with Strategy Policy 3B, which identifies the criteria to be taken into account in considering the suitability of land for development. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>Friends of Ratby Action Group, Government Office for the East Midlands, Miller Homes (East Midlands) & Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd.</p>

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Resource Management Policy 6: Safeguarding Mineral Resources</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>No representations</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>None</p>
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>

List of Respondents

None

Policy No.**Resource Management Policy 8: Land Release: Waste Management****Summary of Issues**

1. Appears to promote waste production and landfill
- One Representation of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not Accepted. The modification refers to current best practice, and is in accordance with processes set out in PPG 10 and the National Waste Strategy. It has been established (nationally) that waste arisings are currently growing at a rate of around 3% per annum. New and replacement waste management facilities are therefore required on an on-going basis, and these will be assessed in the light of points i) to iv) detailed in the modification, including waste minimisation initiatives which are at the top of the waste hierarchy. The anticipated scale of provision required for future waste disposal after 2006, is a matter for the review of the Waste Local Plan, and will be guided by the review of RPG.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification

List of Respondents

Government Office for the East Midlands, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Harborough District Council
Mr A Brooks

Policy No.**Resource Management Policy 9: Environmental Impact of Mineral Extraction and Waste Management****Summary of Issues**

Two Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

None.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Environment Agency, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 10: Igneous Rock Extraction
<u>Summary of Issues</u> No representations
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> None

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 11: Coal Mining and Colliery Spoil Disposal
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Two Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, UK Coal Mining LTD

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 12: Transportation of Minerals and Waste
<u>Summary of Issues</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The phrase ‘wherever reasonably practical’ is open to interpretation and would benefit from clarification, particularly in terms of the financial aspects of waste transportation. 2. There is drafting error in the Proposed Modification to the policy. It should refer to “Rail, canal and pipeline as a means of transporting minerals and waste....”, the subject of the policy. <p>One Representation of Support</p>
<u>Reasoned Response</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted. This policy now echoes policy 9 of the Waste Local Plan, and was tested at the public local inquiry. In reaching his recommendation on this matter, the Inspector concluded, “it would be difficult for the policy to go further

than this since much will depend upon the nature of the waste management proposals". The term "wherever reasonably practical" would be treated as a planning judgement, therefore, and weight attached accordingly on a case by case basis.

2. Accepted. The policy should be amended.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend the Policy to read:

"...Rail, canal and pipeline as a means of transporting *minerals and* waste should be used wherever reasonably practicable."

List of Respondents

Railtrack Plc, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service

Policy No.

Resource Management Policy 13: Restoration Aftercare and Afteruse

Summary of Issues

Two Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

None.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Environment Agency

Policy No.

Resource Management Policy 14: Recovery of Waste

Summary of Issues

Two Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

None.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Environment Agency, Harborough District Council

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 1: Development and the Transport System

Summary of Issues

1. Travel Plans should contain achievable targets.
 2. There should be a policy reference to work on transport and social exclusion.
- Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

12. Not accepted. This issue is covered more appropriately in Strategy policy 5. Travel Plans when required will include suitable targets.
13. Not accepted. Strategy Policy 5 and the opening lines of this policy does this implicitly.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification

List of Respondents

Harborough District Council, Highways Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Railtrack, Cawrey Ltd.
Sally Smart, Andy Brooks

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 4: Buses

Summary of Issues

12. The policy is too onerous because not all development warrants bus provision and it is not always practical for all parts of development to be within convenient walking distance. It does not accord with PPG13 (para.6) or with the EIP Panel recommendations.

13. The original policy gave clear guidance on the maximum walking distance for access to buses. The identification of thresholds in the Explanatory Memorandum gives no opportunity to analyse or object.

Three Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy establishes the importance of the principle of accessibility to bus routes for new development. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The level of detail in the original policy was not appropriate for a Structure Plan. Consideration will be given to this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification

List of Respondents

Birstall Parish Council, Cawrey Ltd., Glenfield Parish Council, GO-EM, Harborough District Council, HBF, Miller Homes, Soar Valley Preservation Soc.

Andy Brooks, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 5: Development of Rail Passenger Services

Summary of Issues

1. Objection to exclusion of the Ivanhoe Line and other stations in the policy as it is contrary to the EIP Panel's recommendations.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. There is not a reasonable degree of certainty that the proposals will proceed within the plan period, which would warrant their inclusion in the policy. However, consideration will be given to referring to these proposals when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Highways Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Railtrack, Cawrey Ltd.
Sally Smart, Andy Brooks

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 6: Freight

Summary of Issues

1. There needs to be a reasonable degree of certainty for identifying rail or waterway freight connections in local plans. If there is uncertainty over the matter, the land should be safeguarded rather than identified.
2. The Proposed Modification omits the phrase “overriding sustainable benefit” which was included in the pre-EIP changes and accepted by the EIP Panel.
3. The policy should provide protection for Waterways, which have historic interest.

Five Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This modified policy already provides for both identification and protection and is the EIP Panel’s recommended form of wording.
2. Accepted. The phrase was inadvertently omitted in the Proposed Modification. It should therefore be re-instated.
3. Not accepted. Covered by Environment Policy 1.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend the last paragraph of the Policy to read:

“Rail or waterway based proposals that do not satisfy the above criteria may be permitted ***if there is an overriding sustainability benefit***, provided that the main justification for the development is the need for rail or waterway access for the movement of goods or raw materials.”

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, English Heritage, English Nature, Gazeley Properties, GO-EM, Harborough District Council, Railtrack, RSPB, UK Coal Mining

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 7: Parking Provision in New Development</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unclear what the policy is intending to do, over and above giving strategic direction to maximum parking standards in individual plans. 2. The policy does not address parking levels below minimum standards. 3. The policy should specify that maximum parking standards are defined in PPG13 and RPG8. <p>Two Representations of Support</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted. The intention of this policy is indeed to give strategic direction to the provision of maximum parking standards in individual plans. 2. Not accepted. PPG13 states that there should be no minimum standards for development 3. Not accepted. The wording of the policy was recommended by the EIP Panel and drafted in accordance with PPG13 and RPG8. Structure Plan policies should not include references to other policy guidance, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, Hinckley & Bosworth District Council.</p> <p>Andy Brooks, Sally Smart.</p>

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 8: Public Car Parks</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>No representations</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>None</p>
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>None</p>

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 9: Park and Ride

Summary of Issues

1. Discussions between the Highways Agency and the Councils should take place before proposals for Leicester West are developed.
2. The policy does not reflect the advantages of locating Park and Ride at transport interchanges.

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. This is not a comment on the content of the Plan. However, the Highways Agency will be consulted on proposals for the Leicester West Transport Scheme.
2. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as no Proposed Modification has been made to amend this policy.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification

List of Respondents

Atis Real Wetheralls, Highways Agency.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 10: New Roads, Road Improvements and Management of Traffic

Summary of Issues

1. A reference in the Explanatory Memorandum to the safeguarding of the Kibworth Bypass would be welcomed.
2. The policy should include proposals from the Road Management Studies and the M1 Multi Modal Study, including particular nodes and land approved for road construction.
3. Concern about the design of the Earl Shilton Bypass.
4. Object to the decision not to accept the EIP Panel's recommendation that the Loughborough Inner Relief Road (LIRR) should be listed in the policy and the reference to the £5m qualifying criteria changed.

One Representation of Support

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however consideration will be given to referring to this proposal when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The policy relates to major transport schemes that are firm proposals in current Local Transport Plans and are strategic in nature. Consideration will be given to referring to such proposals when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. This is a matter for the detailed design and planning application stage.
4. Not accepted. The Loughborough Inner Relief Road should not be referred to in the policy because the cost of the project does not exceed £5million and therefore it is not defined as a major transport scheme. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No changes to the Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Carlton Parish Council, Borough of Charnwood, Harborough District Council.

Andy Brooks.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 11: Transport Routes

Summary of Issues

1. Local plans cannot reserve the continuity of long distance rail routes. Add words "Notwithstanding the above" at beginning of 2nd para.
2. Reference should be made in the Explanatory Memorandum to the M1 alterations and Park & Ride sites, subject to the sites not being identified.

One Representation of Support.

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. Local Plans can safeguard rail routes from other development and therefore reserve their continuity. The proposed amendment is unnecessary.
2. Not accepted. Not appropriate to identify sites within a Structure plan.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Carlton Parish Council

Andy Brooks.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 13: Airports and General Aviation

Summary of Issues

1. The Explanatory Memorandum should clarify the practical interpretation of improved surface access, including the need for a rail link to the airport, and include a reference to the Airport's Transport Forum.
2. The policy should state that surface access must be sustainable and set targets for modal split.
3. The blanket restriction on other airports is too onerous and does not accord with national and regional guidance, the EIP Panel or the balanced approach proposed in respect of general aviation.
4. Economic benefits cannot be balanced against environmental benefits.

Three Representations of Support

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The first paragraph of the policy refers to the evaluation of access provision against sustainability criteria. Modal split targets are a matter for Local Transport Plans.
3. Not accepted. It is considered that there is no justification for the establishment or physical expansion of any other commercial airports that would over-ride the potential environmental damage.
4. Not accepted. Sustainability Appraisals enable proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on a range of criteria including economic and environmental considerations.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Derbyshire County Council, East Midlands Airport, GO-EM, Harborough District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.

Andy Brooks

Policy No.

Housing Policy 1: The Quantity of Housing Land

Summary of Issues

1. The total quantity of housing should be as recommended by the EIP Panel. This involved the provision of 64,750 dwellings between 1996 and 2016, based on the annual rate of provision of 3,200 for 2001-2016 proposed in Draft RPG, and an estimate of actual completions between 1996 and 2001. [Subsequently the final RPG included an average annual provision rate of 3,150 dwellings.]
 2. Housing provision should be expressed as an annual rate, not a total.
 3. The Central Leicestershire Policy Area should include 55% of the total housing allocation as recommended by the EIP Panel.
 4. A specific allocation to the Central Leicestershire Policy Area will deny districts the opportunity to consider the most sustainable settlement pattern.
 5. The urban capacity figures could be exaggerated and do not form a sound basis for calculating the housing distribution.
 6. The proposed distribution of housing should have a policy basis to ensure that local housing need takes account of the “policy neutral” requirement and is met in the most sustainable locations, irrespective of existing local plan allocations without planning consent.
 7. Objections to district housing distributions and alternatives suggested (including the distribution recommended by the EIP Panel). Specifically:
 - Blaby: too high;
 - Blaby too low;
 - Charnwood: too low;
 - Harborough: too low;
 - Hinckley and Bosworth, too low in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area;
 - Allocation to Leicester is too optimistic, and should be lower, with the surplus allocated to the remainder of the Central Leicestershire Policy Area;
 - Melton: too high / should be reduced to 3,000 dwellings (including 36 objections from individuals);
 - North West Leicestershire: too high;
 - Oadby and Wigston too high (including 10 objections from individuals);
 - Oadby and Wigston too low;
 8. Objection to content of Housing Technical Paper;
- Nine Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The EIP Panel’s recommendation that 64,750 dwellings be provided within the Plan area between 1996 and 2016 is not considered

appropriate for the following reasons:

- The final RPG proposed an annual average rate of 3,150 dwellings between 2001 and 2016. The actual number of dwelling completions between 1996 and 2001 was 16,635. Using the methodology used by the EIP Panel the equivalent housing provision figure for 1996 to 2016 would be 63,885.
- However, the Structure Plan Authorities do not consider that the EIP Panel's methodology to be appropriate. This is because it failed to recognise that the technical basis used by the EMRLGA's Planning Forum for calculating the draft RPG8 annual average rate used a base date of 1996. When the start date of the final RPG was rolled forward to 2001 by the Secretary of State no detailed technical information was provided to explain or justify the (relatively minor) change to the annual average rate. It is therefore considered that the technical work carried out by the EMRLGA's Planning Forum to underpin the proposals in draft RPG remains valid. (The minor change to the annual average rate from 3,200 to 3,150 dwellings was justified by reference to adjustments to assumed vacancy rates). In this context it is appropriate to assume that the annual average rate applies to the period from 1996 to 2016 and not just to the period of RPG from 2001. Therefore the annual average rate should be 3,150 dwellings, which equates to 63,000 dwellings over the Structure Plan period 1996 to 2016.
- Housing provision in the first five years of the Plan period (16,635 – that is 3,327 dwellings per annum) has exceeded the annual average rate of 3,150 by 177, a total of 885 dwellings. The EIP Panel considered that this should be added to the housing requirement for the period between 2001 and 2016. It is the view of the Structure Plan authorities that doing this would lead to an over-provision of dwellings in the Plan area as the technical requirement for dwellings between 1996 and 2001 was 3,150 per annum. Any provision over and above this should be offset against provision in the period after 2001, in line with the principles of 'plan, monitor and manage'.

A total housing provision of 63,000 for the Plan period therefore provides a robust housing provision target, consistent with RPG8.

A number of other objectors suggested other housing provision totals, based on the methodology recommended by the EIP Panel, including that the figure should be 64,000 dwellings. For the reasons explained above it is considered that the figure which best reflects the requirement for dwellings set out in RPG8 is 63,000 dwellings.

2. Not accepted. There is no requirement for the provision to be expressed as an annual rate. PPG12 requires structure plans to indicate the scale of provision to be made, including figures for housing in each district. At the Structure Plan level, totals for the whole period are more appropriate for translation to district level provision.
3. Not accepted. The deposit draft Explanatory Memorandum refers in para 2.6 to the aim of locating 55% of **new** development in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA). At the EIP, it was made clear that this was an aspirational target. It would also be unrealistic to apply the target to the total amount of

development over the Plan period. This is because the Plan's strategy for distribution has been unable to influence the distribution to date so only 42% of development in the first five years of the Plan period has been achieved in the CLPA. However, the distribution as set out in the Modifications would result in 53% of new development from 2001 being located in the CLPA over the remainder of the Plan period, close to the 55% target. This proposed distribution will also increase the quantity of housing in the CLPA over the whole Plan period from 28,025 (47% of the total) in the Supplementary Housing Report to 31,500 (50% of the total) in the Proposed Modifications. The EIP Panel recommendation that 19,000 dwellings should be allocated to Leicester could not be achieved if there were to be significant increases in housing provision in the rest of the CLPA outside Leicester. The dwelling provision recommended for the CLPA outside Leicester by the EIP Panel is therefore not accepted. Because of the significant under-achievement in relation to the 55% target for the CLPA in the first five years of the Plan period, the target could only be achieved if substantial amounts of additional greenfield land were to be released for housing within the CLPA outside Leicester. Such releases would undermine attempts to significantly maximise urban capacity and increase housing provision within Leicester.

4. Not accepted. Splitting the housing provision between inside and beyond the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA) has formed a central component of the overall strategy in the Plan from an early stage, reflected in the new proposed Strategy Policy 2. At the strategic level this will facilitate the most sustainable pattern of development, by helping to achieve the aspirational target of 55% of new development in the CLPA. It is entirely appropriate that the Plan should set this strategic context, within which districts can consider a sustainable distribution of development at the local level.
5. Not accepted. It is not considered that the urban capacity figures are exaggerated. The EIP Panel itself concluded in para 4.37 of their report that "*the urban capacity study may be regarded as taking a somewhat conservative approach to assessing future potential*". This and the other factors set out in the Technical Paper accompanying the Proposed Modifications form the basis of the modest increase in urban capacity incorporated into the supply of housing used to derive the district distribution. Response 7 (below) refers to the recent increase in uptake of previously developed land for housing in Leicester. Early indications are that this is being repeated throughout the Plan area, with large site completions on previously developed land rising from 45% (1996 – 2001) to 47% (2001 – 2002). It is appropriate to take the likely contribution from urban capacity into account in calculating the housing distribution. This allows the Structure Planning Authorities to make strategic decisions regarding the broad distribution of new greenfield development in the Plan area. This can only be done if both the supply and proposed strategic greenfield development are incorporated in the distribution figures. (See also responses to Housing Policy 2).
6. Not accepted. The locational strategy of the Plan as set out in Strategy Policy 3A gives the same priority to the main towns as the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area. The overall quantity of housing provision to districts reflects this priority, as well as the following factors:
 - Achieving an amount of development in the Central Leicestershire Policy

Area (CLPA) that would not result in an excessive amount of greenfield provision in the CLPA outside Leicester;

- The aim of balancing housing and employment in Central Leicestershire, districts and more specific locations;
- The level of existing commitments (land with planning permission or allocated in a local plan) and the expected contribution from additional urban capacity;
- The desirability of achieving comprehensively planned strategic greenfield sites which will allow public transport, infrastructure and other facilities to be provided in a managed way;
- Potential locations of strategic greenfield sites capable of development beyond the Plan period;
- The desirability of including an element of smaller greenfield development to meet local needs, for example, for affordable housing.

The “policy neutral” distribution gives a very broad indication of the projected housing requirement on a district basis. Because it reflects past trends, it would not be appropriate to use as a policy basis for a revised distribution. It cannot, for example help with the distribution within and outside the CLPA, and therefore cannot help to ensure the main towns are given the priority required by the sequential approach.

In Charnwood, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth and Oadby and Wigston, the factors listed above require the allocation of additional greenfield land on Strategic Greenfield Housing Sites, as set out in Housing Policy 2. In Blaby, Melton and North West Leicestershire, the supply of land available will ensure that no further greenfield land will be required beyond that needed for smaller greenfield development to meet local needs.

The Strategic Planning Authorities do not consider that the proposed distribution of dwellings across the Plan area has been inappropriately influenced by the inclusion of local plan allocations without planning permission as commitments. This was a view supported by the EIP Panel which stated that individual allocated sites should be reviewed through the local plan process. The matter was covered in the EIP Panel’s Report at paragraphs 4.19 to 4.26 which concluded in paragraph 4.26 that *“Our overall conclusion is that whilst we cannot subscribe to the approach on commitments adopted in the Structure Plan, we have no firm evidence that this has so distorted the allocation of dwellings across the Plan area as to fundamentally undermine the achievement of the Plan’s strategy. However, we do feel that local plan allocations which are judged not fully compatible with the strategy should be reviewed as the local plans are updated and rolled forward. The Structure Plan Authorities agreed to include reference to the need for such reviews in the explanatory memorandum to Housing Policy 1. It was also agreed that Table 6.1 in the explanatory memorandum, which summarises housing provision by local authority area, should be amended so as to distinguish between true housing commitments, namely completions and sites with planning permission, and local plan allocations.”* Clarification regarding those sites allocated in local plans which the EIP Panel described as being ‘not fully compatible with the Strategy’ was provided in Technical

Paper 1, accompanying the Proposed Modifications.

7. Not accepted. The distribution to districts proposed by the EIP Panel does not take into account the supply information provided by the districts updated to 2001 and the adjusted urban capacity assessment (see response to Issue 5, above and the Housing Technical Paper, issued with the Proposed Modifications). On a district basis, the proposed distribution is based on the updated supply, and the distribution of Strategic Greenfield Sites, as set out in the proposed Housing Policy 2.

Generally, the proposed distribution differs from that recommended by the EIP Panel by reducing the amount of new greenfield housing land in the CLPA outside Leicester, thus helping to promote regeneration in Leicester, with the objective of meeting the ambitious allocation in Leicester. (see the response to Strategy Policy 2). The EIP Panel's recommended housing distribution would seriously undermine the prospects of realising this ambitious allocation. Outside the CLPA, the proposed distribution gives a more appropriate emphasis to the main towns in accordance with the sequential approach. It would be inappropriate to transfer housing provision from Melton and North West Leicestershire to the parts of other districts outside the CLPA because it would entail excessive amounts of new greenfield housing land having to be allocated in those districts. The district descriptions below refer to the supply as set out in Table 5, and the distribution of new greenfield housing set out in Table 8 of the Technical Paper.

- **Blaby**

The provision recommended by the EIP Panel would imply new greenfield development of about 900 dwellings, taking into account the supply of 4,457 dwellings, most of which is located in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA). Although Blaby has the longest urban "edge" with Leicester of all the districts, any urban extension here would have to be on a large scale to be viable. This scale is unnecessary, given the reduced need for new greenfield housing land over the Plan area and undesirable given the policy objective of minimising the amount of new greenfield development in the CLPA outside Leicester. Nevertheless, the allocation incorporates a larger element of Smaller Greenfield Sites which reflects the lack of a main town in Blaby and the district council's objection that greater flexibility is required.

- **Charnwood**

In the context of the updated supply information (8,701 dwellings, 70% of which is outside the CLPA), the provision recommended by the EIP Panel would imply new greenfield development of about 1,400 dwellings, in the CLPA and almost nothing outside. This would involve large allocations of new greenfield development close to Leicester, whilst not allowing for an adequate amount of housing to meet the needs of Shepshed and the major market town of Loughborough. The proposed distribution would allow for a more balanced approach, allowing for more modest urban extensions to both Leicester and Loughborough and Shepshed, whilst taking into account environmental constraints around Loughborough.

- **Harborough**

The provision recommended by the EIP Panel would allow for very little new housing outside the CLPA to meet the needs of Market Harborough and Lutterworth, taking into account the supply of 6,909 dwellings, two thirds of which is outside the CLPA. The proposed distribution would allow for a more balanced approach, allowing for more modest urban extensions to both Leicester and Market Harborough / Lutterworth. The supply includes greenfield allocations adjoining Market Harborough, Kibworth and Great Glen. The local planning authority is currently altering the adopted local plan to set in place a phasing mechanism to ensure that the greenfield sites are not developed at the expense of available previously developed land.

- **Hinckley and Bosworth**

The total proposed Structure Plan provision is broadly in line with the EIP Panel's recommendation. However, as with Charnwood and Harborough, the EIP Panel's recommendation would allow for very little new housing to meet the needs of Hinckley and Earl Shilton, taking into account the supply of 6,441 dwellings, 85% of which is outside the CLPA. Although a small part of the borough lies within the CLPA, there are no main towns and none of it adjoins the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area. It is considered therefore that any urban extension in the borough should be located outside the CLPA to meet the needs of Hinckley and Earl Shilton. Development needs within the CLPA can be met from the more modest element of Smaller Greenfield Sites.

- **Leicester**

The EIP Panel recommended an increase in the City's allocation from 16,200 to 19,000 houses. They concluded in their report (para 4.49) that Leicester *"is the most sustainable location and that additional urban capacity over the Plan period is most likely to arise in the city through unidentified windfalls, urban intensification, residential sub-division and the like. The impact of government policy on urban renaissance and local measures for regeneration is also expected to have its greatest effect in major urban areas like Leicester"*.

The Structure Plan Authorities consider that the recently established Leicester Regeneration Company (LRC) will provide a new impetus to overcome obstacles to inner city redevelopment such as land assembly, site contamination and scheme viability. In November 2002 the LRC published its Masterplan, which outlines several major redevelopment schemes, including proposals for about 3,000 new homes within the City centre. The City Council has approved this strategic regeneration framework in principle.

The Masterplan has generated a great deal of interest from landowners and developers. Brownfield housing developments in the City should increase significantly with the implementation of the LRC Masterplan proposals over the next ten years. Evidence of schemes being built in the City centre and many more in the planning pipeline suggest this is already happening. Planning permission has already been granted (subject to a Section 106 agreement) for 475 houses on Bede Island South, with further planned phases which could eventually see up to 850 houses on this major brownfield site.

The City Council has agreed a moratorium on affordable housing requirements in certain areas within the City centre to help kick start private

residential developments. The moratorium initially applied until 31st March 2003 but has been extended for a further six months until 30th September, pending some independent research into the impact and effectiveness of the moratorium.

In addition to these inner City regeneration sites the continued phased development on strategic greenfield sites at Hamilton and Ashton Green will make a major contribution towards the Structure Plan's housing allocation. The first phase of development at North Hamilton is well advanced and the City Council intends to market phase 1 of Ashton Green during 2003.

The Structure Plan Authorities firmly believe that the proposed housing distribution (Housing Policy 1) and phasing of new greenfield sites (Housing Policy 2) are essential planning measures to maximise urban capacity within Leicester. Any further increases in greenfield allocations in adjoining Districts within the CLPA will compete with these sites and make it more difficult for the City to meet its challenging housing target.

- **Melton**

Although Melton Borough falls entirely outside the CLPA, Melton Mowbray plays a major role as a market town for the surrounding area, and this is recognised in its designation as a main town in Strategy Policy 2. The borough has the most self-contained labour market in Leicestershire in terms of journey to work, with 54% of residents working within the borough. The proposed provision of 4,200 dwellings, (7% of the total housing provision) compares with the 125 ha employment provision (10% of the total). Any reduction in the housing provision would result in an imbalance of housing and employment in the borough, encouraging in-commuting. The total provision includes 50 dwellings for Smaller Greenfield Sites and the supply of 4,137 dwellings, the latter including the new village, an allocation in the adopted local plan which is required to meet the housing provision of the adopted Structure Plan. The rationale for including such commitments is set out in paragraph 6 above. The local planning authority will have an opportunity to review its commitments in detail, taking into account the latest guidance and the availability of previously developed land, when it come to review its local plan. It is considered that the proposed provision is sufficient to meet the policy objectives for the Plan without the need for any Strategic Greenfield Housing Sites to be provided under Housing Policy 2.

- **North West Leicestershire**

Although North West Leicestershire falls entirely outside the CLPA it contains the main towns of Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch which play important roles as main towns, reflected in their designation in Strategy Policy 2. Like Melton, the district is relatively self-contained in terms of journey to work, with 48% of residents working within the district. The proposed provision of 7,350 dwellings is a lower proportion of the total than the district's employment provision. Like Melton, any reduction in the housing provision would result in an imbalance of housing and employment in the borough, encouraging out-commuting. The total provision includes 50 dwellings for Smaller Greenfield Sites, and the supply of 7,315 dwellings. The latter includes an allocation at Grange Road, Hugglescote in the adopted local plan. The rationale for including such commitments is set out in paragraph 6 above. The local

planning authority will have an opportunity to review its commitments in detail, taking into account the latest guidance and the availability of previously developed land, when it comes to review its local plan. It is considered that the proposed provision is sufficient to meet the policy objectives for the Plan without the need for any Strategic Greenfield Housing Sites to be provided under Housing Policy 2.

- **Oadby and Wigston**

The EIP Panel's recommendation of 2,400 dwellings would imply new greenfield development of 1,300 dwellings. Whilst it is accepted that as well as falling entirely within the CLPA the borough performs well against the sequential test in Strategy Policies 3A and 3B, greenfield development on that scale would have a serious impact on the already small amount of undeveloped land in the district, as well as competing with regeneration of previously developed land in Leicester. A smaller total provision of 1,700 is therefore proposed, which, taking into account the supply of 1,125 dwellings will require new greenfield development of 600 dwellings.

- **Conclusion**

The distribution of housing to the districts is consistent with the locational strategy of the Plan and takes account of the local circumstances in each district. It is a distribution which moves towards the aspirational target for the amount of new development in the CLPA whilst supporting the challenging housing total for Leicester.

8. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as the Housing Technical Paper provides technical information to back up the Plan, and does not form part of the Proposed Modifications.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Andrew Granger & Co, Blaby District Council, Burton and Dalby Parish Council, Cartfeild, J K, Cawrey Limited, Charnwood Borough Council, Clerk to Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council, Community Planning and Regional Services, CPRE (Regional Officer), D, J, Kent & Co, Chartered Accountants, David Wilson Estates, Derbyshire County Council, Fisher German, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Gaddesby Parish Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Goodwin, A P, Government Office for the East Midlands, Great Dalby Action Group, Harborough District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, House Builders Federation, J S Bloor (Measham) Ltd, John Littlejohn Ltd, Larkfleet Homes, Liberal Democrats- Oadby & Wigston Branch, Meadow Estate Resident Association, Melton Borough Council, Miller Homes East Midlands, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Dev, North West Leicestershire District Council, Persimmon Homes (Midlands) Ltd, Redrow Homes, Revelan Group, Roger Tym & Partners, Soar Valley Protection Society, Somerby Parish Council, Town and Country Planning, Uppingham School, Westbury Homes, Wheatcroft and Son Ltd, Wigston Civic Society, William Davis Ltd.

J M Allsop, Dorothy Bacon, Robert Bowman, R and R Bridges, A Brooks, Phil Clarke, Mrs A Claxton, A and C Clayton, J Cowan, R Cowan, Dr H Daintith, A G Davies, A J Davies, Dr S K Dromgoole, M Duffin, Mr and Mrs, Duffin, R H Duffin,

Tony Fox, Mr and Mrs Ghera, D Hemmings, Mr and Mrs Holdsworth, F and E Honan, Mr and Mrs Horspool, N Hudson, Chris Johnson, M Lepine, J M Luding, Bernard Ludwig, Ruth Mann, Mr and Mrs Milward, John and Linda Moore, Mr and Mrs Parkinson, Dr I Payne, M Pont, Didi Powles, W E Sharpe, Sally, Smart, J J Smith, Mrs E G Smith, T D W Smith, Thomas Smith, J and A Sparrow, Mr Tekhar,,Colonel D E Thornton, Samantha Warring, Mr and Mrs Whittle, P D Wilsher, E A Woodfield, K W Woodfield, Ms Young.

Policy No.

Housing Policy 2: Strategic Greenfield Housing Sites

Summary of Issues

1. Policy should be deleted:
 - It is unnecessarily detailed;
 - Objectives can be achieved through other policies in the Plan;
 - Removes flexibility of Local Planning Authorities to bring forward sites to meet strategic requirements through identification and phasing of sites;
 - Based on unsound premises, including arbitrary increase in urban capacity by 5%;
 - Without an improved monitoring framework, there is no effective basis on which the policy can be founded;
2. Objections to district housing distributions and alternatives suggested, including specifically:
 - Central Leicestershire Policy Area: too low;
 - Hinckley and Bosworth: too high;
 - Hinckley and Bosworth (Central Leicestershire Policy Area): too low;
 - Oadby and Wigston: too high (including 47 from individuals);
3. Allocations not of sufficient size to meet objectives of Strategy Policy 4.
4. Wording of policy could imply no limit in other districts.
5. The policy should include specific reference to local plan allocations at Kettleby Magna, Melton and Bardon Grange, North West Leicestershire.
6. The assumption of 40 dwellings per hectare for calculating land required is too high.

Seven Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted.
 - The policy provides an appropriate degree of strategic guidance and detail by specifying how much greenfield land should be released, its broad distribution and timing. It will ensure that the greenfield development identified in Strategy Policy 4 is subjected to a maximum land area, distributed within districts between the Central Leicestershire Policy Area and the rest of the Plan area, and is not developed until the last five years of the Plan period.
 - This policy complements other policies in the Plan. It provides strategic support for the Plan's objective to maximise urban capacity, supporting Leicester's challenging housing provision target and avoiding the unnecessary release and development of greenfield sites.
 - Within the framework of the guidance offered by this policy, Local Planning

Authorities will be able to identify appropriate sites in the light of more detailed and updated urban capacity studies.

- The EIP Panel concluded in para 4.37 of their report that “the urban capacity study may be regarded as taking a somewhat conservative approach to assessing future potential”. This and the other factors set out in the Technical Paper form the basis of the modest increase in urban capacity incorporated into the supply of housing used to derive the district distribution of new strategic greenfield sites. The Structure Planning Authorities accept the EIP Panel recommendation in para 1.33 referring to arrangements for effective monitoring of the Plan. The likely new arrangements for local development frameworks should facilitate a flexible approach to applying updated information on housing supply to revised proposals for housing provision. This policy will ensure that as part of this process, major new releases of greenfield housing land will not occur prematurely.

2. Not accepted.

- The deposit draft Explanatory Memorandum refers in para 2.6 to the aim of locating 55 % of **new** development in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA). At the EIP, it was made clear that this was an aspirational target. It would also be unrealistic to apply the target to the total amount of development over the Plan period. This is because the Plan’s strategy for distribution has been unable to influence the distribution to date so only 42% of development in the first five years of the Plan period has been achieved in the CLPA. However, the distribution as set out in the Proposed Modifications would result in 53% of new development from 2001 being located in the CLPA over the remainder of the Plan period, close to the 55% target. This proposed distribution will also increase the quantity of housing in the CLPA over the whole Plan period from 28,025 (47% of the total) in the Supplementary Housing Report to 31,500 (50% of the total) in the Proposed Modifications. The EIP Panel recommendation that 19,000 dwellings should be allocated to Leicester could not be achieved if there were to be significant increases in housing provision in the rest of the CLPA outside Leicester. The dwelling provision recommended for the CLPA outside Leicester by the EIP Panel is therefore not accepted. Because of the significant under-achievement in relation to the 55% target for the CLPA in the first five years of the Plan period, the target could only be achieved if substantial amounts of additional greenfield land were to be released for housing within the CLPA outside Leicester. Such releases would undermine attempts to significantly maximise urban capacity and increase housing provision within Leicester;
- The proposed total Structure Plan provision for Hinckley and Bosworth is broadly in line with the EIP Panel’s recommendation. However, the EIP Panel’s recommendation would allow for very little new housing to meet the needs of Hinckley and Earl Shilton, taking into account the supply of 6,441 dwellings, 85% of which is outside the CLPA;
- Although a small part of the borough lies within the CLPA, there are no main towns and none of it adjoins the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area. It is considered therefore that any urban extension in the borough

should be located outside the CLPA to meet the needs of Hinckley and Earl Shilton. Development needs within the CLPA can be met from the more modest element of Smaller Greenfield Sites;

- The EIP Panel's recommended total provision of 2,400 dwellings for Oadby and Wigston would imply new greenfield development of about 1,300 dwellings. Whilst it is accepted that as well as falling entirely within the CLPA the borough performs well against the sequential test in Strategy Policies 3A and 3B, greenfield development on that scale would have a serious impact on the already small amount of undeveloped land in the district, as well as competing with regeneration of previously developed land in Leicester. A smaller total provision of 1,700 is therefore proposed, which, taking into account the supply of 1,125 dwellings, will require maximum new greenfield development of 600 dwellings, on about 15 hectares of land. This is a significant reduction from the amount proposed in the Deposit draft of the Structure Plan.
3. Not accepted. The distribution and size of the sites represents a reasonable balance between providing for selective urban expansion to the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area and the main towns and the need for a certain critical size to enable adequate infrastructure to be provided. In addition, phasing the strategic sites until the last five years of the Plan period will enable Local Planning Authorities to select sites that will, if necessary, be capable of extension beyond the current Plan period, it being accepted that the larger they are, the wider the range of infrastructure they can support.
 4. Not accepted. The Technical Paper provides clarification of this matter and consideration will be given to clarifying it further when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
 5. Not accepted. The allocations referred to are already accounted for in the Plan. "Planning to Deliver" indicates that local plans that should designate particular sites as "strategic sites". It goes on to say that "the broad location of strategic sites may have been signalled by the structure plan", and that the rationale for their selection should be set out in the local plan. The EIP Panel recommended in para 4.81 that the Explanatory Memorandum should refer to the need for a review of local plan housing allocations. It would be inappropriate for the Structure Plan to pre-judge this by specifically referring to selected allocations.
 6. Not accepted. The density used to calculate the area of land required for strategic greenfield sites is based on Housing Policy 5, which requires a **minimum** of 40 dwellings per hectare for locations well served by public transport and accessible to services and facilities. Strategic Greenfield Sites would have to meet the requirements of Strategy Policy 4, and would therefore fall into the 40 dwellings per hectare category in Housing Policy 5.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Cawrey Limited, Community Planning and Regional Services, CPRE (Regional Officer), David Wilson Estates, Derbyshire County Council, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Glenfield Parish Council, Government Office for the East Midlands, Great Dalby Action Group, Hinckley & Bosworth

Borough Council, House Builders Federation, J S Bloor (Measham) Ltd, Jelson Limited, John Littlejohn Ltd, Larkfleet Homes, Liberal Democrats- Oadby and Wigston Branch, Meadow Estate Resident Association, Miller Homes East Midlands, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, Persimmon Homes (Midlands) Ltd, Ratby Parish Council, Redrow Homes, Revelan Group, Roger Tym & Partners, Somerby Parish Council, Wheatcroft and Son Ltd, William Davis Ltd, Wood Frampton.

Helen Adam, Mrs K D Alvey, T Ancell, Dorothy Bacon, Robert Bowman, A Brooks, Mr and Mrs J K Cartfield, Mr and Mrs Chuasama, Shirley Clowes, Mr and Mrs E Coles, Mrs M Cooper, J E Cowan, R Cowan, Mrs Daelwyes, Mrs A G Davies, Mr H H Freudenberg, E Garnier, M P, Mr and Mrs Ghera, J S B, Gill, Dr M D and Mrs P M Glasse, Malcolm Gray, Janet and Jonathan Hal, Mr and Mrs Hales, Mrs M Harding, K Hardy, E Heckley, E and N Cuthbert, Mrs R A Hibbert, Mr and Mrs John Hough, Mrs C Jackson, Mr S S Johal, H R Johnson, Mr and Mrs R Johnson, Mr and Mrs Kerr, John and Linda Moore, Belinda Nuttall, Alison O' Carroll, R W Pain, Pravin Palmer, Mr K Patel, Dr I Payne, Mrs H Peters, Mr and Dr N J Roth, Miss M Rudd, Mr and Mrs D T Saunders, Mr and Mrs Sodhi, J and A Sparrow, Mr John B Stanford, Mr R W Swann, Mrs Y Tahir, Mrs J Talan, P D Wilsher, E A Woodfield, K W Woodfield, D E Woodward, Mr and Mrs Woodward, T K Worth.

Policy No.

Housing Policy 3: New Housing Provision on Previously Developed Land and through Conversions

Summary of Issues

14.The minimum requirement is too cautious and should be 60% in line with the EIP Panel recommendation.

15.The minimum of 50% should be expressed as a target.

16.The policy is meaningless without an effective monitoring framework.

Five Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

14.Not accepted. The minimum requirement of 50% is based on an assessment of availability of sites set out in Table 9 of the Technical Paper, and is realistic, given the characteristics of the Plan area. The assessment indicates that only 45% of completions to 2001 were on previously developed land, but that 50% could be achieved over the Plan period, due to the increased emphasis on using urban capacity and small sites.

15.Not accepted. A target is not rigorous enough to provide an impetus for development on previously developed land. A minimum allows for a higher percentage to be achieved over the Plan period.

16.Not accepted. The Structure Planning Authorities accept the EIP Panel recommendation in para 1.33 referring to arrangements for effective monitoring of the Plan and will make the necessary arrangements for an effective monitoring framework.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Birstall Parish Council, Burton and Dalby Parish Council, Community Planning and Regional Services, Gaddesby Parish Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Government Office for the East Midlands, Great Dalby Action Group, House Builders Federation, J S Bloor (Measham) Ltd, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Dev, Miller Homes East Midlands, North West Leicestershire District Council, Redrow Homes, Somerby Parish Council, Wheatcroft and Son Ltd, William Davis Ltd, Wood Frampton.

Mr A Brooks, Mr and Mrs J K Cartfeild, Mrs A Claxton, J E Cowan, R Cowan, Mrs A G Davies, A P Goodwin, Mrs Didi Powles, Sally Smart, J and A Sparrow, E A Woodfield, K W Woodfield.

Policy No.

Housing Policy 4: Affordable Housing

Summary of Issues

1. Target figures for affordable housing should be retained in the policy.
2. Target figures for affordable housing should at the very least be set out in the Explanatory Memorandum.
3. Detailed criteria should not be introduced “by the back door” through changes to the Explanatory Memorandum.
4. Circular 6/98 is clear that the site size threshold should be 25 dwellings in areas outside inner London and only where justified by housing needs assessments should a lower threshold be used.

Seven Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended that target figures for affordable housing should be removed from the policy, as this goes beyond current government guidance in Circular 6/98.
2. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. It is not intended to introduce detailed criteria “by the back door”. The Explanatory Memorandum provides explanation but does not form part of the policies of the Plan.
4. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Birstall Parish Council, Community and Regional Planning Services, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, House Builders Federation, Miller Homes (East Midlands), Redrow Homes, Soar Valley Protection Society, William Davis Ltd.

Sally Smart

Policy No.

Housing Policy 5: Density and Design

Summary of Issues

1. The Structure Plan should require all local plans to include a 10% flexibility allowance in case density targets are not met with reserve sites to meet the shortfall.
2. The policy should refer to a threshold of 0.3 ha or 10 dwellings or more, whichever is the smaller.
3. Delete “attain” and add “surpass”.
4. Over-rigid and over-prescriptive. Delete part of policy after (d).
5. Density guidelines go well beyond what is currently being achieved. Suggest 30-35 dwellings per hectare across the County with densities for particular sites a matter for local plans.
6. Density guidelines are inflexible, unrealistic and do not take account of the character of the local area.
7. 50 dwellings per hectare goes beyond PPG3 requirement of 30.
8. Density too low in City Centre. Add caveat that within 500m of travel/transport interchanges the priority will be to develop sites at the highest density possible (up to 300 dwellings per hectare in the City Centre)
9. Further clarification as to what constitutes a local centre or other centre well-served by public transport should be provided in the Explanatory Memorandum.
10. Density of 30 dwellings per hectare in rural locations will be used to justify the redevelopment of garden land.

Two Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The EIP Panel cautioned against the use of flexibility allowances. Some sites may exceptionally be developed at lower densities than proposed in the policy, but other sites coming forward at higher densities will be expected to compensate for this.
2. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended that the threshold should be expressed as 0.3 ha rather than 10 dwellings to avoid the risk of schemes being put forward which are just below the threshold.
3. Not accepted. The word “surpass” is not necessary as the policy refers to minimum densities but requires development to be at as high a density as possible.
4. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended this part of the policy. It is considered appropriate and in accordance with government guidance to specify higher density development in locations with good public transport accessibility.
5. Not accepted. The proposed densities may go beyond what is currently being

achieved, but is intended to encourage development at as higher density as possible. It is not accepted that there should be a standard density across the plan area, as densities should be higher in locations with better public transport accessibility, as recommended in PPG3.

6. Not accepted. Criteria (a) – (d) of the policy are intended to ensure that densities are realistic and take account of the local context.
7. Not accepted. PPG3 recommends densities between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare.
8. Not accepted. The policy requires that development should be at as high a density as possible. The figure of 50 dwellings per hectare for the City Centre is a minimum figure.
9. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
10. Not accepted. The recommended minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare in rural locations does not imply that garden land will be developed. The selection of sites for development is a matter for other policies of the Plan and for local plans. By requiring sites to be developed at as higher density as possible, the policy could reduce the potential need for garden land to be developed.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Carlton Parish Council, Cawrey Ltd., Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd., Community and Regional Planning Services, Harborough District Council, House Builders Federation, Miller Homes (East Midlands), Soar Valley Protection Society.

Mr A Brooks

Policy No.

Employment Policy 2: Strategic Employment Sites

Summary of Issues

1. Objection to the retention of the table in the policy (against the EIP Panel's recommendations) referring to the minimum land take for Strategic Employment Sites within each District, within the Central Leicestershire Policy Area and within two time phases.
2. Changes to the table called for, deletion of 25 hectare Blaby allocation, 5 hectares in Harborough to be brought forward to the first time phase and an additional 20 hectares in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area of Hinckley and Bosworth.
3. Objection to the retention of a reference to two Strategic Employment Sites within Charnwood.
4. Suggested changes to the Strategic Employment Sites definition; include B1 uses, specify appropriate locations for B8 and detail rail connection opportunities and employment densities.

One Representation of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The table is necessary to ensure the provision of strategic sites in sustainable locations. This is supported by the subsequent findings of the Quality Employment Lands study, which identified particular employment land shortages in the Three Cities Leicester Sub-area over the next 10 years.
2. Not accepted. These Strategic Employment Sites allocations in the table have not been modified. The EIP Panel endorsed the scale and distribution of employment land in the policy. The Strategic Employment Sites allocations address the identified shortfall in the policy.
3. Not accepted. The Strategic Employment Sites requirements in all the other districts are contained either within the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA) or outside it. Charnwood is the only district where there is an identified need for an Strategic Employment Sites in the CLPA and for one outside it, specifically close to Loughborough. The reference to two Strategic Employment Sites is therefore necessary to ensure provision within these two distinct locations.
4. Not accepted. B1 uses "as appropriate" are included within the Strategic Employment Sites definition. Acceptable locations for B1 offices and B8 uses (including rail connections) are set out in Employment Policy 3 and Employment Policy 8. Directing different B Class uses to appropriate locations will control employment densities

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Gazeley Properties Ltd., Andrew Granger & Co., Cawrey

Ltd., Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Developments, Wheatcroft and Son Ltd., Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, Borough of Charnwood

Mr A. Brooks

Policy No.

Employment Policy 4: Science and Technology Parks

Summary of Issues

No representations

Reasoned Response

None

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

None

Policy No.

Employment Policy 5: Expansion and Relocation of Existing Employment Sites

Summary of Issues

No representations

Reasoned Response

None

Proposed Policy Action

No change to the Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

None

<u>Policy No.</u> Employment Policy 6: Review and Protection of Employment Land and Buildings
<u>Summary of Issues</u> 1. There is a drafting error. Criterion b) should read “no longer suitable” rather than “unfit” Four Representations of Support
<u>Reasoned Response</u> 1. Accepted. This was an editing error.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> Amend criterion b) to read “the land and buildings are unfit <i>no longer suitable</i> for employment purposes”.
<u>List of Respondents</u> GOEM, Gazeley Properties Ltd., NW Leics. District Council, Persimmon Homes (Midlands) Ltd., Revelan Group, Harborough District Council Mr A Brooks

<u>Policy No.</u> Employment Policy 7: Safeguarding High Quality Employment Sites
<u>Summary of Issues</u> One Representation of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Wings

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Employment Policy 8: Storage and Distribution</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>1. The term “Principal Road Network” is vague. (Raised also in connection with Employment Policy 11: Hazardous Installations)</p> <p>2. The policy is not sustainable</p> <p>3. The policy is too restrictive</p> <p>Two Representations of Support</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>1. Not accepted. It is not appropriate to define Principal Road Network within the policy, however this will be defined in the Glossary, Appendix 1.</p> <p>2. Not accepted. The policy is in line with national and regional guidance.</p> <p>3. Not accepted. The policy is in line with national and regional guidance.</p>
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>GOEM, G L Hearn, Gazeley Properties Ltd, Railtrack PLC.</p> <p>Mr A Brooks.</p>

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Employment Policy 9: Employment in Rural Settlements</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>Five Representations of Support.</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>None</p>
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>Carlton Parish Council, Cawrey Ltd., Friends of Ratby Action Group, Northamptonshire County Council, Wheatcroft & Son Ltd.</p>

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Employment Policy 10: Provision of a sub-Regional Exhibition and Conference Centre</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>No representations</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>None</p>
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No changes to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>None</p>

Policy No.

Employment Policy 11: Hazardous Installations

Summary of Issues

1. The term “Principle Road Network” is vague. It is not clear whether it refers to the “Primary Route Network”, which includes trunk and strategic local authority roads or to “Principal Roads”, which are the major local authority roads.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. It is not appropriate to define Principal Road Network within the policy, however this will be defined in the Glossary, Appendix 1.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Government Office for the East Midlands.

<u>Policy No.</u> Central Areas and Shopping 2: Belgrave Road
<u>Summary of Issues</u> No representations
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> None

<u>Policy No.</u> Central Areas and Shopping 3: Retail Development and Community Facilities to Serve Local Need
<u>Summary of Issues</u> 17.The planning system is not designed to protect existing shops, services and facilities yet this policy seeks to sustain or enhance local centres to meet people's day-to-day needs, to reducing the need to travel.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> 17.Not accepted. The policy should not be read as an attempt to protect individual shops. It is a legitimate policy objective to secure the vitality and viability of centres which may involve restriction of changes of use in certain circumstances. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> GOEM

Policy No.

Central Areas and Shopping 4: Out-of-centre retailing

Summary of Issues

1. Policy presumption against out-of-centre retail development is not supported by PPG6 or the planning system in general.
2. Criterion (b) does not reflect the sequential approach to site selection set out in paragraph 1.11 of PPG6.
3. It is not clear why Shepshed is considered to be a "Main Town" for the purposes of Strategy Policy 3A, but its centre is not considered to be a preferred location for new retail or leisure development.
4. In criterion (c) the combined consideration of whether a proposed out-of-centre retail development would adversely affect the vitality and viability of nearby town centres and the presumption against retail development of land allocated for other uses is confusing. Criterion (d) covers the issue of the impact on the vitality and viability and private investment in nearby town centres and would therefore appear to duplicate criterion (c).
5. Criterion (c) conflicts with Employment Policy 6.
6. Explanatory Memorandum, paragraphs 8.3 & 8.16, is out of date in relation to definition of warehouse clubs.
7. In advance of the retail assessment, the Proposed Modifications provide no assessment of retail need or justification that town centres in sequentially preferred locations have sufficient capacity therefore the statement that there is no requirement for a new regional or sub-regional shopping centre cannot be justified.
8. The policy does not reflect RPG8 Policy 17 and supporting text:
 - (a) the qualification that out-of-centre facilities should be located to encourage sustainable development;
 - (b) pressure to redefine out-of-centre facilities as town or district centre facilities in development plans is unlikely to be justified (rather than resisted).

Four Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. Out-of-centre retail developments will be subject to the key tests in Section 4 of PPG6 as clarified by Ministerial statement in 1999. The Proposed Modification to Strategy Policy 2 stresses the importance of strategic considerations.
2. Not accepted. The policy is worded in a way that is consistent with Strategy Policy 3, as recommended by the EIP Panel.
3. Not accepted. Charnwood Local Plan treats Shepshed as a district centre for shopping and leisure purposes. Changes to Shepshed's position in the hierarchy would be premature pending completion of work at the regional level.
4. Not accepted. The wording of criterion c) does not refer to vitality and viability of centres but to prejudicing sites allocated to 'retail or leisure and

entertainment' (the subject of the policy) and to other development.

5. Not accepted. There is no conflict with Employment Policy 6. The policy states that the development of other sites should not be prejudiced and Employment Policy 6 states that key employment sites will be safeguarded from other development proposals. Employment Policy 6 then sets out the criteria when other (non-key) employment sites might be released for development for other purposes. Employment Policy 6 does not suggest that a sequential approach for retail and leisure development can be circumvented.
6. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
7. Not accepted. The need for further development is being addressed through the revision of the Central Leicestershire Retail Strategy. A sequential approach to site selection should be followed in line with PPG6 'Town Centres and Retail Developments' if such a need is identified. The Retail Assessment for Leicester (1998) also provides an indication of capacity for new retail development on the edge of the Leicester's Central Shopping Core and the LRC Masterplan Strategic Framework and subsequent Supplementary Planning Guidance will do the same. A capacity study has been commissioned by the Planning Forum of the EMRLGA to address these issues. When completed it would provide a regional context for development in town centres. The evidence of retail need and justification that town centres in sequentially preferred locations have sufficient capacity will need to be taken into account in subsequent reviews of strategic guidance.
8. Not accepted. Such matters should, more appropriately, be covered in the Explanatory Memorandum. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Glenfield Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, B & Q plc, GOEM, Wm Morrisons Supermarkets, Costco Wholesale, Blaby District Council, David Cooper & Co, Harborough District Council, Borough of Charnwood, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Leisure Policy 2: Leisure & Tourism Development

Summary of Issues

18. With regard to provision for large-scale spectator facilities in central Leicestershire, it is recommended that discussion with the Councils takes place before proposals are developed.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as no modification was proposed for this policy, however the comment has been noted.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Highways Agency

Policy No.

Leisure Policy 3: Protection of Recreation Land and Buildings

Summary of Issues

1. An interpretation of the word “required” needs to be provided in the Explanatory Memorandum.

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Carlton Parish Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council
Sally Smart

<u>Policy No.</u> Leisure Policy 4: Public Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Five Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Carlton Parish Council, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Glenfield Parish Council. Harborough District Council Sally Smart

<u>Policy No.</u> Leisure Policy 6: Caravan and Camping Sites
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Three Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council Sally Smart