

# Public Document Pack



**Meeting**                    **Scrutiny Commission**

**Date/Time**                **Wednesday, 28 May 2003 at 2:30 pm**

**Location**                    **Sparkenhoe Committee Room, County Hall, Glenfield**

**Officer to contact** **Mr. M.I. Seedat (Tel: 0116 265 6037)**

**E-Mail**                        **mseedat@leics.gov.uk**

## Membership

Mr. N. J. Brown CC (Chairman)

Mr. B. Chapman AE CC	Mr. S.J. Galton CC
Mr. P.A. Hyde CC	Mr. R. Jenkins CC
Mr. M.T. Jones CC	Dr. M. O'Callaghan CC
Mr. P.C. Osborne CC	Mr. M.B. Page CC
Dr. D. Pollard CC	Prof. M.E. Preston CC
Lt.Col. P.A. Roffey DL CC	Mr. N.J. Rushton CC
Mrs. M.L. Sherwin CC	Mr. R.M. Wilson CC

## AGENDA

<u>Item</u>	<u>Report by</u>	<u>Marked</u>
1. Appointment of Deputy Chairman for the period ending with the date of the Annual Meeting of the Council in May 2004.		
2. Minutes of the meeting of the Commission held on 12 March, 2003 (previously circulated).		
3. Question Time.		
4. Questions asked by members under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).		
5. Any other items the Chairman has decided to take as urgent elsewhere on the agenda.		
6. Declarations of interest in respect of items on this agenda.		
7. Declarations of the Party Whip in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16.		
8. Presentation of Petitions under Standing Order 36.		

9. Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan Responses to consultation on the proposed modifications and timetable to adoption. Chief Executive A

10. North West Leicestershire Community Strategy. Chief Executive B

11. Date of Next Meeting.

The date of the Commission's next meeting will be Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup> June 2003 at 2.30pm.

12. Any other business the Chairman decides is urgent.



## SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 28<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2003

### LEICESTERSHIRE, LEICESTER AND RUTLAND STRUCTURE PLAN RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND TIMETABLE TO ADOPTION

#### REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

##### Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to seek the views of the Commission on the response of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications.

##### Background

2. Following the Examination in Public and the publication of the report of the Panel appointed by the Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions, Proposed Modifications were prepared and placed on deposit.
3. The responses of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications are set out in Appendix 1 of the attached report considered by the Cabinet on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2003. Part B of the report identifies the key issues raised during the consultation and the proposed course of action. The detailed timetable is set out in Appendix 2 and indicates that the intention is to submit report to the County Council on 9<sup>th</sup> July recommending Adoption of the Plan.

##### Decision of the Cabinet

4. At its meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> May, the Cabinet resolved:
  - (a) That approval be given to the responses of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications as set out in Appendix 1 of the report;
  - (b) That the late objections to the Proposed Modifications set out in paragraph 39 of the report be not accepted.

**Recommendations**

5. The Scrutiny Commission is asked to consider and comment on the response of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications.

**Background Papers**

6. Attached report of the Chief Executive to the Cabinet on 13 May.

**Circulation under Sensitive Issues**

7. As the issues contained in this report apply to all areas of the County the report will be circulated to all Members of the Council under the Members' Information Service.

**Officers to Contact**

Andrew Simmonds	0116 – 265 – 7027
Tom Purnell	0116 – 265 – 7019



**CABINET – 13<sup>th</sup> May 2003**

**LEICESTERSHIRE, LEICESTER AND RUTLAND STRUCTURE  
PLAN**

**RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSED  
MODIFICATIONS AND TIMETABLE TO ADOPTION**

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**PART A**

**Purpose**

1. To allow Cabinet to consider:
  - a) the responses of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications as set out in Appendix 1; and
  - b) the next stages in the preparation of the Structure Plan as set out in the timetable in Appendix 2.

**Recommendation**

2. It is recommended that Cabinet:
  - a) agrees the responses of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications and the proposed resulting policy actions as set out in Appendix 1; and
  - b) agrees that late objections to the Proposed Modifications should not be accepted (see paragraph 39).

**Reason for Recommendation**

3. To ensure that the Structure Plan is adopted without delay.

**Timetable for Decisions**

4. A timetable for proposed meetings is set out in Appendix 2.

**Policy Framework and Previous Decisions**

5. At its meeting on 8th March 2000 the County Council resolved that the Deposit Draft Structure Plan be approved for formal deposit.
6. At its meeting on 7th March 2001 the County Council resolved that approval be given to:
  - the placing on Deposit of the Proposed Pre-EIP Changes to the Structure Plan;
  - the reasoned responses and proposed policy actions in relation to the representations received on all Structure Plan policies as set out in the document entitled 'A Summary of Representations made on all Deposit

Draft Structure Plan Policies and the Responses of the Three Councils to the Representations'.

7. At its meeting held on 10th April 2001, the Cabinet agreed to suggest to the EIP Panel revised housing policies containing a revised distribution of dwellings and greenfield housing requirement based upon updated housing land availability and urban capacity information. This was published in a Supplementary Housing Report (May 2001).
8. In June and July 2001 an Examination in Public (EIP) was held. A Panel appointed by the then Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions presided over the discussion and prepared a report. The Panel's Report was published in September 2001 setting out its recommendations on the matters discussed.
9. Following the Examination in Public and publication of the Panel Report, Proposed Modifications were prepared. At its meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> May the County Council agreed to place the Proposed Modifications on deposit.
10. The next stage in the preparation of the Structure Plan is for the Three Councils to consider the representations made in response to the Proposed Modifications. The key issues raised through consultation on the Proposed Modifications and the proposed course of action are set out in Part B of this report.

#### **Resource Implications**

11. The costs of the proposed work programme will be met from within existing budgets.

#### **Circulation under Sensitive Issues Procedure**

None

#### **Officers to Contact**

Andrew Simmonds	0116 265 7027	<a href="mailto:asimmonds@leics.gov.uk">asimmonds@leics.gov.uk</a>
Tom Purnell	0116 265 7019	<a href="mailto:tpurnell@leics.gov.uk">tpurnell@leics.gov.uk</a>

## **PART B**

### **Background**

12. As indicated in paragraph 10, the next stage in the preparation of the Structure Plan is for the Three Councils to consider the representations made in response to the Proposed Modifications. Depending on the substance of the representations, the Three Councils may decide to respond to them in three ways:
- Adopt the Structure Plan with no further modifications;
  - Propose further modifications in response to objections;
  - Re-open the Examination in Public.
13. If it is decided to adopt the Plan with no further modifications, there are two courses of action that could be pursued by those who consider that the Plan or the procedures followed are unsatisfactory:
- If the Secretary of State considers a plan to be unsatisfactory, particularly in terms of its interpretation of national or regional policies, he may at any time before it is adopted direct the authorities to modify it. The authorities must then re-open the EIP or propose further modifications.
  - After the Plan has been adopted, there is a six week period during which an application can be made to the High Court to have the Plan quashed. This can only be done on the grounds that the Plan is not within the powers of the TCPA 1990 or the proper procedures have not been followed. It is not an opportunity for a person to object to a policy simply because he/she disagrees with it.
14. The implications of the above are considered later in this report, and the proposed timetable is attached in Appendix 2.

### **Representations on the Proposed Modifications**

#### **Main Issues**

15. A schedule of policies, setting out summaries of all representations received and proposed responses to them, is attached as Appendix 1. A formal response from the Three Councils to all “duly made” objections will also need to be made and published as part of any future action.
16. A total of 704 representations were received from 200 respondents. 407 were objections, 249 supports, 34 general comments and 14 counter objections. The largest numbers relate to the housing allocation to Oadby and Wigston (54) and the housing allocation to Melton (48). The latter relate specifically to the new village south of Melton, allocated in the adopted Local Plan.
17. In addition to the overall quantity and distribution of housing the other main issues raised by objectors are as follows:
- The expansion of the Nottingham / Derby Green Belt into north-west Leicestershire;
  - Junction 24 / Donington Park;

- Park and Ride.

18. Two petitions have also been received:

- Opposing the greenfield housing allocation to Oadby and Wigston set out in Housing Policy 2;
- Supporting representations of support for a number of the Proposed Modifications submitted by a residents group in Ratby.

The Quantity of Housing Land (Housing Policy 1)

19. The main issue, including an objection from GOEM, relates to the method of calculation of the total amount of housing, particularly that the completions between 1996 and 2001 should be included.

20. It is considered that the methodology used by the Three Councils is sound and consistent with Regional Planning Guidance.

The amount distributed to districts (Housing Policies 1 and 2)

21. Many objections were made to district totals, including the proportion allocated in the CLPA. GOEM was particularly concerned with the distribution outside the CLPA, particularly that the allocations to NW Leicestershire and Melton were overly influenced by the inclusion of committed sites (allocations in local plans without planning permission).

22. Four District Councils have supported the housing allocations to their areas (Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough and Hinckley and Bosworth); three have objected (Melton, NW Leicestershire and Oadby and Wigston).

23. It is considered that 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 also a distribution which takes account of the challenging housing provision total allocated to Leicester.

Melton's Housing Allocation (Housing Policy 1)

24. Objections have been received regarding the proposed housing allocation to Melton borough, including from Melton Borough Council. A particular issue raised in the objections has been the New Village site south of Melton Mowbray, which is an allocated site in the Melton Local Plan. A planning application has been submitted for the development; however the developers have secured an indefinite postponement of the inquiry until the Structure Plan is adopted.

25. Since lodging its objections to the Proposed Modifications Melton Borough Council has informed the Three Councils that if the adopted Structure Plan includes a housing allocation not in accordance with the Examination in Public Panel recommendations then the Council intends to take the matter to Judicial Review, subject to Counsel's advice.

26. It is considered that the allocation to Melton reflects Melton Mowbray's status as a Main Town, and provides an appropriate balance of housing and employment in the Borough.



Oadby and Wigston's Housing Allocation (Housing Policy 2)

27. There has been considerable opposition, including a petition, to the greenfield housing land allocated in Housing Policy 2 to Oadby and Wigston.
28. Significantly, all other districts partly in the CLPA (i.e. Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough and Hinckley and Bosworth) are generally supportive of the allocation to their respective districts.
29. It is considered that the allocation to Oadby and Wigston is appropriate for its location on the edge of the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area, whilst reducing the impact on greenfield land, compared with the Panel recommendation.

Green Belt (Strategy Policy 18)

30. GOEM and others have objected that extension of Nottingham / Derbyshire Green Belt designation into part of north west Leicestershire is unnecessary because the land is protected by other policies, and that it would pre-empt review of Regional Planning Guidance.
31. It is considered that green belt extension is appropriate and consistent with Regional Planning Guidance.

Burbage Green Wedge (Strategy Policies 6 and 7)

32. Although Burbage Parish Council has again objected to the lack of a Green Wedge south of Burbage, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council has withdrawn an earlier objection and now supports the modifications to Green Wedge policies.
33. It is considered that the Policies remain appropriate and should not be modified.

Junction 24 / Donington Park (Strategy Policy 17)

34. Despite the approach of the Three Councils being generally consistent with Regional Planning Guidance, a number of objectors wished to see the more detailed and permissive policy of the deposit draft Structure Plan re-instated.
35. A letter has also been received from the Chairman of the Board of Donington Park, requesting clarification of the terminology in the policy, particularly its geographical coverage.
36. It is considered that the Policy gives an appropriate degree of protection for the Junction 24 area. It is the view of officers that consideration should be given to the terminology and area covered when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Green Wedges (Strategy Policy 6)

37. Members will be aware that consultation has recently been carried out on two park and ride sites, including one at Glenfield that would be located in a Green Wedge. No modification has been proposed in respect of the location of park and ride sites in Green Wedges. Nevertheless, some objections were received in relation to this matter.

Minor Changes

38. Minor changes are proposed to a few other policies in response to the representations received. Officers have sought legal advice, and consider that they do not, individually or cumulatively, materially affect the content of the proposals, so can therefore be incorporated without issuing further modifications.

Late Objections

39. Six objections were received outside the specified consultation period, all dealing with housing quantity and distribution issues. These issues had been raised by other respondents. The 1999 Development Plan Regulations make clear that the Three Councils are not obliged to consider late representations, although they may use their discretion to do so. Given that the objections do not raise any new issues it seems unnecessary for the Three Councils to make any special case for consideration of these late objections, and it is therefore recommended that the late objections are not accepted.

Implications for the Future Timetable

40. It is considered that the Plan is now fundamentally sound. No new issues have been raised which would justify the re-opening of the Examination in Public, and the Reasoned Responses summarised above and set out in the attached policy templates are sufficiently robust to justify adopting the Plan without further modifications. However, Members should be aware that threats do remain, particularly direction by the Secretary of State, and High Court Action.

41. Any decision on the future course of action should also be taken in the light of the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill (currently before Parliament) which sets out proposals for the abolition of Structure Plans. The Government has made clear, in guidance published recently to cover transitional arrangements, that work on plans as advanced as this one should continue under current procedures. Government expects the commencement date of the new Act will be Spring 2004 and that Plans adopted by that time can be 'saved' for a period of 3 years. The Plan would thus form part of the statutory development plan until at least 2007.

42. The scenarios can be summarised as the following:

- a) The Structure Plan proceeds to adoption according to the attached timetable;
- b) Further Modifications are proposed by the Three Councils (for example a redistribution of the proposed housing). Further consultation would be required which would be likely to lead to further counter objections. This would involve a serious delay to the proposed timetable, raising questions about the value of continuing to take forward the Structure Plan in the light of its abolition under the new Planning Act due to come into force in spring 2004;

- c) The Secretary of State directs the Three Councils to modify the Plan. Further Modifications would then have to be proposed as in b)above;
- d) There is a High Court Challenge by Melton Borough Council and/or others. This can only be done after the Plan has been adopted. The High Court can only consider whether the Plan is within the powers available under the Act and whether proper procedures have been followed, not whether the Plan has been amended in accordance with particular objections. It is the opinion of officers that all the proper procedures have been followed. However if a High Court Challenge by Melton Borough Council were to be successful, the housing figure for Melton could be reduced or deleted altogether. It may not then be possible to review the housing figures under the current arrangements.

### **Background Papers**

Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Deposit Draft Structure Plan 1996-2016, (May 2000);

Report of the Panel, (September 2001);

Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Deposit Draft Structure Plan 1996-2016: Proposed Modifications, (June 2002).

A copy of the background papers has been placed in the Cabinet Office.

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Schedule of proposed responses of the Three Councils to representations made on the Proposed Modifications.

Appendix 2 Proposed timetable to adoption.

## APPENDIX 2

## PROPOSED STRUCTURE PLAN TIMETABLE

	<b>County</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Rutland</b>
13 May	Cabinet		
28 May	Scrutiny Commission		
3 June			Cabinet
4 June	District Briefing		
4 June	Joint Member Steering Group	Joint Member Steering Group	Joint Member Steering Group
24 June	Cabinet		
7 July			Full Council (TBC)
9 July	Full Council		
10 July		Full Council (TBC)	
18 July	Notice issued of intention to adopt Plan after 28 days		
15 Aug	Adoption of Plan		
22 Aug	First notice (of two) stating date of adoption and the date it became operative Start of six week period during which an application can be made to the High Court to have the Plan quashed		
Sep			
3 Oct	End of six week period during which an application can be made to the High Court to have the Plan quashed		

Appendix 1

Responses to the Consultation on the Proposed Modifications to  
the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan  
1996-2016.



**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.

**Policy No.****Strategy Policy 3B: Suitability of Land for Development****Summary of Issues**

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.

## Five Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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).

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

Blaby District Council, Burbage Matters! County Museums Service, CPRE 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.

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Strategy Policy 17 Junction 23a / 24 / 24a Area</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy should be deleted as recommended by the EIP Panel.</li> <li>2. Terminology in the policy should be defined.</li> <li>3. The Explanatory Memorandum should take into account the results of multi-modal studies.</li> <li>4. The deposit draft of the policy is relevant and should remain.</li> <li>5. The policy should take into account the results of QUELS study.</li> </ol> <p>Nine Representations of Support</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Andrew Granger &amp; Co, CPRE Leicestershire, Derbyshire County Council, Donington Park Estates, Glenfield Parish Council, Hallam Land Management, Highways Agency, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Transport 2000, North West Leicestershire District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Developments.</p> <p>Mr A Brooks, Sally Smart.</p>

**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.



<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Environment Policy 1: Historic Environment.</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>1. Would be beneficial to include information about recent schemes that are being employed nationwide by County Archaeology section.</p> <p>Four Representations of Support</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Glenfield Parish Council, County Museums Service, Harborough District Council.</p> <p>Ms Sally Smart</p>

<b><u>Policy No.</u></b> <b>Environment Policy 3: Biodiversity Enhancement.</b>
<b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b> Eleven Representations of Support.
<b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b> None.
<b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b> No change to Proposed Modifications.
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> 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

<b><u>Policy No.</u></b> <b>Environment Policy 4:Geology.</b>
<b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b> Four Representations of Support.
<b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b> None.
<b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b> No change to Proposed Modification.
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council. Ms Sally Smart





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

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

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Resource Management Policy 3: Energy Installations</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. The policy does not recognise the importance of the reduction in climate change the use of renewable energy sources produces.</li> <li>3. The policy does not take account of policy 56 of RPG8.</li> <li>4. The fourth bullet point is unclear.</li> </ol> <p>Four Representations of Support, one with a general comment.</p>

**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**

1. The policy does not address development that would impede the flow of flood water or affect the capacity of the floodplain to store water.
2. The policy should refer to archaeology.

Four Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

1. **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.
2. 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

**Policy No.**

**Resource Management Policy 5: Agricultural Land**

**Summary of Issues**

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.

One Representation of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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.

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

Friends of Ratby Action Group, Government Office for the East Midlands, Miller Homes (East Midlands) & Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd.

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

<b><u>Policy No.</u></b> <b>Resource Management Policy 8: Land Release: Waste Management</b>
<b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b> 1. Appears to promote waste production and landfill One Representation of Support
<b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b> 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.
<b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b> No change to Proposed Modification
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> Government Office for the East Midlands, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Harborough District Council Mr A Brooks

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Resource Management Policy 9: Environmental Impact of Mineral Extraction and Waste Management</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>Two Representations of Support.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>None.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Environment Agency, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service</p>

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

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

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Resource Management Policy 12: Transportation of Minerals and Waste</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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 <b>minerals and waste....</b>”, the subject of the policy.</li> </ol> <p>One Representation of Support</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Accepted. The policy should be amended.</li> </ol>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>Amend the Policy to read:</p> <p>“...Rail, canal and pipeline as a means of transporting <b>minerals and waste</b> should be used wherever reasonably practicable.”</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Railtrack Plc, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service</p>

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Resource Management Policy 13: Restoration Aftercare and Afteruse</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>Two Representations of Support.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>None.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Environment Agency</p>

<b><u>Policy No.</u></b> <b>Resource Management Policy 14: Recovery of Waste</b>
<b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b> Two Representations of Support.
<b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b> None.
<b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b> No change to Proposed Modification.
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> 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**

1. Not accepted. This issue is covered more appropriately in Strategy policy 5. Travel Plans when required will include suitable targets.
2. 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**

1. 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.
2. 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><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Accessibility and Transport Policy 7: Parking Provision in New Development</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unclear what the policy is intending to do, over and above giving strategic direction to maximum parking standards in individual plans.</li> <li>2. The policy does not address parking levels below minimum standards.</li> <li>3. The policy should specify that maximum parking standards are defined in PPG13 and RPG8.</li> </ol> <p>Two Representations of Support</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not accepted. The intention of this policy is indeed to give strategic direction to the provision of maximum parking standards in individual plans.</li> <li>2. Not accepted. PPG13 states that there should be no minimum standards for development</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, Hinckley &amp; Bosworth District Council.</p> <p>Andy Brooks, Sally Smart.</p>

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

None

**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 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 but has been extended for a further six months until 30<sup>th</sup> 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 out-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 the response to Issue 6. 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 the response to Issue 6. 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.

- **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.

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Housing Policy 3: New Housing Provision on Previously Developed Land and through Conversions</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The minimum requirement is too cautious and should be 60% in line with the EIP Panel recommendation.</li> <li>2. The minimum of 50% should be expressed as a target.</li> <li>3. The policy is meaningless without an effective monitoring framework.</li> </ol> <p>Five Representations of Support</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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.</li> <li>2. 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.</li> <li>3. 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.</li> </ol>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

**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

<b><u>Policy No.</u></b> <b>Employment Policy 4: Science and Technology Parks</b>
<b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b> No representations
<b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b> None
<b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b> No change to Proposed Modification.
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> None

<b><u>Policy No.</u></b> <b>Employment Policy 5: Expansion and Relocation of Existing Employment Sites</b>
<b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b> No representations
<b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b> None
<b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b> No change to the Proposed Modification.
<b><u>List of Respondents</u></b> None

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

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

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Employment Policy 8: Storage and Distribution</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></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><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></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><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>GOEM, G L Hearn, Gazeley Properties Ltd, Railtrack PLC.</p> <p>Mr A Brooks.</p>

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

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

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Employment Policy 11: Hazardous Installations</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></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><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Government Office for the East Midlands.</p>





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

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Central Areas and Shopping 3: Retail Development and Community Facilities to Serve Local Need</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>1. 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.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>1. 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.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>GOEM</p>

**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.



<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Leisure Policy 2: Leisure &amp; Tourism Development</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>1. 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.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>1. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as no modification was proposed for this policy, however the comment has been noted.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Highways Agency</p>

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Leisure Policy 3: Protection of Recreation Land and Buildings</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>1. An interpretation of the word “required” needs to be provided in the Explanatory Memorandum.</p> <p>Four Representations of Support.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Carlton Parish Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council Sally Smart</p>

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

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



## **SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 28TH MAY 2003**

### **REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

#### **NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

##### **Purpose**

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Commission of the views of the five member panel (Community Strategy) on the North West Leicestershire Community Strategy.

##### **Background**

2. The North West Leicestershire Strategic Partnership (NWLLSP) has published for consultation its draft Community Strategy. A copy of the Strategy is attached (Appendix A).
3. North West Leicestershire District Council is the lead partner on the NWLLSP. The County Council is also a partner and Mrs. Pendleton CC represents the Authority on the Partnership Board.

##### **Comments on the Panel**

4. The Panel considered the draft Strategy at its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> May. The Panel welcomed the Strategy and concluded that the Strategy appeared to be broadly compatible with County Council policies and the emerging Leicestershire Community Strategy. The Panel also noted that a number of points of drafting which emerged in its consideration would be drawn to the attention of officers responsible for writing the Strategy.
5. The Panel welcomed the following features of the format of the consultation document.
  - the contents page and the index;
  - the consultation response form.
6. Whilst broadly welcoming the Strategy, the Panel was of the view that the Cabinet should be asked to draw the following comments to the attention of the NWLLSP:-

a) Vision

There appears to be insufficient recognition given to the particular economic conditions facing the District and how these might be addressed. The North West Leicestershire District Area, served as it is by an extremely good road network is clearly an attractive location for the warehousing and distribution trades which whilst providing jobs would not necessarily provide the higher paid jobs the Strategy envisaged. It is unclear how the Strategy and the partners propose to address this.

b) Challenges

- (i) There appears to be insufficient consideration given to the potential impact, economically and environmentally, of any expansion to East Midlands Airport.
- iii) The considerable impact the development of the National Forest could have in terms of environmental enhancement and the economic regeneration of the area (in terms of tourism) appears to be underplayed. The reference to tourism appears to deal solely with the threats rather than opportunities.

c) Targets/Actions

The inclusion of specific measurable targets within the document was welcomed. However the Panel was of the view that the document would be much improved if the Partnership could identify which of the targets would be achieved by individual agencies and which would be achieved by the partners working together, and the added value such joint action might bring. This in turn would enable the County Council, as a key partner in the delivery of the strategy, to be clear about its role.

**Equal Opportunities Implications**

- 8. The Strategy contains a commitment to 'provide fair and equal opportunities for everyone'.

**Recommendations**

- 9. The Commission is asked to note the comments of the five member panel and agree to these being forwarded to the Cabinet for consideration.

**Officer to Contact**

Mr. M.I. Seedat ☎ 0116 265 6037



*The Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*



*working towards*

***A Better Future***

*A Community Strategy for North West Leicestershire*

**CONSULTATION DRAFT**

March 2003



***Member Organisations:***

- Charnwood & North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust
- Faith Communities
- Job Centre
- King Edward VII College
- Leicestershire Chamber of Trade & Industry
- Leicestershire Constabulary
- Leicestershire County Council
- North West Leicestershire Association of Parish Councils
- North West Leicestershire Council for Voluntary Services
- North West Leicestershire District Council
- North West Leicestershire Health Forum
- North West Leicestershire Partnership in Safer Communities
- Stephenson College

The organisations represented on the Partnership have not yet considered this Draft Strategy. They will do so as part of the public consultation process. This means that they have not pre-judged the outcome of the public consultation process and will be able to consider the recommendations of the Partnership on consultation responses with an open mind when the formal strategy is produced.

## *Contents*

<a href="#"><u>Partnership for North West Leicestershire</u></a> .....	2
<i>Contents</i> .....	3
<a href="#"><u>Consultation</u></a> .....	4
<a href="#"><u>Introduction</u></a> .....	5
<a href="#"><u>Statement of Purpose</u></a> .....	6
<a href="#"><u>Vision</u></a> .....	7
<a href="#"><u>Challenges Facing North West Leicestershire</u></a> .....	8
<a href="#"><u>Our Strategy</u></a> .....	10
<a href="#"><u>Theme One: Community Spirit and Involvement</u></a> .....	12
(Civic Pride, Local Activities, Influencing Decisions )	
<i>Aims</i> .....	12
<i>What’s Already Happening</i> .....	13
<i>Targets</i> .....	13
<i>Actions</i> .....	14
<a href="#"><u>Theme Two: Personal Well Being</u></a> .....	15
(Health, Education, Economy, Crime)	
<i>Aims</i> .....	16
<i>What’s Already Happening</i> .....	16
<i>Targets</i> .....	17
<i>Actions</i> .....	18
<a href="#"><u>Theme Three: An Attractive Place to Live and Work</u></a> .....	19
(Environment, Noise & Pollution, Recycling, Recreation)	
<i>Aims</i> .....	20
<i>What’s Already Happening</i> .....	20
<i>Targets</i> .....	21
<i>Actions</i> .....	21
<a href="#"><u>Theme Four: Access to Services</u></a> .....	22
(Local Shops, Services & Facilities, Opening Times & Buses)	
<i>Aims</i> .....	22
<i>What’s Already Happening</i> .....	22
<i>Targets</i> .....	23
<i>Actions</i> .....	24
<a href="#"><u>Conclusion</u></a> .....	25
<a href="#"><u>Full List of Members</u></a> .....	26
<a href="#"><u>Index</u></a> .....	27
<a href="#"><u>Response Form</u></a> .....	29

## *Consultation*

This Draft Community Strategy has been produced for public consultation. It has been drawn up by a Local Partnership representing a cross section Local Authority, Service and Community interests.

It is very much a 'draft' and we would like to know whether you think we have identified the real issues that need to be tackled jointly in North West Leicestershire. We have included a number of 'targets'. Some of these are based on service information – but others are rather speculative because we do not yet have the 'starting point' information.

Since this is a 'Strategy', which deals with a wide range of activities and services, it has to be fairly broad in its approach. So the next stage will be to draw up detailed action plans to identify exactly what needs to be done and who will be doing it.

### *What we would like you to do*

We would like you to tell us:

- Whether you think we have identified the most important things to tackle in North West Leicestershire. Have we missed out anything important?
- Are there any specific initiatives, activities or improvements that you think need to be tackled in your own local area or for the benefit of particular groups of people with specific needs?
- What are the **three most important** things you would like to see done or improved?

We can then make any necessary amendments to the Strategy and start to draw up more detailed action plans for the Partnership and for local areas.

***Please use the response form at the end of this document if possible. You can photocopy it or obtain further copies from us.***

*Comments can be sent by post, e-mail or via the N W Leicestershire web site:*

**Post** Customer Care  
NWLDC  
FREE POST  
MID22264  
Coalville  
Leicestershire LE67 3RK  
Please mark clearly **Community Strategy  
Consultation**

**e-mail** [community.strategy@nwleicestershire.gov.uk](mailto:community.strategy@nwleicestershire.gov.uk)

**Web** [www.nwleics.gov.uk](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk)

This Strategy is also available to view on the website - you can submit your comments via the web site.

We would like to receive your comments as early as possible so that we can start work on the action plans.

**The consultation period will run until 30<sup>th</sup> May 2003.**

## *Introduction*

The Government has asked every local authority in the country to develop a Community Strategy. The District Council is responsible for developing a local strategy, in partnership with others and the County Council is responsible for developing a countywide strategy. In North West Leicestershire we have brought together public, private, voluntary and community organisations to form a Local Strategic Partnership. We have called this the "*Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*". The Partnership's job is to develop and agree a Community Strategy for North West Leicestershire and to prepare an Action Plan to implement it. The Community Strategy is intended to take account of the needs and aspirations expressed by local people – but it must also reflect the Government's policies and priorities and co-ordinate economic, social and environmental action.

Our *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* was created in 2001. We have looked at the public consultations that Partnership members have carried out. We have also carried out further consultations with a wide range of local organisations and we have held a series of area meetings with people representing a cross section of local interests to find out what local people think needs to be done.

The result of the work so far is this Draft Community Strategy which has been produced for wider public consultation. In this Draft Strategy we have set out the **Purpose** and limits of the Strategy, our **Vision** for the District in the coming years, the **Challenges** that we face and our broad **Strategy** for tackling these challenges. We have also set some broad **Aims** and some specific **Targets**. We have also identified some of the major **Actions** that we believe will need to be taken to help create a better life for the people of North West Leicestershire.

We are consulting on this Draft Community Strategy before developing an Action Plan to implement it. This is to make sure our approach has the broad support of organisations and individuals who live and work in the District.

When the Community Strategy is finally agreed it will drive the timetables and priorities of many organisations and will help to deliver local priorities in local communities. It will form the backbone for the submission of projects for external funding and grant aid, including those that arise from local community groups. Without it we will not be able to tap into national and european resources.

We will also need to monitor progress to make sure that the Strategy and Action Plans really do bring about the changes intended – and if necessary re-focus the Strategy if different issues or priorities emerge.

## *Statement of Purpose*

***By working together in an agreed way the Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire will be more effective and have greater influence to help create a better life for the people of North West Leicestershire.***

All service providers endeavour to respond to local needs and aspirations. They also have to deliver National Policies and meet National Targets. They seek the views of the people they serve and try to respond to their wishes as far as they can. Our Partnership can share what it has learnt from various consultations so we can develop a strategy that reflects local concerns and aspirations as well as delivering wider government policies and national targets.

Both National and Regional Governments play a significant role in setting targets and priorities for local public organisations. The County and District Councils, the Police, and the Primary Care Trust, all have to deliver national policies as well as meeting local needs. For example the Primary Care Trust is responsible for how government money for health services is spent locally. All these are members of the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*. These public organisations already work closely together. They also work closely with voluntary and private sector organisations. They produce a variety of Strategies and Action Plans to help direct their work to meet these targets. For example, the North West Leicestershire Partnership in Safer Communities has developed a strategy for tackling crime. This partnership includes the Police, The County and District Councils and voluntary organisations such as Victim Support and the Council for Voluntary Services.

This Community Strategy does not set out to duplicate or replace the roles or targets that individual organisations and partnerships have established. The purpose of the Community Strategy is to put things into a wider context and help co-ordinate activities at the local level. This means that individual organisations will continue to develop and deliver their programmes of work to meet their targets but they will also take action, where possible, to meet the broader objectives set out in this Community Strategy.

We believe that by working in partnership we will be more effective. We will be able to work more closely together to take action on a broader range of inter-related issues. We will identify ways that different organisations can work together so that their actions compliment each other. By working together we should be able to achieve more than we could individually - making the whole add up to more than the sum of the parts. By working together as a partnership we will also be able to bid for additional funding to help deliver what we need.

However, we cannot do it all on our own. We need to work together - with individuals and organisations from across the district. Whilst individual service providers can play there part, there are many factors that affect our quality of life that only we as individuals can influence. By working together in an agreed way we hope to make that influence more effective to create a better life for the people of North West Leicestershire.

## *Vision*

***This Vision is a description of how The Partnership would like North West Leicestershire to be by 2010. Working with the community and other organisations we believe this is possible.***

### *Our Vision*

Imagine it is the year 2010.

There is a high level of civic pride in North West Leicestershire. There is a close working relationship between the members of the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*, and between the Partnership and the wider community. Partnership working for the benefit of all is well established and the Community Strategy is widely supported. Community and Voluntary Sector groups are well developed and play a prominent role in the continued improvement of people's quality of life in the District.

People's physical, spiritual and mental health has improved and there are lower rates of coronary heart disease and teenage pregnancy. Levels of crime and the fear of crime are significantly lower than 7 years ago, helped by the reduced levels of drug abuse.

The local economy is buoyant with high levels of employment providing household incomes at the average for the region. Formal education, vocational and workforce training has produced a better skilled workforce and a closer match between those skills and the needs of local employers.

In 2010 North West Leicestershire has achieved a good reputation as an attractive district to live in and to visit. The local environment is clean and safe and the District as a whole is making its contribution to reducing global environmental problems by using resources efficiently.

Public services such as, doctors, dentists, libraries, schools, leisure and cultural facilities are accessible and opportunities are equally available to everyone. Facilities are close to where people live or are accessible through improved public and community transport. Information about these services is easy to find and their provision is responsive to local needs.

Overall, our communities are more sustainable than in the past and economic and social inequalities are significantly reduced.

## ***Challenges Facing North West Leicestershire***

***To achieve the sort of conditions and quality of life set out in the Vision, the Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire and other organisations and individuals will have to work together to overcome a range of challenges.***

### ***Where are we now?***

North West Leicestershire is a pleasant rural area served by 2 market towns, Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch along with 4 principal villages, Castle Donington, Measham, Ibstock and Kegworth.

The A42 from Birmingham and the West Midlands forms the main spine road through the district, joining the M1 and the Stoke-Derby link in the north of the district, near Kegworth and Castle Donington,, providing good access to the East Midlands Airport and Donington Park motor racing circuit.

We have succeeded in improving the unsightly areas around Coalville and in the south western part of the District left by the coal mining industry. There has been a considerable amount of new industrial and housing development on former mine sites – whilst others have been reclaimed and landscaped. The principal tourist attraction is the National Forest and Visitor Centre at Moira, to the west of Ashby, along with the Snibston Museum and Discovery Park in Coalville. We have high levels of employment. The District is a very pleasant place in which to live and work.

### ***What we need to do***

Whilst unemployment levels in the District are below the national average, there is still a great deal to be done to improve the quality of life of people living and working in the District. Average household income is the lowest in Leicestershire. We need to attract a wider variety of better quality jobs – and make sure that the people of North West Leicestershire have the opportunity to be trained to take advantage of them. Although the District has good road and air transport links to the rest of the country, the lack of good local rail links tends to encourage people to travel by car, adding to the congestion on the A42 and M1.

There are still a number of areas where there are concentrations of high unemployment, low incomes and other social problems that develop under these circumstances – drug abuse, crime, ill health, low staying-on rates and poorer educational attainment at some schools, along with high levels of teenage pregnancy in some areas.

These things do not just affect the people concerned; they affect us all. They can only be tackled by the co-ordinated efforts of everyone involved - in the public, private and voluntary sectors. Many of these problems are inter-related. That is why we need a Community Strategy. We need to have a co-ordinated approach and agreed priorities in order to tackle problems such as these.

But there are also less evident things we need to tackle which affect large numbers of people in North West Leicestershire. Many people living in rural areas have difficulty in getting to some



services and facilities – particularly essential services. We need to look at more imaginative ways of bringing services out into the community – perhaps by sharing premises or sharing staff – and also at ways of providing better public transport links between rural areas and service centres. It is no good having bus services if they do not take people to services or leisure facilities at the time they need to use them – and get them back!

Our Town Centres are showing signs of decline. There are a number of empty shops in both Coalville and Ashby. Town Centres not only serve our needs but they can make a big impression on people and firms thinking of moving to the area. So it is important that we continue to improve the range of services and shops as well as the physical environment and character of our centres. Better standards of building design, well maintained public and private spaces and good public art would all help to improve the attractiveness of our centres. Shop owners and major retailers need to play an active part in the promotion of our town centres, as do cultural and leisure organisations – particularly for the evening economy.

We also need to look at the needs of young people, old people and people with disabilities. Young people are the country's future resource. We need to understand *their needs* and the pressures they face. We need to do all we can to establish true community values in young people at an early age – this means that a wide range of organisations, both public and voluntary, will need to work together in a co-ordinated way. There is a considerable amount of effort already being put in by a large number of people, including the development of a Youth Council, but the things we do are not always co-ordinated to achieve the best effect.

### ***The Challenge***

All service providers, and indeed the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*, have the challenge of understanding and responding to local concerns. One of the biggest challenges is to find effective ways to gather balanced views and ideas from all sectors of the public – not just from those who are able to shout the loudest. At the same time, many of the members of our Partnership, as well as other service providers, have to meet obligations and targets set by National Government. These include the contribution we are expected to make towards tackling global issues, such as climate change, pollution and the wasteful use of resources. Things that can also affect people outside the confines of North West Leicestershire.

## *Our Strategy*

***The North West Leicestershire Community Strategy sets out how we intend to work together on four themes: Community Spirit and Involvement, Personal Well Being, An Attractive Place to Live and Work, and how to improve Access to Services. There are many links between these themes. Achieving success in any of them will reinforce progress in the others.***

### *Key Issues*

A large number of consultations and discussions have taken place with local people, local organisations and voluntary groups over the past 18 months. We have looked at the main areas of concern that people feel need to be addressed if we are to continue to improve our quality of life.

The following key issues have emerged from the consultation process as the most important things to tackle overall. Some need to be addressed primarily at the local level; others have wider implications and will require public, private and community service providers to reassess how they deliver their services, to ensure that they take into account people's needs and priorities.

- *A desire to have greater **Community Spirit** and involvement*
- ***Access to Services** – both providing transport such as buses to the right place at the right time and improving the availability of services generally*
- *Better facilities and opportunities for **young people***
- ***Revitalisation of town centres** and preventing the decline of village centres*
- ***To feel reassured** that we live in a safe place*
- ***A better street environment** for all.*

### *Local Issues*

Major local concerns included noise and traffic related to East Midlands Airport and the Racing Circuit, the availability of doctors' and dentists' surgeries and access to health facilities, providing for the needs of older people, young people and people with disabilities, and concerns about areas affected by localised flooding.

There was also a general desire to promote more sustainable living by improving recycling facilities and minimising waste.

### ***Our Approach***

These issues and concerns have been brought together in the Community Strategy under 4 main headings

- **Community Spirit and Involvement:** The need to improve community spirit, responsibility and involvement of local people in supporting their community.
- **Personal Well Being:** The need to tackle crime and disorder, drugs, generally improve our health, and tackle things that affect on our sense of well being.
- **An Attractive Place to Live and Work:** The need to tackle environmental problems – particularly traffic dangers and noise, and to improve the street environment.
- **Access to Services:** The need to improve access to services and facilities, including better public transport and improved information.

All these things are interconnected. Even though we have separated out four key themes in our strategy, tackling any one of them is likely to help make improvements in the others.

Our intention is to bring about real improvements and make sure that we provide fair and equal opportunities for everyone. That does not just mean local authorities and public service providers. It also means local firms and businesses, voluntary organisations – and not least, each one of us as individuals.

## ***THEME ONE: Community Spirit and Involvement***

Community Spirit is a difficult thing to measure or identify. There is a perception that there is a lack of community spirit in some areas. People say that it needs to be improved.

*Getting involved* A reluctance of people to get involved in community activities and support local initiatives seems to be an underlying theme emerging from discussions with local people. In part this may be a reflection of people's lifestyles – changing patterns of shopping, working out of the area, more choices of entertainment and people moving further from family and friends. The substantial amount of new housing development that has taken place in some areas is also felt to have resulted in an imbalance some communities.

*Decision Making* There is a feeling that decisions that affect us are made without us really having an effective way of making our own feelings and desires known. Different generations also seem to have different social values and behaviours. This can create divisions between people of different age groups.

*Projects and Activities* A feeling of Community Spirit often comes from working on projects and activities in a collective way, such as building or improving a Village Hall, taking part in community celebrations like fetes, becoming a school governor or being informed about what is happening locally. This sort of involvement brings different people together and can create a sense of belonging and an understanding and acceptance of different attitudes.

*Individuals* Creating a sense of community spirit and belonging is really down to each of us as individuals. But there are also things that the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* can do that will encourage and foster a sense of community and belonging. This could include supporting volunteering, making sure advice is available about organising and funding community projects and finding better ways of including people in decision-making through consultation. The Community Strategy can help provide the framework – but only local people can make the difference.

### ***Aims***

- To increase people's **sense of belonging** and involvement in their community and contribute to peoples enjoyment.
- To develop a strong sense of **Civic Pride** in North West Leicestershire.
- To develop strong communities where people feel that they **have a say in the future**.

### ***What's Already Happening?***

*Community appraisals* There is already a great deal of activity in many local communities that is helping to foster community spirit. Many villages are developing Village Appraisals and Parish Plans setting out what local people feel should be done to improve their communities. A similar approach is now being taken in our two towns with the development of the Ashby and Coalville Market Town Initiatives. These will bring people together to agree how these town centres could be improved.

*Clubs and Groups* There are a large number of local clubs and community organisations in North West Leicestershire. These rely on local people putting in a lot of time and effort. Many are helped and supported by grants from local authorities and other organisations such as the Leicestershire Rural Partnership, as well as the private sector. There are tenants and residents associations, neighbourhood watch schemes, and a large number of sporting clubs as well as local history and natural history groups.

*Community Events* Community events, sports and arts are promoted and supported throughout the District, including events such as 'Picnic in the Park' and Christmas in Coalville. Some villages hold annual fetes, theme weeks and processions, but these often rely on a small number of individuals.

*Voluntary Sector* The voluntary sector, through the Council for Voluntary Services in particular, organises and supports a wide range of services and contributes to getting people interested and involved.

*Consultation* There is also an increasing amount of consultation with local people about all sorts of activities and decisions. This could be developed further.

### ***Targets***

The *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* has set some targets, which will contribute to increasing the sense of Community Spirit and involvement in the district by 2010.

The Partnership would like to:

- Increase turn-out at Parish, District and County Council Elections to above the East Midlands average.
- Increase by 10% the number of young people (14 –19 year olds) represented on Management Committees of voluntary organisations. (provisional target)
- See 95% of all Parent and Community School Governors posts filled.
- Every village and urban neighbourhood to have completed a village appraisal or similar local assessment.
- Increase the number of successful bids by local voluntary and community organisations to funders such as the Lottery by 20%. (provisional target)
- Increase the number of hours given by volunteers by 20%. (provisional target)
- Increase the percentage of people involved in a voluntary community activity by 20% (for example involvement in

Tenants and Residents Associations Neighbourhood Watch or local group). (provisional target)

### *Actions*

Some of the most significant actions that we are proposing are to:

- Create a co-ordinated approach to consultation between members of *our Partnership* and others to get a better cross section of community views and aspirations.
- Further develop a support system for local organisations to assist them in developing projects and winning the money to make them happen.
- Consult and actively involve Young people in identifying & providing for their own needs. (For example by improving their representation on organising and decision-making bodies).
- Implement the recommendations of the North West Leicestershire Cultural Strategy – “Growing Together”
- Continue to develop new and flexible ways for people to vote at elections.
- Promote volunteering and in particular to create opportunities for company volunteering schemes.
- Develop an events and tourism infrastructure and increase the capacity for local communities to hold local events, meetings and activities.

## ***THEME TWO: Personal Well Being***

There are many things that affect our personal sense of well-being. Personal circumstances such as family relationships, how well we get on with our neighbours, our state of health, how much we earn, the quality of our housing - all affect our sense of well-being. Some people have to deal with a disability, or are particularly vulnerable because of mental health or learning difficulties. There are also other more general things that affect the way we feel - the level of crime the availability of opportunities for education and the ability to participate in social activities like sport, play, art and evening classes.

As the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* we believe there are four main areas where we can take action to help improve people's personal well-being;

- improving health,
- reducing the fear of crime and improving people's safety,
- improving education and training achievements, and
- improving the local economy.

*Equality* We recognise the need make the opportunities created available to everyone whatever their background or circumstances - particularly vulnerable and disabled people and their carers.

*Personal Health* North West Leicestershire has a higher than average rate of coronary heart disease, long term disability and teenage pregnancy. There are also significant health inequalities. Public and voluntary sector service providers can help to improve health by working together to promote healthy living and better diets and by informing and educating people about healthier lifestyles. We can promote exercise, access to leisure centres and other facilities. But it is only by health agencies, schools, , youth workers, faith communities and voluntary organisations working together that we can make a real difference.

*Fear of Crime* Crime and the fear of crime can also affect our well being. Even if we do not suffer directly from crime ourselves, there is the stress and worry that we may be affected either at home or in the street. That means making our streets and built environments safer through better lighting, CCTV, and by providing reassurance through community workers, wardens, policing and neighbourhood watch schemes. It also means tackling safety on the roads and reducing the number of serious injuries and fatal accidents.

*Education & Training* Improving employment prospects in the district also means tackling education and training. The educational attainment of our young people in some areas, such as Coalville, is below the County average. There is also a relatively low take up by local businesses of programmes such as 'Investors in People', which encourages and supports businesses in providing appropriate training and development for their staff. Finding ways to encourage businesses to support their workforce will have an impact on people's sense of personal well-being as well as on the local economy.

*Income* Our well being also depends on having a reasonable income to support our families and ourselves. Although North West

Leicestershire has low levels of unemployment our average household income is below the regional average, and that is in a region where average household income is also lower than the national average. Working with agencies such as the East Midlands Regional Development Agency (*emda*) and the Leicester Shire Economic Partnership, we can find ways of attracting businesses that provide higher quality jobs with better pay. This could include attracting modern businesses such as internet, media and design companies. We can also contribute by making sure that those in most need take up the benefits they are entitled to.

### *Aims*

Our aims are to:

- Improve the physical, mental and spiritual health of people in North West Leicestershire.
- Reduce inequalities in health between different groups and areas in the District.
- People to feel reassured and safer on the street and at home.
- Improve the skills and knowledge of people in the District.
- Ensure an adequate supply of quality affordable housing with high energy efficiency.
- Attract and develop new businesses that provide long-term and higher paid jobs.
- Make sure we treat everyone fairly and understand people's different needs, whatever their background and circumstances.

### *What's Already Happening?*

*Health* There is already a huge amount of work being undertaken in the District to help improve people's personal circumstances. The recently established Primary Care Trust is working with the County and District Councils and others, for example, to provide more sexual health counselling in schools and youth clubs. There are initiatives like *Resolution* to help and support people in giving up smoking cigarettes - a major factor in coronary heart disease. There is also a Health Forum which brings different agencies and service users together to co-ordinate health improvement activity. There is an excellent GP referral scheme where GP's prescribe physical activity programmes at local leisure centres, rather than drugs, for a range of physical and mental health problems.

*Crime & Safety* The North West Leicestershire Partnership in Safer Communities, formed four years ago, has established a range of projects aimed at tackling key community safety issues through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy. There has been an increase in the number of police hours spent in the community, the introduction of closed circuit television(CCTV) and a programme of placing speed safety cameras at accident hot spots.

*Housing* Clear links have been established between the quality of housing and the health of the population. North West Leicestershire is making a good progress in meeting the Decent Homes Standard for all public housing. The Council's planned maintenance



programme concentrates on works to improve energy efficiency. A stock condition survey is to be carried out to determine levels of unfitness and energy efficiency in the private sector.

*Education* Responsibility for schools rests primarily with the County Council, which has identified Coalville as an Education Improvement Zone. Over £100,000 of additional funding has been secured to help tackle low attainment levels and low staying on rates at schools in this area. Adult education is provided through a variety of means and the Learning and Skills Council is working closely with local schools and colleges to encourage the take up of courses that lead to qualifications.

*Project Partnerships* Partnership working between different agencies is well established. For example, a Community Action Zone and partnership has been established in the Greenhill ward in Coalville – one of the 20% most deprived wards in the country. The Greenhill Community Action Zone is developing new ways of working to tackle a range of social and economic issues to help create a better life for the people who live there.

*Credit Union* Significant quality of life improvements have been achieved through a range of projects and initiatives both locally and more generally, including the development of a Credit Union.

*Jobs* The development of the local economy has recently focussed on attracting higher quality jobs and increasing tourism in the District, building on the presence of the National Forest. This is already creating jobs and attracting other new businesses. Strategies are also to be developed for Ashby and Coalville to attract and retain businesses.

### ***Targets***

The *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* has set some targets, which it believes if met will contribute to everyone's well being by 2010. These are to:

- Reduce conception rates in teenage girls (under 17) each year to achieve a target reduction of 45% within 10 years.
- Work towards the reduction in the number of deaths of those under 75 with circulatory disease (from a rate per 100 000 population of 100.8 to 91.9).
- Reduce the rate of smoking by 1% per year for women continuing to smoke throughout pregnancy and by a similar rate for other specific groups.
- Achieve a target of 70% in influenza immunisation in people aged 65 and over.
- Improve GCSE results to support the achievement of the County-wide target that at least 63% of 16 year olds should obtain 5 or more GCSEs by 2005.
- Increase the % of residents who regularly participate in sport & physical activity to above the national average.
- Increase the level of reassurance and feeling of personal safety to 90% (to be established from a community reassurance survey).
- Reduce road casualties involving death or serious injury by 40%.

- Increase average household income in the District to the regional average.
- Increase the energy efficiency of the housing stock (private & public) to above the national average.
- Three business a year to introduce an Investors in People Programme for all their staff (provisional target).

### *Actions*

Some of the most significant actions that we are proposing are:

- Develop additional drug treatment centres and facilities.
- Take measures to improve roads with a focus on improving their safety, including introducing speed cameras.
- Continue to develop "Safe Routes to Schools".
- Seek to secure funding and Recruit 10 Community Custodians (which may include special constables, neighbourhood wardens, and volunteers).
- Continue to develop a co-ordinated health promotion campaign focussing on exercise, diet & drugs, (including cigarettes and alcohol).
- Provide sexual health advice and support in schools and youth clubs.
- Work with East Midlands Development Agency and the Leicester Shire Economic Development Partnership to attract high quality jobs.
- Promote the establishment of the National Forest Railway line and a link to the main rail network.
- Develop Community Action Zones in those areas with multiple social and economic needs.
- Support the implementation of Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy.
- Carry out a housing stock condition survey by June 2003.
- Prepare a private sector housing strategy by July 2003.

## ***THEME THREE: An Attractive Place to Live and Work***

*Leisure* Living, working and enjoying our leisure time in attractive surroundings has many benefits. We feel better, we're likely to work harder and we're likely to get more enjoyment from our leisure time. Businesses too benefit from an attractive environment. It encourages more people to use our services and spend their money in the district rather than elsewhere. An attractive and clean environment also benefits our physical and mental health.

*Our Environment* We all want to enjoy a pleasant and attractive environment, litter free, with well maintained verges and pavements and no graffiti or fly posting.

A pleasant and attractive environment outside our front door is one of the first things we want to see - free of litter and with well maintained verges and pavements. That is what we all expect. The quality of buildings also contributes to an attractive environment. We also want safe and pleasant places to walk and to cycle. It is also important to have safe and stimulating places where children can play and grow up. Trees, good public open spaces, town squares and village greens and "Public Art" all add to the attractiveness of the District.

*Natural Environment* The quality and diversity of the natural environment is also important. Having attractive countryside, good quality parks and recreation grounds, which are easy to get to and pleasant places to take friends when they come to visit, helps to make us feel where we live is attractive. A lot of progress has been made in improving the environment especially clearing up industrial dereliction. The development of the National Forest and the creation of ecological sites and habitats have made a big difference to the area.

*Built Environment* The quality of the built environment is also extremely important - not just for our enjoyment but also for our economy. The attractiveness of Town and Village Centres can encourage visitors. This helps to support local businesses. The creation of good quality Civic Space such as town squares - and the presence of public art, can make a significant contribution to the attractiveness of the District. An attractive environment can also influence investment decisions - for example, where a company wishes to locate.

*Noise and Pollution* There are also the things that we cannot see that make a difference, such as having low levels of pollution, knowing that we are contributing to protecting the wider environment by recycling and reducing emissions of gases that contribute to climate change. Noise is another factor that can reduce the attractiveness of the places we live and the quality of our lives. East Midlands Airport and Donington Race Circuit are both places that generate noise that causes concern but at the same time they provide jobs and opportunities as well as facilities for other businesses.

*Action as Individuals* Tackling some of these issues requires everybody to play their part. Litter, for instance, doesn't just appear - people drop it. It

would be better if we could stop the problem rather than have to pay to clear up the mess that we make. Similarly recycling, reducing air pollution and using less energy to protect the global environment, are things that we can take action about ourselves.

*Partnership Action* There are also things that the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* can do to help people protect the attractive District that we live in. We can promote higher standards of building design. We can take the lead by seeking to reduce the energy we use and we can look at ways of using renewable energy. We can develop more cycle routes and footpaths. We can provide information about how people can use the countryside without disrupting the lives of people who live and work there. We can create the conditions that discourage people from dropping litter and we can encourage people to recycle by providing better and more convenient facilities.

### ***Aims***

Our aims are to:

- Improve the physical street environment.
- Improve the quality of parks, open spaces and other public places and provide better facilities for play.
- Make the local environment more 'friendly' - particularly for people with disabilities and children.
- Protect and improve the physical and natural environment.
- Minimise the impact of noise from East Midlands Airport and Donington Race Circuit.
- Improve the physical appearance of Town and Village Centres.
- Make North West Leicestershire an even more desirable place to live and visit - a place we can be proud of.

### ***What's Already Happening?***

*Litter* The District Council already undertakes a large amount of work to maintain the street environment and to remove litter, fly posters and graffiti from public spaces.

*Open Spaces* The District and Parish Councils maintain parks and play areas. A range of Country Parks have been developed by the County Council and by private landowners through National Forest initiatives. The National Forest contributes massively to the attraction of the District and plays a significant role in promoting the area as an attractive place to visit.

*Recycling and Pollution* There are a wide range of facilities that enable people to recycle - including Kerbside Collections of paper and other recyclable materials in some areas. The Local Transport Plan has actions to help reduce pollution from travelling by seeking improvements to public transport and by improving cycling facilities. Businesses, schools, and individuals can also get support and advice to help them reduce the impact they have on the environment, particularly by reducing energy consumption and using materials more efficiently.

*Noise* Whilst East Midlands Airport helps to contribute to the local economy there are major concerns about the impact of noise at night. Although the Secretary of State has recently declined to

take action himself to control night noise, *the Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* will press for controls and improvements to provide an acceptable environment for local people.

### ***Targets***

The *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire* has set some targets, which it believes if met will increase the attractiveness of North West Leicestershire for people who live and work here.

- Recycle 33% of household waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill by 20% by 2010, compared to 2000 levels.
- 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (in the district) below 1990 levels by 2010 (provisional target).
- Increase visitors to North West Leicestershire by 10% by 2010.
- Increase people's satisfaction with parks and open spaces to 90%. (provisional target)
- Three business a year to write and publish an environmental policy (provisional target).

### ***Actions***

Some of the most significant actions that we are proposing are:

- An audit and needs assessment of the open space, play and recreation needs of the District.
- More Kerbside Recycling and Green Waste Collections.
- Additional cycle paths (multi use trails) and improvements to footpaths (following the cycling strategy and network plan).
- Develop a Play Strategy
- Promote and develop tourism.
- Develop initiatives for promoting arts in the community.
- Develop a "Best Kept Ward" competition sponsored by local businesses in urban areas.
- Implement the recommendations of the North West Leicestershire Cultural Strategy "*Growing Together*"
- Develop an "Environmental Buildings Standard" for new development that promotes energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy.
- Promote Workplace Travel Plans for larger businesses to help reduce car usage, pollution and road congestion.
- Contribute to the National Forest Tree Planting Target to secure 500 hectares of new planting each year in the National Forest, by promoting schemes within North West Leicestershire.

## ***THEME FOUR: Access to Services***

Being able to get to local services, such as shops, dentists' and doctors' surgeries, leisure facilities, libraries and schools, when we need them, is critical for everyday life.

*Local Services* There are a number of things that affect how easy it is to get access to services - how close the services are to where we live, the availability of public transport to get us there and back - and of course the cost. This is particularly important to young people, older people who are less mobile and people with disabilities - and people without access to a car.

*Knowing about Services* Knowing what services are available and how to find out about them is essential if we are to be able to make best use of them. Information also needs to be accessible to people with visual and hearing impairments. Being able to make use of several different services on the same trip, because they are close together, is also important. The opening times of services are also important so that we can make use of them at convenient times. Buildings and all forms of public transport need to be physically accessible to people with disabilities, parents with pushchairs and people who are less mobile.

The need to improve access to services has emerged from our consultations as an important priority for people in North West Leicestershire.

*Access to Services* There are a number of things that could be done in the coming years to improve access to services. Bringing services closer to where people live and at the same time improving the provision of public transport to provide access to more distant services will have an impact. Making sure that information about services is more easily available and accessible to everyone and that the services themselves are accessible to disabled people will also help improve people's ability to get the most out of these services.

### ***Aims***

Our Aims are to:

- Improve access to public services and local shopping for everyone, especially people who have difficulty in getting to them.
- Improve access to service information for everyone.
- Increase the range of shops and services available.

### ***What's Already Happening?***

*Service Improvements* The District Council, The Primary Care Trust, Leicestershire County Council, The Police and other public service providers, including voluntary and community organisations, already work extremely hard to provide good access to the services that they provide. Many of these organisations have detailed consumer service plans to improve their services and their availability. New initiatives like Sure Start have been developed to provide support to families with children under four years old.

The County Council is seeking to improve all its services through its *Better Access to Better Services Initiative*, so that all

Leicestershire people can access services in the way they prefer. The District Council is also consulting people about its services to make them more responsive to people's needs. The Primary Care Trust is constantly trying to make health services more convenient and accessible. Organisations such as the Leicestershire Rural Partnership and Rural Community Council play a vital role in delivering practical projects, which can make a real difference to people living and working in rural Leicestershire. There are also a number of "One-Stop-Shops", such as those at Ibstock and Measham, which provide a wide range of local and service information in one place. Internet facilities and training is provided for local people at Measham, Moira and Appleby in addition to facilities at local colleges.

*Public Transport* There is a range of initiatives to improve public transport in the District. The voluntary sector runs a Dial-a-Ride scheme, the District Council has provided transport to Leisure Centres when there has been sufficient demand. Special needs transport is provided by the County Council. Subsidies are available for public transport in rural areas and grants are available to Parish Councils to develop innovative community transport projects. Many of these initiatives are promoted by the county-wide Local Transport Plan.

*Market Towns* The Market Towns Initiatives for Ashby and Coalville are also looking at how to improve these market towns as hubs for business, shopping and services. We will also be looking at the main villages, which provide services for rural areas.

*Schools and Colleges* The facilities at community colleges and some schools are open outside school hours for use by the community, some in partnership with the District Council. There are also programmes such as "Leisure Link" which provide subsidised or free leisure activities for those on means-tested benefit.

*User Forums* Planning and delivering services is often complex. Services often have to be provided with very limited resources. Service users are consulted about the best ways to manage and deliver services through Forums such as the Health Forum and the Disability Forum.

### ***Targets***

The Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire has set some targets, which it believes if met will make services more accessible by 2010.

- 95% of all households within 13 minutes walk of an hourly or better bus service by 2005/6.
- Seek to secure more convenient and accessible public or community transport to market towns and other service centres and key community facilities at the times they are required, where there is sufficient demand to sustain such services.
- Getting through to the right person in a public agency to answer a query will take no more than two phone calls.
- All public buildings will be accessible to people with disabilities by 2004 and will comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.

*Actions*

Some of the most significant actions we are proposing are:

- Extend services like dial-a-ride and other innovative forms of community transport.
- Develop a directory of services available for people in North West Leicestershire, and make this available "on-line".
- Make an "on-line" service directory available to all service providers.
- Extend the hours that leisure and community centres, schools and colleges open their facilities to the wider community at affordable prices.
- Develop a network of publicly accessible Internet facilities.
- Work with businesses to promote our two Market Towns and principal service villages and develop their facilities and services.
- Develop the shared use of facilities by different service providers, increasing "one-stop" use.
- Support the implementation of the local Transport Plan.
- Improve services and facilities for young and elderly people.



**..... and in Conclusion**

If we really want to make things happen - and make a difference, we will all have to play our part - as service providers, as local organisations, as voluntary groups and as individuals.

The requirement to produce a Community Strategy means that, for the first time, local people and organisations have a clear route, through the *Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*, to get their views across to service providers and policy makers.

By working together we should be able to combine resources and co-ordinate activities to best effect - so that as ordinary citizens we get a better deal and work towards agreed changes and improvements.

We all have the opportunity to contribute to the strategy - and to making things happen.

*The Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire*

*List of Members*

The Partnership for Improving North West Leicestershire Board is responsible for producing this draft strategy. The members are listed below.

Cllr John Fisher (Chairman)	North West Leicestershire District Council
Rev. G Glasius	Voluntary Sector Representative
Mick Wells	Charnwood & North West Leicestershire Primary Care Trust
Vacant	Secondary Education Representative
Mr Max Boden	Leicestershire Chamber of Trade & Industry
Inspector Jez Cottrill	North West Leicestershire Partnership in Safer Communities
Chief Superintendent I.R. Stripp	Leicestershire Constabulary
Mrs G Smith	NW Leicestershire Association of Parish Councils
Cllr F Straw	North West Leicestershire District Council
Mr D Raith	Higher Education Representative
Reverend J Stevenson	Faith Representative
Mr J Lee	Job Centre (District Manager)
Cllr Lesley Pendleton	Leicestershire County Council
Cllr Alison H Harrop	NW Leicestershire Health Forum

This membership may change as the partnership becomes more established.

# *Index*

---

## *A*

Arts · 7, 13, 15, 21  
     public art · 9, 19  
 Ashby · 8, 9, 13, 17, 23

---

## *C*

Castle Donington · 8  
 Children · 19, 20, 22  
 Civic Pride · 7, 12  
 Climate Change · 19  
 Coalville · 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 23  
 Community Action Zone · 17, 18  
**Community Wardens** · 15, 18  
 Consultation · 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 22, 23  
**Credit Unions** · 17  
 Crime and disorder · 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18  
 Crime and Disorder · 15

---

## *D*

Disabled People · 9, 10, 15, 22, 23  
 Drug Abuse · 8, 11, 18

---

## *E*

East Midlands Airport · 10, 19, 20  
**East Midlands Development Agency** · 16, 18  
 Economy  
     **cultural industries** · 16  
     local · 15  
 Education · 15  
     **adult** · 17  
     schools · 7, 15, 22, 23  
     **training** · 15  
**Education Improvement Zone** · 17  
 Employment · 7, 8, 16, 19  
 Environment  
     energy efficiency · 18  
     global · 7, 9, 19, 21  
     local · 7, 10, 19, 20

---

## *F*

**Faith** · 15  
 Flooding · 10

---

## *G*

Graffiti · 19  
**Greenhill** · 17

---

## *H*

Health · 7, 11, 15, 16  
     **coronary heart disease** · 16  
     mental · 16  
     mental · 15  
     services · 22  
**Housing** · 12, 15  
     affordable · 16

---

## *I*

Ibstock · 8  
 Income · 8  
     household · 7, 15, 18  
 Internet · 24  
 Investors in People · 18

---

## *K*

Kegworth · 8

---

## *L*

**Learning and Skills Council** · 17  
 Leisure · 7, 9, 15, 22, 23  
 Libraries · 22  
 Litter · 19, 20, 21

---

## *M*

**Market Towns** · 13, 23  
 Measham · 8

---

## *N*

National Forest · 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21  
 Noise · 10, 19, 20

---

## *O*

Older People · 9, 10, 22  
 One-Stop-Shops · 23

---

## *P*

Parish Councils · 23  
 Parks · 19, 20, 21  
 Pollution · 19, 20, 21

---

***R***

Recycling · 19, 20, 21

**Road Safety** · 15, 16, 18

---

***S***

Shops · 9, 22

---

***T***

Teenage Pregnancy · 8, 15, 17

Toung People · 24

**Tourism** · 17, 21

Town Centres · 9, 10

Traffic Accidents · 18

Transport

    cycling · 19, 20, 21

**Local Transport Plan** · 20, 23

    National links · 8

    public · 7, 9, 10, 20, 22, 23

    railways · 18

    walking · 19

---

***V***

**Village Appraisals** · 13

Volunteering · 13, 14

---

***Y***

Young People · 9, 13, 14, 16, 22



Please return to:  
Customer Care  
NWLDC  
FREEPOST  
MID22264  
Coalville  
LE67 3RK  
or  
goto [www.nwleics.gov.uk](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk)

## Community Strategy Response Form

1. How well do you think the Draft Strategy covers the most important issue for North West Leicestershire?

Very Well      Well      Not Well      Not Very Well

                

2. Have we identified the most important things to tackle in North West Leicestershire?

Yes      No

    

3. Please tell us about anything important we have missed?

4. Please list the three most important things you think need to be tackled locally.

1

2

3

5. Please tell us about any **specific** parts of the Strategy that you disagree with.  
(see the following page for specific comments)

<p>Community Spirit &amp; Involvement</p> <p>Aims</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>Actions</p>	<p>Personal Well-Being</p> <p>Aims</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>Actions</p>
<p>An Attractive Place to Live &amp; Work</p> <p>Aims</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>Actions</p>	<p>Access to Services</p> <p>Aims</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>Actions</p>



