

Rep ID	Respondent ID	MM Number	Site Number	Sustainable Habitats Policies Representation Summary
R001	P001	MM25	261	In the general area of fields where houses will be built, archaeological finds have recently come to light. Please explain how the identities and landscape setting of distinct settlements can be mitigated when the intention is to build on former green wedge land, thus effectively joining these areas together with a built environment. Whilst there are proposals to retain of some natural green spaces, hedgerows and trees within the development, it is the extent of the open space between settlements which is equally important to the integrity of individual communities and which most concerns the residents of Thurcaston. This applies to SL03 and SL04 and is central to policy OSSR01. "At least 670 homes" This statement requires clarification as to the actual number of houses proposed, for an informed comment to be made. Pleased to see that importance of areas of separation between Thurcaston and Leicester have been recognised. Statements need further clarity in how much separation is proposed for both SL04 and SL03. The current maps indicate that this 'separation' is in some cases, just the width of a hedgerow which is clearly insufficient to retain the integrity of Thurcaston village. As it stands, the proposed SL04 development backs directly onto some existing properties in Thurcaston along Rectory Lane, which contravenes Policy OSSR01.
R002	P002	MM21		Removal of 'in total' suggests license for much larger number of homes with no restrictions. If the homes are to go ahead, there should be clarity from the outset on the actual number for the modifications to be commented on in a properly informed manner. Why has "retention of on-site pond" been deleted? Concern for reduction in biodiversity in proposed eradication of aquatic and marginal wildlife and valuable feature for resident and visiting birds, animals and insects. There are very few natural ponds in this area and efforts should be made to conserve, not destroy them. Contradicts statement below which says: 'seek to retain on-site waterbodies and protect them from any contamination' Pleased to see that importance of areas of separation between Thurcaston and Leicester have been recognised. Statements need further clarity in how much separation is proposed for both SL04 and SL03. The current maps indicate that this 'separation' is in some cases, just the width of a hedgerow which is clearly insufficient to retain the integrity of Thurcaston village. As it stands, the proposed SL04 development backs directly onto some existing properties in Thurcaston along Rectory Lane, which contravenes Policy OSSR01. "minimise impacts on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site"; How will this be achieved? "seek to retain on-site waterbodies and protect them from any contamination." Totally agree, but the statement above 'Retention of the on-site pond', which has been deleted as part of these amendments would appear to contradict this. Pleased to see that the heritage and archaeology of Thurcaston is being taken into account in this statement
R003	P002	MM25		When will this 'masterplan' become available? It is unrealistic to expect informed comment on these modifications without having this critical component of the Strategic Plan in place. "Retention of some green space on site will reduce the need for trips to European sites for recreational purposes." Where is the evidence to suggest that the token amount of green space referred to in developing SL04 will reduce visits to the European Sites of the River Mease, Ensor Pool and Rutland Water? This would appear to be a subjective statement and suggest that it is removed, unless it can be justified objectively.
R004	P002		42	The plan needs to allocate land for new burial spaces whilst ensuring that faith based burial needs are respected. The amount of burial space, particularly for some faiths, is nearing capacity. LCC should engage with faith communities to ensure equitable and culturally sensitive solutions. The Local Plan must ensure that future developments include provisions for cemetery expansion to meet the needs of a growing and diverse population. Should be considered based on input from local communities and those it affects.
R005	P003			Object to the inclusion of site 335 as a housing allocation and to the inclusion of text in the Main Modifications for the change of use of the remaining playing field to open space in an educational use. These developments would fail to accord with any of the exemption criteria in Paragraph 104 of the NPPF or in emerging Policy OSSR04.
R006	P004	MM38	335	Object to the inclusion of site 559 as a housing allocation and to the inclusion of text in the Main Modifications for the development on the remaining playing field for a highway scheme. These developments would fail to accord with any of the exemption criteria in Paragraph 104 of the NPPF or in emerging Policy OSSR04.
R007	P004	MM38	559	Object to the inclusion of site 961 as a housing allocation and to the inclusion of text in the Main Modifications for the remaining playing field to be used for informal open space. These developments would fail to accord with any of the exemption criteria in Paragraph 104 of the NPPF or in emerging Policy OSSR04.
R008	P004	MM38	961	MM17 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R009	P005	MM17		MM23 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R010	P005	MM23		MM24 (page 43) doesn't include a requirement for a Heritage Appraisal within the list set out. This would be at odds with other main modifications proposed e.g. MM25. Suggested changes to MM: Include the requirement for a Heritage Assessment within the list set out in MM24.
R011	P005	MM24		MM25 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R012	P005	MM25		MM38 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R013	P005	MM38		MM111 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R014	P005	MM111		MM112 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R015	P005	MM112		MM119 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R016	P005	MM119		MM181 is Sound and Legally Compliant
R017	P005	MM181		surrounding lower density neighbourhoods, vehicle parking would be difficult, congested and unsafe at this density. The proposed density of dwellings for the land to be developed should not exceed 3 or 4. Changes to MMs suggested
R018	P006	MM38	559	Welcome that the modifications include strengthening of the environmental content of the plan in a number of policies particularly with regards to the provision of green infrastructure.
R019	P007			Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety and Traffic Volume, Inadequate Parking Infrastructure, Loss of Vital Green Space, Impact on Community Life and Wellbeing, Flood Risk and Inadequate Drainage, Air Quality and Traffic Congestion, Environmental Impact, Threat to Biodiversity.
R020	P008	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety and Traffic Volume, Inadequate Parking Infrastructure, Loss of Vital Green Space, Impact on Community Life and Wellbeing, Flood Risk and Inadequate Drainage, Air Quality and Traffic Congestion, Environmental Impact, Threat to Biodiversity.
R021	P009	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R022	P010	MM38	481	Objects to the development of urban green spaces in Leicester with concerns of wellbeing impacts, lack of open space access for children, impacts to wildlife and open space providing climate change mitigation.
R023	P011	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety and Traffic Volume, Inadequate Parking Infrastructure, Loss of Vital Green Space, Impact on Community Life and Wellbeing, Flood Risk and Inadequate Drainage, Air Quality and Traffic Congestion, Environmental Impact, Threat to Biodiversity.
R024	P012	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R025	P013	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R026	P014	MM38	481	Satisfied with the proposed modifications overall document and policies. Welcome continued engagement to support the Local Plan update.
R027	P015			Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R028	P016	MM38	481	The Trust does not have any comments to make on this consultation.
R029	P017			modification.
R030	P018	MM26		Changes to MM suggested

				MM27 requires additional clarification to be considered sound. It is unclear how the supporting text regarding the mitigation of the loss of the green wedge should be used to inform the proposals for the site or the decision making.
R031	P018	MM27		In response to the modifications to Draft Policy SL05 (MM29) we have also raised concern that the potential for overlap has not been recognised between the requirement for approximately 1.8 ha of new informal open space, parks & gardens and approximately 2 ha of existing natural green space, including priority trees, hedgerows and woodland. Changes to the modification wording suggested.
R032	P018	MM28		MM28 is considered unnecessary and contrary to NPPF paragraph 16(f). This list repeats bullet points from paragraph 4.32. The standard validation requirements should be removed as they do not serve a clear purpose in accordance with NPPF paragraph 16(f). Changes to MM suggested <u>Housing</u> - On reflection it is considered that in attempting to create additional flexibility by including 'at least' in the policy wording, the amendment in itself creates a restriction on anything less than 336 dwellings, even if this was 335 homes. In light of the other policy changes, it is suggested that this is amended further to 'approximately' or 'around' 336 homes. <u>Facilities and Services</u> - This new bullet point is prefixed with 'The development will provide:' and it is therefore not clear whether there is a new requirement for on-site facilities to be provided or whether this provision is through the anticipated off-site contributions via section 106 agreements. The evidence for such community facilities has not been shared and the provision for on-site facilities will significantly affect the land budget for uses already set out in the policy and illustrated in the proposed masterplan that is proposed to be included alongside the text of the policy. Any contributions towards community facilities should however be in the form of s106 developer contributions and should pass the Community Infrastructure Regulations by being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning term, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <u>Open Space / Green and Blue Infrastructure</u> - It is not clear what the relationship is between these two requirements for 'open space' and 'green and blue infrastructure'. The element of informal open space requirement could also contribute towards the retention of natural green space. It is suggested that the policy wording is clarified. With regard to 'maintaining important elements of the former Green Wedge', this is not a realistic, effective or justified objective of the policy given the context of the proposal to allocate the site for housing. <u>Transport Infrastructure</u> - As written, the wording 'all parts of the site are accessible by roads cycling and walking routes and connected to existing routes and surrounding areas, including the wider allocation in Blaby and Charnwood' is imprecise, and it is unclear the policy is trying to secure. Similarly, the wording in relation to bus provision is imprecise. <u>Heritage Mitigations</u> - The paragraph under this heading which commences with 'Meet the requirements of Policy HE01...' sits on its own and does not make sense without and introductory text needed to precede the criterion. Also, Policy SL05 and Policy HE01, when applied together, create an incoherent policy framework. In order to develop site SL05 with the amount of development envisioned within the Policy there will be some harm to heritage assets. <u>Indicative Diagram</u> - The reference to the 'indicative diagram' in the policy is supported, it is essential that there is flexibility in relation to the layout through the design iteration process that is underway.
R033	P018	MM29		
R034	P018	MM40		We support the amendment for a site by site approach for M4(3)a and M4(3)b planning application. Changes to MM suggested
R035	P018	MM42		It is important to point out that there will be circumstances whereby internal space standards are not appropriate to a particular development or are not viable or technically feasible. There should be this flexibility in how this policy requirement is applied to ensure that needed and appropriate development can come forward. Changes to MM suggested
R036	P018	MM47		
R037	P019	MM38		Having revisited the representations that Officers submitted on behalf of the Council to your Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan in February 2023, it is apparent that all matters raised for Site 715: Land North of Gartree Road, Site 559: Judge Meadow Community College Open Space, and, Site 961: Welford Road Playing Fields, After 614 Welford Road have been satisfactorily addressed in the Main Modifications Document. Therefore, the Council has no further comments to make with regards to these matters and supports the proposed modifications as drafted.
R038	P020	MM38	481	Objects to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens. Development would: Damage the character of the neighbourhood, Negatively impact mental and physical health, Increase traffic and congestion, Harm local wildlife.
R039	P021	MM38	481	Objects to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens. Development would: Damage the character of the neighbourhood, Negatively impact mental and physical health, Increase traffic and congestion, Harm local wildlife.
R040	P022	MM38	481	on this small but significant green space, threatens safety and well being on a number of levels. These plans appear to contradict Leicester City Council's elsewhere stated social and environmental objectives.
R041	P023			been included in the Main Modifications schedule. We note that we requested an update to the list of signatories to the Leicester & Leicestershire SoCG on Housing and Employment Need (June 2022) to include CBC, which has now been amended. However, it is understood that both Harborough DC and Hinckley & Bosworth BC have now signed the SoCG, and consideration could be given to adding these for completeness.
R042	P024	MM5		CEG supports the modification to paragraph 4.1 on page 30 which clarifies the role of Diagram 2 (Growth in the Leicester Urban Area)
R043	P024	MM9		boundary.
R044	P024	MM11		CEG welcomes the wording change to the first paragraph on Page 37, Policy SL01, which clarifies the extent of the policy application.
R045	P024	MM149		CEG supports the proposed modification to Diagram 17 (Open Space Network, Leicester Urban Area) to clarify the location and extent of Green Wedges and Open Space relative to the City boundary.
R046	P024	MM150		CEG welcomes the proposed modification to the Green Wedge policy supporting text (page 208, paragraph 14.11) which recognises the role of transport corridor within Green Wedges in supporting improved connectivity and promoting active and sustainable travel choices.
R047	P024	MM151		CEG supports the proposed modification Policy OSSR01 (Green Wedge policy) on page 209 to support the delivery of local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Wedge location.
R048	P024	MM169		CEG welcomes the proposed modification to Diagram 18 (The Spatial Transport Strategy) on Page 234 to include Thorpebury on the Spatial Transport Strategy diagram.
R049	P025	MM38	629	Site no 629 (Netherhall Road Open Space) is not sound as it fails to meet the area's objectively assessed needs. This development results in a loss of open space. Although there is a surplus of open space in the Leicester NE area, there is a deficit of accessible parks and open space within Netherhall (i.e. within distances per para 5.8 of LCC OSSRS 2017 that is the Local Plans stated benchmark for the provision of this need). MM38 should be amended to retain site 629 as open space. The immediate area surrounding site 629 has poor access to open space (i.e. contrary to OSSR02 point a)). There is no additional provision as part of this development, and there would be local loss resulting from other proposed developments (i.e. contrary to OSSR point c)). The development of plots 577, 631 and 648 would generate a requirement for additional accessible open space. It is not possible to develop any part of this site without creating a loss of access to open space for residents to both the north or south of the site. Any development of the site would lead to reduced visibility of the walkway running through it, meaning some people would feel unable to use it. Land to the east of Hamilton Lane (in Harborough District Council area) is earmarked for housing development as part of the Scraftoft North Strategic Development Area (application 19/00700/OUT). This will mean that much of the green space to the east of Netherhall is likely to be developed placing further pressure on green space for residents of this area. Netherhall Road Open Space meets many of the Council's criteria for designation as a park. There are benefits to designating it as a park as it could help ensure the site would not be developed, and it would help meet the Council's aims for accessibility to open space (accessibility criteria are that a park should be located within a 300m distance while an open space should be located within a 100m distance). Site 629 should be removed as a proposed allocation and it should be re-designated from an open space to a park. Changes to MM suggested
R050	P025	MM38	577	Add requirement for developer contributions for recreational spaces for site 577 to be put toward enhancing facilities of Netherhall Road Open Space, to help meet the objectives of local plan point 14.14(c) and mitigate the loss of amenity space resulting from these developments for the residents of Netherhall. Changes to MM suggested
R051	P025	MM38	631	Add requirement for developer contributions for recreational spaces for site 631 to be put toward enhancing facilities of Netherhall Road Open Space, to help meet the objectives of local plan point 14.14(c) and mitigate the loss of amenity space resulting from these developments for the residents of Netherhall. Changes to MM suggested
R052	P025	MM38	648	Add requirement for developer contributions for recreational spaces for site 648 to be put toward enhancing facilities of Netherhall Road Open Space, to help meet the objectives of local plan point 14.14(c) and mitigate the loss of amenity space resulting from these developments for the residents of Netherhall. Changes to MM suggested

R053	P026	MM25	261	Too many houses proposed. There would cease to exist a boundary between Leicester and Thurstaston. Local roads would not be able to cope with the increased traffic volumes. The development would be overbearing on the setting of Thurstaston. There are no provisions for local services and existing services are already at capacity. No provision of a park, green space, playground community centre or other amenities. Grade 3 agricultural land would be lost. A lot of wildlife would be displaced, and woodland would be lost. Any public transport provided would impact local roads which cannot cope with an increase in traffic. Noise pollution from the A46 would make any houses built undesirable. The proposed developments are contrary to planning policies and there are more appropriate sites with better access to facilities and amenities compared to the proposed development.
R054	P027	MM21	262	the Ashton Green development currently under construction in relation to the loss of green space, biodiversity loss, increase in flood risk, and impact on local infrastructure. The development would be car reliant due to lack of public transport in the area. The Ashton Green development currently under construction should be fully built out before this site is allocated for development. The allocation is contrary to current Development Plan Document policies including the protection of green wedges and safeguarding of green spaces. The site is assessed as RED in the Sustainability Appraisal.
R055	P028	MM32		<p>The main modifications fall short on soundness due to reasons listed below. These are from the summary of technical report: Elevated contaminant concentrations have been identified which were indicated to represent a risk to controlled waters. The report concluded that the visual receptors with an average sensitivity of Medium/High. The receptors with higher sensitivity are those located within the site as they are engaged primarily with their surroundings. With the layout as prescribed, it will completely eliminate the usability of remaining green spaces for public use as they will be surrounded by industrial units. No family or individual looking for safe space, peace and tranquillity of an open public green space would be able to use it. The design itself defeats the primary objective of retaining some parts of green spaces for public use. The unusually extra traffic of medium to heavy vehicles on to the part and on roads leading up to them will become a bane for the residents living along that stretch as well as for any residual park users if at all. The following key ecological constraints were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the site is designated as a Biodiversity Enhancement Site in the Local Plan. • Most of the site is designated as Green Space in the Local Plan. • The site supports the following Priority Habitats: lowland mixed deciduous woodland; mature trees; hedgerows; and a pond. • The large size of the site and diversity of habitats mean that it is likely to be of particular ecological importance. <p>The site also has potential to support other protected species and species of conservation concern. Council's mere acceptance to have mitigation proposals fall too short of meeting such serious loss to the habitat and biodiversity.</p> <p>The layout/design as prescribed must be changed now to make any future industrial development to become natural extension which should be adjacent/contiguous to the existing industrial units to the north/north-east of the park. This would ensure a separate/residual open green space to the southwest/south of the park. The 12 Gypsy/Travellers pitches should be disregarded as there is no real ask or need as has been confirmed before. The layout change could mean reducing the earmarked 7.14 hectare to around 5.14 hectare of development. This will be the right balance between larger community interests and development needs.</p>
R056	P029	MM1		Para 1.3 refers to the purpose of the Local Plan being 'to provide the overall strategic and spatial vision for the future of the Leicester Urban Area'. For clarity it would be useful for that terminology to be included on Diagram 1 (i.e. Leicester City Administrative Boundary (The Leicester Urban Area)) or made clear at the end of para 1.3 ...Leicester Urban Area (i.e. area within the Leicester City Administrative Boundary).
R057	P029	MM3		HDC welcomes the introduction of the new objective relating to the use of Brownfield sites to deliver a significant part of the new housing and employment requirement.
R058	P029	MM7		It is not clear why the new paragraph inserted after paragraph 4.14 refers to working collaboratively with Charnwood Borough Council only. The paragraph should recognise that all the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities are working together on seeking agreement on the accommodation of the Strategic Warehousing requirement. Also, it is suggested that reference to 'sites' in the final sentence should be replaced by either 'Areas of Opportunity' or 'locations'.
R059	P029	MM196		Changes to MM suggested
R060	P029	MI16		The new 'Plan Review' policy, committing to the commencement of an immediate review upon adoption of the Local Plan, is welcomed.
R061	P030	MM38	190	Para. 4.6 (re: Signatories to the Statement of Common Ground). Harborough District Council (and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council) should now be in the list of those authorities having agreed the 2022 SoCG.
R062	P030	MM38	219	Object to the allocation and permission given as with the major conditions relating to flood risk and land contamination. Area is prone to major flood risk, with two recent flood events. We and the residents do not believe any amount of action to mitigate the flood risk would alleviate any future flooding causing serious problems to the existing houses on Lanesborough Road and the new dwellings. Regarding the contamination of the site, which is near a petrol station, the concerns still remain that not enough will be done to alleviate this problem. Request has been made to see copies of flood and contamination reports and what will be taken to mitigate this, but has not been received.
R063	P031			The Ward Councillors of Rushey Mead and the residents of Wyvern Avenue and Rosedale Avenue are writing to request that this site be removed from the plan mainly because of access issues. Under very normal circumstances, the traffic on Catherine Street that feeds into Wyvern Avenue and Gleneagles Avenue is quite high. Furthermore, there are two more schools on Gleneagles Avenue so at peak times there is a serious traffic jam with tailbacks.
R064	P007		Yes	<p>Furthermore, the Wyvern Avenue that leads to the Wyvern School gates and the Rushey Fields park is a narrow road with cars parked on both sides.</p> <p>Even at best of times, this small narrow road is full of cars with serious problems at school peak up and drop times.</p> <p>In addition, no consideration is given to the fact that this proposed access road will be next to the Cricket and football pitches which are heavily used most of the times. A road in such locations would cause serious health and safety related issues not to mention it will take away valuable land donated by someone for recreation purposes.</p> <p>It is our belief that the new dwellings at this site would considerably increase number of cars using Wyvern Avenue, causing concerns to the Rushey Fields park Users, Children using the school gates with possibly a blind spot (the road will need to curve at almost 90 degrees near the gates) and the residents. It will also create extra pressure on Gleneagles Avenue and Catherine Street.</p> <p>No known new infrastructure interactions within the area, but electricity demand is expected to rise. To meet with decarbonisation of energy infrastructure, there will be a shift to greener energy sources and enhancement of existing power lines. National grid request to stay informed of any plans and reviews that may affect the transmission network.</p> <p>Natural England has reviewed the Habitat Regulations Assessment for the Main Modifications for the Leicester City Local Plan. We can confirm that the modifications proposed have not changed the original HRA's conclusion that the Plan's policies either alone, or in combination with other plans, are unlikely to have a detrimental effect on the integrity of European sites. We therefore agree with your authority that an Appropriate Assessment would not be required.</p>
R065	P032	MM195		Welcome the new policy on monitoring but would request that the Method/Action that would occur if monitoring showed under-delivery of housing, should be more than just a review of the Plan. There are other actions that the Council could seek to take to address under-delivery including for example working with developers, seeking external funding, flexibility in policy asks to support viability and deliverability and permitting additional planning permissions.
R066	P032	MM162		<p>HBF suggest that these milestones set out in the Local Development Scheme Feb 2025 should be included within the Monitoring Policy and explicit reference should be made to the Plan being out of date, if the new Local Plan is not prepared in line with the timeframe set out.</p> <p>Changes to MM suggested</p> <p>This section heading should be called 'Biodiversity Net Gain'. Particular care is needed to avoid any confusion between the well established mitigation hierarchy and the new BNG hierarchy. This could have impact on delivery of the Plan.</p> <p>HBF suggest it would then be helpful to explain the introduction of Biodiversity Net Gain and the implementation dates for larger and smaller sites. Working of the Plan not clear that BNG is non-negotiable</p> <p>Para 15.10 suggests the Council I looking to deliver higher than 10% and proposals doing so will be supported. This does not clearly explain that the 10% is required, and other policies may need to be compromised to secure delivery of a schemes where 10% BNG impacts on viability.</p> <p>HBF would also question the Council's interpretation of the interface between the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the BNG hierarchy. It is perfectly legitimate for developers to purchase off-site units and statutory credits if required to deliver their BNG as long as they have explored other options first. Delivering BNG further from the development site is already penalised by the metric calculations and this should not be caveated further by Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Changes to MM suggested</p> <p>Policy title should be renamed to 'Biodiversity Net Gain'</p>
R067	P032	MM163		This policy does not make the distinction between the mitigation hierarchy and the BNG delivery hierarchy clear enough.
R068	P032	MM201		Changes to MM suggested

				<p>EXAM 103 does not provide the Inspectors with a direct answer to action 285, rather it evades a direct and straightforward question. The Inspectors clearly asked for some precision on the procedure for the review of green wedge underpinning the plan at examination. The Council have not provided any new detail regarding the procedure they have taken for the review of the Evington Green Wedge in relation to this plan. EXAM 103 only provides a historical account of previous local plan covering the period 1996-2016. This does not reflect the current circumstances.</p> <p>The approach to the assessment of the Green Wedge and the allocation of housing sites interacting with this designation is unsound and liable to further challenge.</p> <p>As part of modification MI100 'Diagram 17' it said that this "now shows local plan revisions to green wedges". We cannot see this diagram as part of the published consultation documents so we have not been able to consider it.</p> <p>A draft Local Development Scheme should be published alongside these modifications and this should set out the role of a Green Wedge review and how it will inform the immediate review of the Local Plan upon its adoption.</p> <p>Suggests amendments to the wording of MM196 "New Policy:Plan Review." Changes to MM suggested</p>
R069	P033	MM196		
R070	P034	MM21		Suggests that the Policy make reference to the adjacent allocation within Charnwood Borough, namely with regards to master planning matters around Green and Blue Infrastructure, as well as vehicular and pedestrian links between the Zones in Leicester City and Charnwood Borough. Changes to MM suggested
R071	P035		Yes	Considers HRA to be sound and legally compliant
R072	P036			The Environment Agency considers the Main Modifications to be sound and legally compliant.
R073	P037	MM38	715	Objects to allocation of the site due to: site forms part of established green wedge, the proposal would establish precedent for similar kind of development along Gartree Road which could destroy the green wedge.
R074	P038	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R075	P039	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R076	P040	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R077	P041	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R078	P042	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R079	P043	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R080	P044	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
R081	P045	MM38	481	Objecting to the development of Brent Knowle Gardens due to the following concerns: Road Safety Concerns, Parking, Access to Green Space, Quality of Life for Existing Residents, Flood Risk and Drainage, Congestion and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Wildlife.
				<p>This area is a valuable natural green space for the local community. The HRA states that around 19 ha of it will remain when the development has been completed, but given its importance to the local community as an area of natural green space, no development should take place on the site at all. Table 3.3 of the Sustainability Appraisal shows that there will be a strongly negative impact on biodiversity in relation to the proposals to develop on Strategic Site SL02 (the former Western Park Golf Course). Not enough thought has been given to this at all, and one of the main reasons why SL02 is so valuable to the local community is because of its biodiversity. The site is not disused, it is a valuable green space that provides local people with an opportunity to enjoy being out in nature, to exercise and to support their mental health. It provides a green lung for the surrounding areas, which is especially important given that there is a motorway and a busy A road nearby. There is already a significant amount of traffic in the area, and this will only worsen if the development goes ahead. To make things even worse, there will be the loss of a green lung at the same time. This will mean that air quality for local residents will be extremely poor. The site acts as a natural sponge, soaking up rainwater. Not enough thought has been given to the potential increase in the amount of flooding in the local area if the development goes ahead. It is also important to remember that, because of climate change, there is highly likely to be an increase in the amount of rainfall over the coming years and decades. The best way to minimise the risk of flooding in the surrounding area is to not build on the site at all and to plant more trees on the site. More trees will soak up even more of the rainwater. The proposals to develop on the land need to be scrapped, and the area should be rewilded and become a nature reserve. Western Golf Course is an important and essential green space for the mental and physical health of residents. The green space needs to be retained.</p>
R082	P046	MM17	702	
R083	P047	MM17	702	
R084	P048	MM32	464	Contamination concerns, and loss of public park.
R085	P049	MM32	464	There are other areas set aside for industrial units. There has been no proper assessment of traffic or wildlife impacts. The Gypsy and Traveller Transit site is unnecessary as there have been no transient travellers for a number of years. A proper assessment of the traffic impacts, mental health impacts, crime and anti social behaviour impacts and wildlife impacts is required.
R086	P050	MM32	464	Natural England have still not been consulted. The MMs are unsound due to the following reasons: Limited access to A46 causing increased traffic volumes and air pollution. Concern over water contamination. Concerns over ground gas contamination. The layout of the site doesn't allow for wildlife to continue as before, there are rare nesting bats and 20 year old badger sets that will be disturbed by construction and industrial operations. Residents will loose a vital green space. Not a sensible site to develop as the cost of development with gasses and toxic waste and the loss of an important eco diverse space outweighs the need for more industrial units. Also fails to listen to the views of the residents of Beaumont Leyes. Remove Beaumont Park as an allocation.
R087	P051	MM17	702	Proposed development is not justified nor consistent with national policy, it is contrary to NPPF paragraph 147. The development of the site makes mitigation of the four function of a green wedge almost impossible. There is no evidence that alternative uses have been explored. Development will lead to a deterioration in local air quality. The Local Plan doesn't demonstrate evidence to show that the development is designed to deliver a biodiversity net gain or that the local wildlife site can be protected, preserved and enhanced.
				<p>The former wording of para a) gave quite a clear understanding of what needs to be achieved. It outlined some of the areas that disabled people feel don't work currently - e.g. the separation (the entrance round the back only opened on request for example!) or the elements of independent use and dignity. The proposed change is much more vague and hard to evaluate. Even subtle changes such as 'safe ...environments' rather than 'safe to use ... for everyone' diminish the clarity of the policy and give a different picture of inclusion in the mind. I cannot see 'excluding' applications being amended, refused or enforced based on that, nor developers understanding what they should aim for.</p> <p>Para b) is important but reflects only the Equality Act legislation which, while supposed to be pro-active can only be enforced by an individual affected. On its own it would not achieve inclusion in development. Therefore I feel the proposed amended wording of this policy will not deliver its aims and so will not be effective.</p> <p>On a minor point, due to the change in leading sentence of the policy, paras b) and c) are not now grammatically correct.</p> <p>The original para a) should be retained and the new wording, or parts of it, included as a separate paragraph -e.g. the wording about the lifetime of the development as frequently buildings become less accessible in future.</p>
R088	P052	MM79		