



**Leicestershire Minerals Development
Framework: Core Strategy &
Development Control Policies DPD
(Preferred Options)**

**Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic
Environmental Assessment (SEA)**

**Sustainability Appraisal Report
(Appendices)
June 2006**

Prepared for Leicestershire County Council by:

Atkins Ltd
Axis 6th Floor West
10 Holliday St
Birmingham
B1 1TF

Tel: Nicki Schiessel 0121 483 5986
Email: nicki.schiessel@atkinsglobal.com

This document is copyright and should not be copied in whole or in part by any means other than with the approval of Atkins Consultants Limited. Any unauthorised user of the document shall be responsible for all liabilities arising out of such use.

Contents

| <i>Section</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|--|-------------|
| Appendix A: List of Consultees and Interested Stakeholders | 1 |
| Appendix B: Summary of the Consultation Responses on the Scoping Report | 17 |
| Appendix C: Baseline Tables | 24 |
| Appendix D: Assessment of Draft Preferred Core Strategy and Development Control Policies | 39 |

APPENDIX A: LIST OF CONSULTEES AND INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS

SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BODIES

GENERAL:

| | |
|--|---|
| East Midlands Regional Assembly Melton Mowbray | Programme Planning & Development, Birmingham |
| Countryside Agency, East Midlands Region, Nottingham | East Midlands Development Agency Nottingham |
| Environment Agency, Peterborough / Anglian Region, Northern Area / Tewkesbury / Trentside Offices, Nottingham | Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, Leicester |
| English Heritage , East Midlands Region Northampton | Coventry Airport, Coventry |
| English Nature, Grantham | East Midlands Airport Divisional Standards Manager (Environment), Castle Donington |
| Network Rail, Temple Meads, Bristol | Ministry of Defence, Defence Estate Organisation, Sutton Coldfield |
| Highways Agency, | British Waterways, East Midlands Office, Nottinghamshire |
| LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES AND COUNTY COUNCILS: | |
| Blaby District Council, Chief Planning Officer, Narborough | Chief Planning Officer, Melton Mowbray |
| Charnwood Borough Council, Head of Planning Services, Loughborough | North West Leicestershire District Council, Chief Planning Officer, Coalville |
| Harborough District Council, Development Control Manager, Market Harborough | Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, Assistant Director (Planning), Wigston |
| Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, District Planning Officer, Hinckley | Cambridgeshire County Council, Environment and Transport Department, Cambridge |
| Leicester City Council, Head of Development Plans, Leicester | Derby City Council, Development and Cultural Services Department, Derby |
| Melton Borough Council, | Derbyshire County Council, |

Director of Environmental Services,
Matlock

Lincolnshire County Council,
Head of Planning and Conservation,
Lincoln

Northamptonshire County Council,
Head of Sustainable Development,
Northampton

Nottingham City Council,
Director of Development,
Nottingham

Nottinghamshire County Council,
Director of Environment,
Nottingham

Peterborough City Council,
Head of Planning Services,
Peterborough

Staffordshire County Council,
Director of Development Services,
Stafford

Warwickshire County Council,
Warwick

Corby District Council,
Director of Development Services,
Corby, Northants

Daventry District Council,
Director of Development Services,
Daventry, Northants

East Northamptonshire District Council,
Chief Planning Officer,
Thrapston

East Staffordshire Borough Council,
Head of Planning and Engineering
Services,

PARISH COUNCILS:

Clerk to Aston Flamville Parish Council,

Clerk to Blaby Parish Council,

Clerk to Braunstone Parish Council,

Clerk to Countesthorpe Parish Council,

Burton on Trent
Erewash Borough Council,
Director of Technical Services,
Long Eaton

Kettering Borough Council,
Director of Development Services,
Kettering

Lichfield District Council,
Director of Planning,
Lichfield

Newark and Sherwood District Council,
Director of Development,
Newark, Nottingham

North Warwickshire Borough Council,
Borough Planning Officer,
Atherstone

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough
Council,
Director of Planning and Development,
Nuneaton

Rugby Borough Council,
Head of Planning Services,
Rugby

Rushcliffe Borough Council,
Director of Development,
West Bridgford, Nottingham

South Derbyshire District Council,
Planning Dept.,
Swadlincote, Derbyshire

South Kesteven District Council,
District Planning Officer,
Grantham,
Lincs.

Clerk to Cosby Parish Council,

Clerk to Croft Parish Council,

Clerk to Elmhurst Parish Council,

Clerk to Enderby Parish Council,

| | |
|--|---|
| Clerk to Glen Parva Parish Council, | Clerk to Mountsorrel Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Glenfield Parish Council, | Clerk to Newtown Linford Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Huncote Parish Council, | Clerk to Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Kilby Parish Council, | Clerk to Queniborough Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Kirby Muxloe Parish Council, | Clerk to Quorndon Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Leicester Forest East Parish Council, | Chairman of Ratcliffe on the Wreake Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Leicester Forest West Parish Council, | Clerk to Rearsby Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Lubbethorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Rothley Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Narborough and Littlethorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Seagrave Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Potters Marston Parish Council | Clerk to Sileby Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Sapcote Parish Council, | Clerk to Shepshed Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Sharnford Parish Council, | Clerk to South Croxton Parish Council, Chairman of Swithland Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Stoney Stanton Parish Council, | Clerk to Syston Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Thurlaston Parish Council, | Clerk to Thrussington & Cropston Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Whetstone Parish Council, | Clerk to Thurmaston Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Wigston Parva Parish Council, | Chairman of Ulverscroft Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Barkby Thorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Walton on the Wolds Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Barkby Parish Council, | Chairman of Wanlip Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Barrow upon Soar Parish Council, | Clerk to Woodhouse Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Beeby Parish Council, | Clerk to Wymeswold Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Birstall Parish Council, | Chairman to Allexton Parish Meeting |
| Clerk to Cossington Parish Council, | Clerk to Arnesby Parish Council, |
| Clerk to East Goscote Parish Council, | Clerk to Ashby Magna Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Hathern Parish Council, | Chairman of Ashby Parva Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Hoton Parish Council, | Clerk to Billesdon Parish Council, |
| | Chairman of Bittesby Parish Council, |

| | |
|---|--|
| Clerk to Bitteswell Parish Council, | Clerk to Great Glen Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Blaston Parish Council, | Chairman of Gumley Parish Council |
| Chairman of Bringham, Drayton & Nevill Holt Parish Meeting, | Clerk to Hallaton Parish Council |
| Clerk to Broughton Astley Parish Council, | Horninghold Parish Council |
| Clerk to Bruntingthorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Houghton on the Hill Parish Council |
| Clerk to Burton Overy Parish Council, | Clerk to Hungarton Parish Council |
| Chairman of Carlton Curlieu Parish Council, | Clerk to Husbands Bosworth Parish Council |
| Chairman of Catthorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Illston on the Hill Parish Council |
| Clerk to Claybrooke Magna Parish Council, | Chairman of Keyham Parish Council |
| Clerk to Claybrooke Parva Parish Council, | Clerk to Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Council |
| Cold Newton Parish Council, | Clerk to Kibworth Harcourt Parish Council |
| Harborough District Council, | Norton Parish Council |
| Clerk to Cotesbach Parish Council, | Clerk to Knaptoft Parish Council |
| Chairman of Cranoe Parish Council, | Chairman of Laughton Parish Council |
| Clerk to Dunton Bassett Parish Council, | Clerk to Launde Parish Council |
| Clerk to East Langton Parish Council, | Clerk to Leire Parish Council |
| Chairman of East Norton Parish Council, | Chairman of Little Stretton Parish Council |
| Clerk to Fleckney Parish Council, | Clerk to Loddington Parish Council |
| Clerk to Foxton Parish Council, | Chairman of Lowesby Parish Council |
| Chair of Frisby Parish Council, | Clerk to Lubenham Parish Council |
| Chairman of Frolesworth Parish Council, | Clerk to Lutterworth Parish Council |
| Clerk of Gaulby Parish Council, | Chairman of Marefield Parish Council |
| Clerk to Gilmorton Parish Council | Clerk to Medbourne Parish Council |
| Chairman of Glooston Parish Council, | Clerk to Misterton with Walcote Parish Council |
| Chairman of Goadby Parish Council, | Clerk to Nevill Holt Parish Council |
| Clerk to Great Bowden Parish Council, | |
| Clerk to Great Easton Parish Council, | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Chairman of Mowsley Parish Council | Withcote Parish Council, |
| Clerk to North Kilworth Parish Council | Clerk to Bagworth & Thornton Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Noseley Parish Council | Chairman of Shearsby Parish Council, |
| Chairman to Peatling Magna Parish Council | Chairman of Skeffington Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Peatling Parva Parish Council | Clerk to Slawston Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Rolleston Parish Council | Clerk to Barlestone Parish Council, |
| Saddington Parish Council | Clerk to Burbage Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Scraftoft Parish Council | Clerk to Cadeby Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Shangton Parish Council | Clerk to Desford Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Shawell Parish Council | Clerk to Earl Shilton Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Smeeton Westerby Parish Council | Clerk to Carlton Parish Council, |
| Clerk to South Kilworth Parish Council, | Clerk to Groby Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Stockerston Parish Council | Clerk to Higham on the Hill Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Stonton Wyville Parish Council, | Clerk to Market Bosworth Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Stoughton Parish Council, | Clerk to Markfield Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Swinford Parish Council, | Clerk to Nailstone Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Theddingworth Parish Council, | Clerk to Newbold Verdon Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Thorpe Langton Parish Council, | Clerk to Osbaston Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Thurnby Parish Council, | Clerk to Peckleton Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Tilton Parish Council, | Clerk to Ratby Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Tur Langton Parish Council, | Clerk to Shackerstone Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Ullesthorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Sheepy Parish Council, |
| Chairman of Welham Parish Council, | Clerk to Stanton-under-Bardon Parish Council, |
| Chairman of West Langton Parish Council, | Clerk to Stoke Golding Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Willoughby Waterleys Parish Council, | Clerk to Sutton Cheney Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Wistow Parish Council, | Clerk to Twycross Parish Council, |
| | Clerk to Witherley Parish Council, |

| | |
|--|---|
| Clerk to Asfordby Parish Council, | Clerk to Ashby Woulds Parish Council, |
| Parish Hall, 24 Main Street, | Clerk to Breedon on the Hill Parish |
| Chairman to Barkeston, Plungar and Redmile Parish Council, | Clerk to Castle Donington Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Belvoir Parish Council, | Clerk to Charley Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Bottesford Parish Council, | Clerk to Ellistown and Battleflat Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Buckminster Parish Council, | Chairman of Chilcote Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Croxton Kerrial Parish Council, | Chairman to Coleorton Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Eaton Parish Council, | Heather Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Freeby Parish Council, | Clerk to Ibstock Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Frisby and Kirby Parish Council, | Chairman of Isley cum Langley Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Gaddesby Parish Council, | Clerk to Kegworth Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Garthorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Lockington-Hemington Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Grimston, Saxelbye & Shoby Parish Council, | Clerk to Long Whatton Parish Council, Parish Manager of Measham Parish Council |
| Clerk to Hoby with Rotherby Parish Council, | Clerk to Normanton le Heath Parish Council |
| Clerk to Scalford Parish Council, | Clerk to Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe Parish Council |
| Clerk to Somerby Parish Council, | Clerk to Ravenstone with Snibston Parish Council |
| Clerk to Sproxton Parish Council, | Clerk to Osgathorpe Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Twyford and Thorpe Parish Council, | Clerk to Packington Parish Council |
| Clerk to Stathern Parish Council, | Clerk to Snarestone Parish Council |
| Clerk to Waltham & Thorpe Arnold Parish Council, | Chairman of Staunton Harold Parish Council, |
| Clerk to Wymondham Parish Council, | Chairman of Stretton en le Field Parish Council |
| Clerk to Appleby Magna Parish Council, | Clerk to Swannington Parish Council |
| Clerk to Ashby de la Zouch Town Council, | Clerk to Swepestone Parish Council |
| Chairman of Bardon Parish Council, | |
| Clerk to Belton Parish Council, | |

Vice Chairman to Worthington Parish Council

Chairman of Westrill and Starmore Parish Council

Clerk to Thurcaston and Cropston Parish Council

Clerk to Broughton , Old Dalby & Ab Kettleby Parish Council

Clerk to Kimcote and Walton Parish Council

Clerk to Burton and Dalby Parish Council

Chairman of Owston & Newbold Parish Council

Clerk to Clawson, Hose and Harby Parish Council

Clerk to Tugby and Keythorpe Parish Council

Clerk to Knossington and Cold Overton Parish Council

Clerk to Normanton-on-Soar Parish Council

ADJOINING PARISH COUNCILS:

Alverton and Kilvington Parish Meeting

Upper Broughton Parish Council

Colston Bassett Parish Council

West Leake Parish Council

Costock Parish Council

Whatton in the Vale Parish Council

East Leake Parish Council

Widmerpool Parish Council

Gotham Parish Council

Willoughby on the Wolds Parish Council

Granby cum Sutton Parish Council

Wysall and Thorpe in the Glebe Parish Council

Hickling Parish Council

Ashley Parish Council

Flawborough Parish Meeting

Brampton Ash Parish Council

Elton on the Hill Parish Meeting

Braybrooke Parish Council

Kingston on Soar Parish Council

Clay Coton Parish Meeting

Kinoulton Parish Council

Clipston Parish Council

Langar cum Barnstone Parish Council

Cottingham Parish Council

Normanton on Soar Parish Council

Dingley Parish Council

Orston Parish Council

East Carlton Parish Council

Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting

East Farndon Parish Council

Rempstone Parish Council

Great Oxendon Parish Council

Stanford on Soar Parish Council

Gretton Parish Council

Staunton Parish Meeting

Lilbourne Parish Council

Sutton Bonington Parish Council

Marston Trussell Parish Meeting

Thrumpton Parish Meeting

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Middleton Parish Council | Atherstone Town Council |
| Rockingham Parish Meeting | Austrey Parish Council |
| Sibbertoft Parish Council | Bentley and Merevale Joint Parish Council |
| Stanford on Avon Parish Meeting | Burton Hastings & Stretton Baskerville |
| Sulby Parish Meeting | Caldecote Parish Council |
| Sutton Bassett Parish meeting | Churchover Parish Council |
| Welford Parish Council | Clifton upon Dunsmore |
| Weston-by-Welland Parish Council | Copston Magna Parish Council |
| Wilbarston Parish Council | Grendon and Dordon Parish Council |
| Ashwell Parish Council | Harborough Magna Parish Council |
| Barrow Parish Meeting | Hartshill Parish Council |
| Baleythorpe Parish Meeting | Mancetter Parish Council |
| Belton in Rutland Parish Council | Monks Kirby Parish Council |
| Braunston in Rutland Parish Council | Newton & Biggin Parish Council |
| Brooke Parish Meeting | Newton Regis and Seckington Parish Council |
| Caldecott Parish Council | Pailton Parish Council |
| Greetham Parish Council | Polesworth Parish Council |
| Langham Parish Council | Wibtoft Parish Council |
| Lyddington Parish Council | Willey Parish Council |
| Market Overton Parish Council | Withybrook Parish Council |
| Oakham Parish Council | Wolvey Parish Council |
| Ridlington Parish Council | Aston upon Trent Parish Council |
| Stoke Dry Parish Council | Castle Gresley Parish Council |
| Stretton Parish Council | Elvaston Parish Council |
| Teigh Parish Meeting | Hartshorne Parish Council |
| Thistleton Parish Meeting | Linton Parish Council |
| Uppingham Parish Council | Melbourne Parish Council |
| Wardley Parish Meeting | |
| Whissendine Parish Council | |

Netherseal Parish Council

Overseal Parish Council

Rosliston Parish Council

Shardlow And Great Wilne

Smisby Parish Council

Ticknall Parish Council

Weston upon Trent Parish Council

Woodville Parish Council

Skellingthorpe Parish Council

UTILITIES and OTHER BODIES

Anglian Water Services Ltd,
Spalding,
Lincolnshire

British Telecommunications,
Hanley,
Stoke-on-Trent

Energis Communications Ltd,
Dartford

National Grid Company Plc,
Hams Lane,
Coleshill

Severn Trent Water Ltd,
Sheldon,
Birmingham

Transco West Midlands LDZ,
Wolverhampton

East Midlands Electricity Plc,
Castle Donington

Powergen,
Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station,
Nottingham

Transco East Midlands LDZ,
Mansfield,
Nottinghamshire

Central Networks
Derbyshire

British Waterways,
East Midlands Office,
Nottinghamshire

Coventry Airport,
Coventry

East Midlands Airport
Divisional Standards Manager
(Environment),
Castle Donington

GENERAL CONSULTATION BODIES

GENERAL:

Forestry Authority
East Midlands Conservancy,
Lincolnshire

British Geological Survey,
Onshore Minerals and Energy Resources
Programme,
Nottingham

The Coal Authority,
Department of Mining,
Projects and Property,
Nottinghamshire

Health and Safety Executive,
Field Operations Division,
Northampton

Sport England - East Midlands,
Nottingham

Ministry of Defence,
Defence Estate Organisation,
Sutton Coldfield

Department of Trade & Industry,
Minerals Team,
London

| | |
|--|---|
| DEFRA, Government Office for the East Midlands, Nottingham | NFU East Midlands Region, Rutland & Stamford Branch, Stamford |
| Council for the Protection of Rural England, Thurnby | Collyweston Stone Slaters Trust, Estate Office, Peterborough Age Concern, Leicester |
| Country Land & Business Association, Sutton Bassett, Market Harborough | CEH Directorate, Abbots Ripton, Huntingdon |
| Leicestershire Bridleways Association, Loughborough | CRE, Birmingham |
| Leicestershire Footpaths Association, Oadby | Leicestershire Representative, c/o DRC Helpline, Stratford upon Avon |
| Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust, Oadby, | Leicestershire Representative, c/o DPTAC , London |
| Loughborough Friends of the Earth, Quorn, Nr. Loughborough | Housing Corporation Leicester: Attenborough House, 109/119 Charles Street, Leicester |
| National Farmers Union, Uppingham, Rutland | Leicestershire Representative, c/o The Gypsy Council, European and UK office, Aveley, |
| The National Forest, Swadlincote | DTZ Pieda Consulting, Birmingham |
| The Ramblers Association, Coalville | Jones Day, London |
| Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Banbury | National Federation of Builders, Midland Region, Melbourne |
| The Woodland Trust, Grantham | Friends of the Earth (Leicester Branch,) Leicester |
| Leicestershire Representative, c/o CABE, London | Environ, Leicester |
| HBF Midland Region Contacts, Birmingham | |
| Ketton Conservation Trust, Ketton, Stamford | |
| National Playing Fields Association, Coventry | |

MPs and MEPs:

Mr. S. Dorrell MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. A. Duncan MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. E. Garnier MP,
House of Commons,
London

Ms. Patricia Hewitt MP,
House of Commons,
London

Sir Peter Soulsby MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. A. Robathan MP,
House of Commons, London

Mr. A. Reed MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. P. Whitehead MEP,
Regional European Centre,

Notts

Mr. D. Taylor MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. D. Tredinnick MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. K. Vaz MP,
House of Commons,
London

Mr. N. Clegg MEP,
Nottinghamshire

Mr. C. Heaton-Harris MEP,
Blaby Conservative Association

Mr. R. Helmer MEP,
Blaby Conservative Association

Mr. W. Newton-Dunn MEP,
Lincoln

Ms. M. Read MEP,
Regional European Centre,
Notts.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS:

| | |
|--|--|
| Leicestershire Local Strategic Partnership c/o Leicestershire Council Council, Leicester. | Leicestershire Cultural Strategy Forum, C/O Community Services Dept, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester |
| Blaby Local Strategic Partnership, Leicester. | Leicestershire Rural Partnership, Glenfield, Leicester |
| Charnwood Local Strategic Partnership, C/o Charnwood Borough Council, Charnwood | Leicester Racial Equality Council, Leicester |
| Harborough Local Strategic Partnership, Harborough District Council, Harborough | Leicestershire Constabulary, Force Headquarters, Enderby |
| Hinckley And Bosworth Local Strategic Partnership, Leicester | Chairman, Leicestershire Police Authority, Quorn, Leicestershire |
| Melton Community Partnership, Leicestershire | (Leics Cvs Community Partnership Representative), 'Coping With Cancer', Leicester |
| Director Of Public Health, Charnwood And Nwleics Pct, Loughborough | Board Of Social Responsibility, Leicester |
| Oadby And Wigston Local Strategic Partnership, Leicester | Loughborough University, Loughborough |
| Leicestershire And Rutland Association Of Parish And Local Councils, Melton Mowbray | Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce & Business Link, Leicester |
| Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce, Leicester | Acting Chief Executive, Blaby District Council, Narborough |
| Leicestershire And Leicester City Learning Partnership, Melton College, Melton Mowbray | Chief Executive, Charnwood Borough Council, Loughborough |
| Local Learning Partnership, Leicester | Chief Executive, Harborough District Council, Market Harborough |
| Leicestershire Learning And Skills Council, Leicester | Acting Chief Executive, Hinckley And Bosworth Borough Council, Hinckley |
| North West Leics Lsp And Chairman, Charnwood And North West Leics Pct, Ratcliffe On The Wreake | Chief Executive, Melton Borough Council, Melton Mowbray |
| Enable, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester | Chief Executive, North West Leicestershire District Council, Coalville |

Chief Executive,
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council,
Wigston

Jobcentre Plus,
Leicester

Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland
Combined Fire and Rescue Service,
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Chief Executive,
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Government Office For The East Midlands,
Nottingham

Melton Borough Councillor (Observer),
Melton Mowbray

Policy Team Leader, Chief Executive's Dept.,
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Assistant Chief Executive (Community
Planning),
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Policy Assistant, Chief Executive's Dept,
Leicestershire County Council,
Leicester

Environmental Management Section,
Community Services Department
Leicestershire County Council
Leicester

Leicester Partnership Development
Manager,
Leicester City Council,
Leicester

'Care And Repair (North West Leics) Ltd',
Coalville, Leicester

Children And Young Persons' Strategic
Partnership For Leicestershire (Cypspl), C/O
Social Services Department, Leicestershire
County Council

Director of Community Safety, Leicestershire
Fire And Rescue Service,
Glenfield

Leicestershire and Rutland Association of
Parish and Local Councils,
Leicestershire

CITY COUNCIL CONSULTEES:

Aylestone Village Society,
Aylestone

Braunstone Community Association,
Leicester

Capitec (Trent),
Sheffield

Chaos Enterprises (Leicester),
Tudor Centre,
Leicester

CPRE Leicestershire,
Leicestershire

De Montfort University,
Director of Estates,
Leicester

Fosse Golf Co (Leicester) Limited, Leicester

Hamilton Trustees,
Loughborough,

Leicestershire Asian Business Association,
Leicester

Lafarge Aggregates,
Melton Mowbray

University Hospitals of Leicester, Director of
Estates,
Leicester

Leicester Chamber Of Commerce, Leicester

Leicester City plc,
Leicester

Leicester City West Primary Care Trust,
Leicester

Leicester Civic Society,
Leicester

Leicester College,
Leicester

| | |
|--|--|
| Leicester Friends Of The Earth, Leicester | Open Spaces Society, Henley-on-Thames, Oxon |
| Leicester Regeneration Company, Leicester | |
| Leicestershire County Cricket Club, Leicester | Powergen Uk, C/o Dtz Pidea Consultants SecondSite Property, Basingstoke |
| Leicestershire Footpath Association, Nottingham | |
| Leicestershire Golf Club, Leicester | Leicester Rugby Football Club, Leicester |
| Leicestershire T2000, Leicester | The University Of Leicester, Director of Estates, Leicester |
| Biffa Leicester Ltd, Leicester | The Woodland Trust, Grantham |
| Leicestershire Business Voice, Leicester | Voluntary Action Leicester, Leicester |
| | INDUSTRY: |
| Viridor Waste Management, Taunton, Somerset | Acresford Sand & Gravel Ltd, Leicester |
| Lafarge Aggregates, Leicestershire | Midland Quarry Products, Buxton |
| GRS (roadstone) Limited, Wolvey, Hinckley | Tarmac Central Ltd, Buxton |
| Castle Cement, London | Bullimores Sand and Gravel, Grantham |
| Onyx UK limited, Wolverhampton | Hepworth Concrete, Ellistown |
| R.M.C Aggregates (Eastern Counties) Ltd, Peterborough | SITA, Meridan, Coventry |
| R.E.W. West, Leicestershire | UK Coal Mining Ltd, Doncaster |
| Aggregate Industries UK Ltd, Estates Manager, Leicestershire | Land & Mineral Resource Consultants Ltd, Yate, South Gloucestershire |
| Quarry Products Association, London | British Aggregates Association, Derbys. |
| Ennstone Breedon Ltd, Breedon-on-the-Hill | Dickerson Group, Cambridge |
| | British Gypsum Limited, Loughborough |

| | |
|--|--|
| Tapton Estates Limited, Sheffield | Bottesford, Nottingham |
| Hanson Brick, Bedford | Leicester Paper Processes, Coalville |
| Ibstock Brick Leicester Ltd, London | East Midlands Metals, Loughborough |
| Charnwood Forest Brick Ltd, Shepshed, Leicestershire | R.J. Stanley Plant Hire, Castle Donington |
| Red Bank Manufacturing Co Ltd, Measham, Derbys' | Cossington Stables, Cossington |
| Confederation of UK Coal Producers, Wakefield | Sherwood Skip Services, Greetham |
| British Ceramic Confederation, Stoke on Trent | De-Pack, Wymeswold, Burton on the Wolds |
| Ensor Holdings plc, Manchester | J. Smith & Sons, Granite Close, Enderby |
| Coal Contractors Limited, Rushyford, Co. Durham | Glenfield Waste, Glen Parva |
| Merriman Ltd., Thurmaston, Leicester | Westmoreland Hualage, Enderby, Leicester |
| Simon Heaton, West Bridgford, Nottingham | Planters, Osbaston |
| The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership (Northern), Leeds | Neil Harby, Granite Way, Loughborough |
| Smith Stuart Reynolds Consultants, Sywell, Northampton | LSPS, South Wigston, Leicester |
| George Wimpey (South Midlands) Ltd., Central Milton Keynes, Bucks. Mineral Surveying Services, Glenfield, Leicester | Cosby Spinneys Farm, Cosby |
| Wrightways Ltd., Coalville | Johnson Metals, Loughborough Pebble Hall Farm, Theddingworth |
| Mr. E. Taylor, Lynden Lea, Hinckley | Soars Lodge Farm, Countesthorpe |
| Midland Skip Hire, | Planning Licensing and Estates Manager, Waste Recycling Group PLC, Raynesway |

Glebe Farm,
Nuneaton

Planning Manager,
Biffa Waste Services Ltd.,
Sutton Coldfield

Steven's Scrap, Hungarton,
Leicester

Environmental Services Association, London

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF THE CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE SCOPING REPORT

Table A: Summary of Consultation Responses on the Scoping Report

| No | Consultee | Comments on Additional Information Sources | Further Comments | How Comments Have Been Dealt With |
|----|------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | English Nature | SEA and Biodiversity: Guidance for Practitioners, RSPB Local Geodiversity Action Plan for Leicester & Rutland: Contact British Geological survey Keith Ambrose, Kinsley Dunham Centre, Keyworth, Nottingham NG12 5GG Tel 0115 936 3100, Fax 0115 936 3200 European Landscape Convention could be added | Overall EN is pleased and supportive of the emphasis put on biodiversity in the report. % of SSSI in favourable conditions not included in Appendix A in the document. Supportive of inclusion of geodiversity within Minerals Development Framework. | Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. SSSI data to be included in Appendix C of MDF. Comments noted |
| 2 | English Heritage | National documents: 'The Historic Environment - a Force for our Future (DCMS 2001)...' Planning for the supply of natural building and roofing stone in England and Wales ' by the Symonds group, ODPM March 2004 Regional Documents: Regional Environment Strategy and 'Viewpoints on the historic Environment of the East Midlands'. | Table 6-1. Shortage of building and roofing stone is an issue for MDF. EH recommends designating heritage quarries. Table 4-2 in the document should refer to 'protecting and enhancing the historic environment.' Landscape change and the erosion of landscape quality and traditional character and the issue on aftercare and after use. Where mineral extraction cannot be avoided, the interpretation of the industrial and cultural heritage would be welcomed. Restoration schemes could restore past landscapes. Some previously developed land could be of natural or historic interest. | Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. LCC advises that heritage materials quarries are present in Rutland but that the resource is not generally available in Leicestershire Documents included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Documents included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Comments to be taken into consideration in development of MDF policies. Comment to be taken into consideration in development of MDF policies. Comments to be taken into consideration in development of MDF policies. Documents included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Comments to be taken into consideration in development of MDF policies. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------|
| | | | <p>Table 7-1 Objective 4 - it should be stressed that there should be no loss of designated sites. Loss of other sites should be minimised. A target relating to the enhancement of historic assets could be included. The appraisal should consider indirect impacts such as potential impact on the setting of historic sites. Non-designated features of local historic interest and value should be considered.</p> | Comments noted. |
| | <p>A gazetteer of sites is available on www.northamptonshire.gov.uk</p> | <p>Table 7-1 Objective 5 - Would welcome the inclusion of an indicator / target relating to the supply of building and roofing stone. A possible indicator could be the identification of existing and potential sources of stone, and potential heritage quarries. Ridge and Furrow field systems are threatened yet characteristic landscape features of Leicestershire.</p> | <p>Consider inclusion of suggested indicator in the MDF document. Include reference to ridge and furrow field systems in MDF document. Additional data source noted.</p> | |
| | <p>Other data sources: Extensive Urban Surveys, Conservation Area Appraisals, Buildings at Risk</p> | <p>Table 7-1 Objective 7: The first indicator should distinguish between ancient woodland and more recent plantation/ regenerated sites. Figure 5-4, the key should refer to 'Scheduled Monuments' and 'Registered Historic Parks and Gardens'. The registered Battlefield at Bosworth should be shown.</p> | <p>Update Figure 5.4 in MDF. Distinguish woodland types. Additional data sources noted.</p> | |
| | <p>Leicestershire's heritage service team should be consulted about baseline data for historic environments, designated sites, relevant issues, appraisal of significant effects, mitigation and enhancement, and monitoring.</p> | <p>Table 7-1 Objective 8: Waterlogged soils might contain significant archaeological remains which need to be considered. The number of listed buildings in each grade for each district should be shown in a table and reference to this be made in the key of the map.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Number of listed buildings grades for each district to be listed in a table within the MDF document. Update Figure 5.4. Heritage Services to be included in the next round of consultation.</p> | |
| | | <p>Table 7-1 Objective 14: As far as possible high quality building stone should not be used for aggregate. Changes to policy should seek to reduce future damage, provide appropriate mitigation, and to remediate existing damage to archaeological sites through waste operations and mineral extractions.</p> | <p>Comments noted and to be considered in the formulation of policies and proposals.</p> | |
| | | <p>The sustainability framework will need to set out the monitoring network.</p> | <p>Include a monitoring network.</p> | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 3 | Environment Agency | Publication referred - 'Policy and Practice for the Protection of Flood Plains' | Implication of flood risk should be identified in table 6-1 and table 7-1. The source for identifying 'reducing flood risk's a key issue should be PPG25, and not PPG23. EA is eager to discuss the issues and get engaged in considering core policies and options. SEA framework does not consider flood risk | Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Amend PPG reference. Include a flood risk objective and indicator in the MDF document. EA to be included in development of flood risk policies. |
| 4 | Biffa Waste Services | | Biffa finds the report to be quite comprehensive in its approach. | Objective 21 added to consider flood risk in MDF. Comments noted. |
| 5 | Lafarge- UK Aggregates | | In Para 3.6 there doesn't seem to be any recognition on the safeguarding of mineral resource or reserve itself or the means by which it is worked. Downstream infrastructure e.g. asphalt plants, mortar plants etc are not covered either as on-site or as stand-alone units. The land that has the capacity to facilitate such uses or to enable onward transportation of materials such as wharf sites and rail sidings are also not considered in this context. Point 12 of the SA draft framework, in the indicator column 'data on minimisation...' the context in which it is referred needs to be clarified. This same issue is pertinent to Point 1 of Table 8-1. The objective should be separated to cover two issues- minerals safeguarding/prevention of sterilisation and minerals management and their use. The above suggestion could relate to Point 4. Residential development being proposed near a mineral operation should not be allowed to have an adverse effect on the day to day running or reducing output due to limitations in respect to noise production or traffic movement or the overall viability of a site. | Amend para.3.6 to acknowledge site viability and site safeguarding in MDF document. Comments noted and the MDF document to be updated accordingly. Suggestion noted. Point 12 to be clarified. |
| 6 | Nottingham East Midlands Airport | Table 4-1 could include: ODPM circular 1/2003- Aerodrome Safeguarding and ICAO Annex 14 Vol 1- provision of Bird Strike Hazard Reduction | | MDF document to be amended Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Ensure that ASO are included in next round of consultation. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>7 Harborough Council</p> | <p>1. Core strategy Scoping Report, March 2005 and 2. Core strategy Issues and Options Report, May 2005</p> | <p>In the Plans and Programmes, the Local Plan should be referred to as Harborough District Local Plan. Initial SA report is no longer required. The SA/SEA work undertaken between the Scoping Report and the Preferred Options must be made available to the public for information e.g. on the county website The report should refer to the WDF as a relevant plan. The coordination of both reports would be advantageous. Any plans to test the compatibility of the objectives of the two plans? The framework is found to be very clear with appropriate objectives, indicators and targets. Table 9-1 lists some methodologies, but does not explain which methodologies may be more appropriate for certain types of policy. If they apply to every single policy, is there a resource implication?</p> | <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Amend title of Harborough District Local Plan. Action upon consultation responses to be displayed on LCC website. Comment noted. No, not required. Comment noted.</p> |
| <p>8 Warwickshire Council</p> | | <p>In Table 6-1 it is noted that 'minerals are transported by road...'. This should be expanded to include reference to congestion. Traffic issues are not sufficiently assessed until stage C. This may be too late. In Table 7-1 objective no.16 should refer in particular to reduce the transportation of minerals by road and thereby vehicle omissions. The Agency supports this key objective. In Figure 5-5, A6 through Leicester and Loughborough is identified as a trunk road which is no longer the case.</p> | <p>The Sustainability Appraisal reports indicate the exact methodology utilised in the assessments. Amend Table 6.1 in MDF document.</p> |
| <p>9 Highways Agency</p> | <p>Regional Freight Strategy should be included.</p> | <p>No comments on this occasion. Council wishes to continue to receive reports of this type. We have access but could not download. Send a print copy.</p> | <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Amend Table 7.1 in MDF document. Amend Figure 5.5 in MDF document.</p> |
| <p>10 Woodhouse Parish Council</p> | | | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>11 Medbourne Parish Council</p> | | | <p>Print copy to be sent.</p> |
| <p>12 The Countryside Agency-Landscape Access Recreation</p> | <p>The State of Countryside Report (East Midlands) 2004 www.countryside.gov.uk/publications/index.</p> | <p>Tables 4-1, 4-2, 6-1 and 7-1 should include reference to the relevant character areas from countryside agency's character assessment vol 4. Table 9-1 and appendix E- we welcome and agree with.</p> | <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Tables 4.2, 6.1 and 7.1 to be updated in MDF document.</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| | <p>Countryside Character Volume 4: East Midlands www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/cc.</p> <p>Topic Papers to view on the countryside Character Network www.ccnetwork.org.uk.</p> <p>National database for all landscape character assessment can be found at www.ccnetwork.org.uk/index.</p> <p>Data from Countryside Quality Counts (CQC) project www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk</p> <p>Nationally designated Landscape Area www.countryside.gov.uk</p> <p>Maps of all open countryside and registered common land in England www.countryside.gov.uk</p> <p>Web based GIS data www.magic.gov.uk</p> | <p>Landscape and Woodland Strategy has not embraced a landscape character assessment approach to understanding the landscape of the county.</p> <p>Local level LCA by Rutland County Council should be referred to.</p> <p>Table 4-2 should include information from 'shaping the future' sections of CACC Vol 4.</p> <p>Promotion of sustainable transport should be informed by the Rights of Way improvement plans.</p> <p>A map of the Agency's local landscape character areas could be included.</p> <p>Table 6-1. MDF policy should seek to 'enhance' landscape character.</p> <p>Table 7-1 objective 2, targets could be derived from objectives detailed for each character area identified in the local level LCA.</p> <p>The impacts of climate change should be taken into consideration within the MDF. The importance of the ancient woodland is missing from the draft. The distribution of ancient woodland should be included on either Figure 5-2 or 5-3.</p> <p>MDF should contain policies on climate change to ensure that site allocations and development control policies can be adapted to future conditions. Data on accessibility to woodlands in Leicestershire using the woodlands trust woodland access standard is available in map and numeric form, which the trust is happy and eager to supply.</p> <p>Mineral sites in close proximity to ancient woodland and other semi-natural habitats should be prioritised for restoration to woodland and other semi-natural habitats.</p> | <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document.</p> <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document.</p> <p>Additional information source noted. Update Table 3.2 in MDF document.</p> <p>Document/website reference to be included in MDF document.</p> <p>Include a map of local landscape character areas.</p> <p>Additional information source noted. Update table 6.1 in MDF.</p> <p>Additional information source noted. Amend Table 7.1 in the MDF document.</p> <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Refer to ancient woodlands and climate change in the MDF policies.</p> <p>Document included in Table 3.1 in MDF document. Consider whether climate change should be included in MDF policies.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| 13 | <p>Woodland Trust</p> <p>The regional forestry framework- Space 4 Tree (www.space4trees.org.uk)</p> <p>ODPM document 'The Planning Response to Climate Change</p> | <p>Fig 5.5 Principal transport routes does not show navigations, which are the principal transport routes for boats</p> | <p>Include navigation routes for boats in Figure 5.5.</p> |
| 14 | <p>British Waterways</p> | <p>Fig 5.5 Principal transport routes does not show navigations, which are the principal transport routes for boats</p> | <p>Include navigation routes for boats in Figure 5.5.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|----------------|
| | | | Appendix A table B notes modal split for waste movement. Note that dredgings from waterways may be spread on neighbouring fields or moved by barge. | Comment noted. |
|--|--|--|---|----------------|

APPENDIX C: BASELINE TABLES

Table A: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| No. & area of designated sites (& non-statutory local designations) | 91 SSSIs in LCC & Rutland (4500ha) 0.4ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1000 population. 34 SINC and one SSSI in Leicestershire No national parks. See maps in main report | No valid comparators | No trends identified at present | Lack of public knowledge & awareness of wildlife sites which may restrict access. | Leicestershire, Leicestershire & Rutland BAP Leicestershire Environment report ENABLE |
| Quality of designated sites | 66.67% of SSSI sites in Leicestershire meet PSA targets. Full condition survey data exists Full re-survey due in 2005. | Public Service Agreement (PSA) target to have 95% of the SSSI area in favourable or recovering condition by 2010. England: 65.36% of sites meeting PSA targets unfavourable recovering Leicestershire: 43.84% England : 19.83% unfavourable no change. Leicestershire 22.86%. England 21.66% unfavourable declining Leicestershire 10.24%, England 12.89% | Leicestershire better than England as a whole. Overall there has been a decline in the quality and quantity of SINC in Leicestershire. | Species-rich grasslands are Leicestershire's most threatened habitat. | Leicestershire environment report English Nature Regional Quality of Life indicators Leicestershire Environmental Statement 2002-3 |
| Population of species and areas of priority habitat | Datasets for Leicestershire currently in unclassified form, pending computerisation. 19 Habitat Action Plans, 14 Species Action Plans. BAP for National Forest and for Charnwood. Lowland wet grassland in Soar valley declined from 3200ha in 1940 to 150ha in 1998. | To meet 100% of the objectives set out in the Leicestershire, Leicestershire & Rutland BAP | A number of the last remaining old grassland sites have been safeguarded either by purchase or by designation as nature reserves, the creation of sand martin banks has led to 107 new breeding pairs in the county, and for the first time in many decades the other has once again been recorded as breeding in the catchment of the river Soar after decades of absence. Loss/fragmentation of habitat through modern agricultural practices leading to species decline. | Objectives in BAP are not quantified. Lack of baseline. Estimates of change not readily available. 'Unimproved' grassland, which once made up 90% of the agricultural landscape in the two counties, now considered 'extremely rare' by county wildlife experts | Leicestershire, Leicestershire & Rutland BAP, English Nature, ENV/iron http://www.environment.org.uk/issues/nature/Leicestershire/index.php?cid=121 |
| Area of woodland cover | 3.8% of Leicestershire & Rutland is woodland cover | The county is one of the least wooded areas of England | Total non-deciduous area of woodland has increased in | The county is one of the least wooded areas of England | ENABLE 2004 |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--------|--|
| Amount of new woodland planted | (1% of this is ancient semi-natural woodland). 256km ² of National Forest is within LCC. Woodland cover in National Forest area has doubled since 1991- 5 million new trees, and 575ha of derelict mineral workings & coalfield land planted. | National Forest area target of 1/3 woodland cover. | recent years. National Forest area is achieving and exceeding annual targets. | | ENABLE 2004 Www. nationalforest.org |

Table B: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Air

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Assessment against UK National air quality targets | NO2 exceedances in 2004 by district: LC: Leicester 1N – 1 Leicester 2N - 1 B: 0 C: Loughborough 1N - 1 H: Harborough 1N – 1 Harborough 5N - 1 H&B: 0 M: 0 NWL: Coalville 10N - 1 O&W: 0 | To achieve national air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide within Districts by end 2005 (defined in the Air Quality Regulations (2000)) | Progress towards targets in most areas Air quality monitoring over the past few years has indicated that pollution levels have remained generally static or increased modestly. | Probability that many districts will not meet target for Nitrogen Dioxide - Annual mean not exceeding 40ug/m3 in certain areas. Possibility that short term standards for fine particle (PM10)1 concentrations may be exceeded around Croft Quarry in Blaby DC. | Local Air Quality Management Strategies/Action Plans www.airquality.co.uk data Stage 4 Review for: Harborough DC, Blaby DC, Leicestershire CC, NW Leics DC ENABLE |
| No. of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) | 15 AQMAs Leicester: 1 Blaby: 3 Charnwood: 3 Harborough: 1 Hinckley & Bosworth: 0 Melton: 1 NW Leics: 2 Oadby & Wigston: 4 | To achieve national air quality objectives for NO2 defined in the Air Quality Regulations (2000) by 2005 | Leicestershire: no change from 2000 Blaby: 2004 review shows worsening. Possible extension of AQMAs Charnwood: no change. Harborough: Worsening. AQMA to be extended Hinckley & Bosworth: reduced from 2 following review in 2004 Melton: No data at present NW Leics: reduced from 6 following review 2003 Oadby & Wigston: no data at present | All AQMAs due to traffic. Limited potential to reduce road traffic in AQMAs. | Local Air Quality Management Strategies/Action Plans www.airquality.co.uk data Stage 4 Review for: Harborough DC, Blaby DC, Leicestershire CC, NW Leics DC |
| Modal Split for waste transport | 100% road | No target identified | No trend identified at present | Limited infrastructure potential for non-road transport of waste | Atkins internal review. |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|-------------------|--|---|----------------------------|--|--------|
| Traffic Volumes | Traffic on m1 J19-22 in Leicestershire 41,800-67,500ADT northbound, 45,000-68,700ADT southbound. Jan-Sep2004. HGVs form 18.5-27.4% northbound, 19.5-25.6% southbound | No target identified | Further growth anticipated | Anticipated traffic growth on motorways? | |

Table C: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Climatic Factors

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| CO2 Emissions (By sector) | No data identified to date | Target to reduce national carbon dioxide emissions by 30% by 2011, from a 1996 baseline figure. | Not yet identified | | |
| Energy consumption per sector | No data identified to date | No comparators identified | E Mids Draft Sustainable Energy Strategy 2003 predicts that E Midlands total energy consumption (domestic, commercial industrial & transport) will increase by 15% by 2020. | Increase in energy use | ENABLE 2004 |
| Renewable Energy | In 2003, for LCC: Wind power – none Biomass - none Landfill gas – 10.7MW Anaerobic Digestion - 1.34MW Photovoltaics - <0.2MW Total renewable energy <12.24MW Bradgate Landfill has approx 3MW capacity, Narborough 2MW and Cotesbach 3 MW. Landfill gas power generators also exist at Lount, Mountsorrell & Enderby | Gov't target to supply 10% of UK electricity from renewable sources by 2010. To be met for 2010 for LCC: Wind power – 22MW Biomass - 11.2MW Landfill gas – 18MW Anaerobic Digestion – 3.2MW Photovoltaics – 0.4MW Total renewable energy 58MW | At present, Leicestershire unlikely to meet targets | Lack of renewable energy sources developed within the county. Growing timber economy – potential for wood heating. | ENABLE 2004 East Midlands Draft Sustainable energy strategy 2003 Atkins review. |
| Conservation of Energy | No data identified to date | National home-energy conservation target is 30% increase in domestic energy efficiency by 2010 | | Lack of data and monitoring for energy efficiency outside Council's own operations. | |

Table D: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Water and Soil

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Contaminated Land | Charnwood : no sites identified 2003 Other LAs – no data identified No comprehensive register of contaminated sites in LCC exists | No targets identified | New contamination less likely than previously due to environmental controls | Historical land use in Leicestershire has resulted in the potential for further contamination, although the identification of sites is dependent on the development control process. Lack of data on sites Cost and lack of disposal facilities for hazardous waste may in some cases reduce attractiveness to developers of brownfield sites | District websites. Blaby Contaminated Land strategy ENABLE 2004 Regeneration & Renewal 4March 2005 p10 |
| % of development on previously developed land (PDL) | Data incomplete for Districts No data for waste sites on PDL | 60% of new dwellings on PDL by 2008 (PPG3). RPG 60% by 2021. Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland Structure Plan 50% of dwellings on PDL | Overall, targets appear to be being met. | Potential housing pressure for development on open spaces in the future | |
| % of best and most versatile agricultural land occupied by development | 80% of land use in Leicestershire is agriculture | No targets identified at present | Decline in livestock farming. | Agricultural land is subject to loss due to competition from developments especially around peripheral urban areas. | |
| Improvement/worsening of soil quality | No data at present | No targets identified | No trends identified | | |
| Water Quality (Biological and Chemical) | In 2003 94.2% of rivers in Leicestershire were classified as good or fair chemical quality. 87.1 % were classified as good or fair biological quality. 96.1% were classified as poor phosphate quality. 48.8% were nitrate poor or | In the UK, it is estimated that about 95 % of rivers were of good or fair chemical quality in 2003, and about 73 % of rivers in 2003 were of good chemical quality. In England: 93 % of river lengths were of good or fair chemical quality in | No trends identified | Focus on chemical quality tends to ignore phosphate and nitrate quality. Some downstream pollution on River Soar from discharges | www.defra.gov.uk, www.environment-agency.gov.uk ENABLE 2004 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/regions/eas tMidlands/activities/ /evidenceAndAnalysis/rsotc/ Natural_resources.asp |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | bad. | 2003, compared with 84 % in 1990. 62 % were of good quality in 2003, compared with 43 % in 1990. In the UK, it is estimated that about 96 % of rivers were assessed as being of good or fair biological quality in 2003 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In England, 95 % of river lengths were of good or fair biological quality in 2003 compared with 89 % in 1990. 69 % were of good biological quality in 2003 compared with 60 % in 1990. | | | |
| Nitrate vulnerable zones | All of Leicestershire declared NVZ in 2002 | 55% of England designated NVZ in 2002 | In 1996 only 2 NVZs – area has increased | | ENABLE 2004 |
| Groundwater vulnerability | EA data received but not yet mapped | No targets identified | No trends identified | Groundwater quality generally good in Leicestershire and aquifers of low vulnerability to pollution | ENABLE 2004 |
| No of properties at risk of flooding | 15700 properties in Flood Zone 3 (>1% chance of river flooding, pa) Naborough landfill is in a flood risk zone | Flood Zones show where flood waters would go if no defences (PPG25) | Improved flood alleviation system near Melton Mowbray completed 2002/3. | Development Pressures on floodplain increase risk of downstream floods and damage to property. Potential increase in flood risk due to future climate change if adaptation measures not implemented | EA Data 2004 ENABLE 2004 ENABLE Draft Climate Change Strategy |
| Flood Zones | See attached mapping. | No targets identified | No trends identified, though improved flood control systems have minimised effects. | The River Soar valley in particular has suffered significant flooding since late 18 th C | ENABLE 2004 |
| Pollution incidents investigated by Environment Agency | 67 waste-management related incidents recorded by EA in 2003 | No targets identified | No trends identified | | EA data |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|----------------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---|---------|
| Fly tipping incidents by council | 3220 incidents dealt with by local authorities Mar-Oct 2004. Total incidents per head of population were: Blaby 0.002 Charnwood 0.012 Harborough 0.002 Hinckley & Bosworth 0.003 Leics City 0.001 Melton 0.004 NW Leics 0.004 Oadby & Wigston 0.001 | No targets identified | No trends identified | Charnwood had twice the total number of recorded incidences of fly-tipping than any other Districts during this period. This may be due to a short term anomaly in data collection, a specific clean-up 'drive' or an underlying problem which needs further investigation. Leicester City after Charnwood, had the second highest rate of fly-tipping per square km | EA data |

Table E: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Cultural Heritage / Landscape

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| No. of Listed Buildings/scheduled ancient monument/historic parks/historic landscapes and proportion at risk | 212 Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) 244 historic townscapes or villages 16 parks & gardens on English Register of Historic Parks & Gardens 1 battlefield on English Heritage Battlefields Register 4337 buildings listed for special architectural or historic interest. Risk unknown. See map in main report | Nationally 3.6% of Grade 1 and Grade II* listed entries at risk in England and Wales | | Many features of cultural heritage significance are not registered and may therefore be overlooked. Leicester has a high level of community and voluntary support for cultural heritage | ENABLE, 2004 |
| % of development on PDL | | 60% of new dwellings on PDL by 2008 (PPG3: Housing, 2000) | Continuation of 100% of development on PDL in Leicester City is predicted to continue | Potential housing pressure for development on open spaces in the future | Leicester City figures |
| Landscape character areas | 43% Leicestershire is tilled agricultural land 35% managed grassland No AONBs or National Parks 18 Character areas | No comparators or targets identified. County Historic Landscape characterisation will commence in summer 2005. | Continued pressure from residential, industrial, power generation, mineral workings and transportation around margins of urban areas and major river valleys of Trent & Soar. Development pressure associated with East Midlands Airport | Lack of detailed mapping and characterisation to underpin planning decisions. No historic landscape classifications mean that significance can be overlooked Lobby continuing for Charnwood Forest to be designated an AONB | ENABLE 2004 Leicestershire, Leicester & Rutland Landscape & Woodland Strategy |
| Changes in countryside character and countryside quality | Countryside Agency character profiles indicate a large number of East Midlands character areas show some or marked changes inconsistent with character | | Gradual erosion of traditional character | Lack of local-level detail mapping and characterisation to underpin planning decisions – local character area descriptions are not much more detailed than regional ones. | ENABLE 2004 http://www.countryside.gov.uk/regions/ http://www.countryside-quality-counts.org.uk/cap/eastmids/index_em.htm |

Table F: Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends for Population and Human Health

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Noise Levels | 22% of Leicestershire residents surveyed 2002-3 concerned about noise in their area | No comparators or targets identified | | | Leicestershire Quality of Life indicators for 2002-3 |
| Life expectancy | Data to be collected from census profiles | 2000-2002 Females in England – 80.64 2000-2002 Males in England – 75.98 | | | www.statistics.gov.uk |
| Proportion of people with self assessed good health | Data to be collected from Census profiles | | | | |
| Employment Activity | | The economic activity rate (working age population) for Leicestershire in 2003 (80.6%) was higher than the regional (80%) and national (79.5%) averages. | | However, this disguises considerable differences, with Leicestershire recording a very low activity rate (70.7 per cent). Overall, unemployment in Leicestershire is very low at 2.8% (just 1.5 per cent in the County). However, this masks significant variations; in the City a rate of 5.6 % was recorded in October 2003. Within specific communities there are pockets of very high unemployment such as in Wycliffe Ward and North Braunstone Ward in the City and Greenhill Ward, North West Leicestershire. | LSEP |
| Unemployment Rate | At September 2004: Leicestershire: 2.3% Leicestershire County 1.2% Leicestershire City 4.6% | East Midlands 1.9% UK 2.3% | Continued decline in traditional manufacturing forecast. Increase in knowledge industries & service sector | Relatively low skills base restricts employment growth | http://www.lerp.co.uk/downloads/september%202004.pdf Source: Office for National Statistics (NOMIS) |
| Employment in Waste industry | Leicestershire: 982 employees (0.3% of all employees) in employment category 900: Sewage and | No targets or comparators identified | | | NOMIS Data retrieved 16 Feb 2005 |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|---|---|--|------------------------|---|---|
| Deprivation | refuse disposal, sanitation & similar activities. Leicester City is 29 th most deprived of 149 local authorities. Leicester County is 136 th most deprived. | | No trends identified | According to the Government Indices of Multiple Deprivation, 13 of the City's 28 wards rank within the most deprived 10% nationally - 47.1% of the population of Leicester City live in wards which rank within the most deprived 10% of the wards in the country. None of the wards in Leicester County rank within the most deprived 10%. Within the County, Harborough District ranks within the least deprived 10% of districts nationally, with Blaby, Melton and Oadby & Wigston ranking within the least 20%. Leicester County is in the 10% least deprived of counties and unitary authorities nationally. | |
| Street cleanliness | LCC: In 2001/02 the Cleaning Index for the city centre was 69%, and in 2002/03 it had reached 75% LC: No data | To improve the cleanliness of Leicester city centre (Cleansing Index – PSA measure – in the city centre to be 75% or above by 2005) | Improving. Met target. | | Leicester Environmental Statement. 2002-3 |
| Statistics on complaints about waste sites (noise/odour/dust/vermin etc) Population density and rural population | Data to be collected from District Environmental Health officers Population density per square km for districts is : Leicester UA 3834 Leicestershire 339 Blaby 694 Charnwood 550 Harborough 129 Hinckley and Bosworth 337 Melton 99 NW Leicestershire 306 Oadby and Wigston 2324 | No comparators identified The proportion of the East Midlands population living in rural districts rose from 38.47% in 1981 to 40.62% in 2001. This is the third highest proportion for any English region. Nationally, only 28.52% of the population lives in rural areas. | No trends identified | | http://www.countryside.gov.uk/EvidenceAndAnalysis/state_of_the_countryside_reports/regionalSOCRdownloads.asp GOEM |

Table G: Additional Economic and Social Baseline Data, Indicators, Targets and Trends

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Areas of space/outdoor recreation (ha of open space per 1,000 urban population) | In Leicestershire, approx 30% of land area is open space, including the riverside, woods, green wedges, country parks and local amenity spaces, as well as private open space such as gardens. 18% of city area classified as public open space. Oadby & Wigston Borough has 173 hectares of Outdoor Sports Playing Space which equates to 3 hectares per 1,000 population. (74% in private or educational use) | National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) recommends 2.43 ha of open space per 1000 population (1.6ha – 1.8ha should be for outdoor sport, 0.6ha – 0.8ha should be children's playing space (PPG17 – each borough is recommended to produce open space assessment to ensure validity of NPFA targets) | Leicester: There was an increase of 2.1 hectares of publicly accessible green space from 875.9 hectares in 2001/02 to 878 hectares in 2002/03. This target (863 ha by 2020) is currently being exceeded. Leicester is well provided for in terms of public open space, though some areas of the city are deficient in accessible local open space | Oadby & Wigston Draft SPG play & open space | http://www.environmentcity.org.uk/article.asp?ParentID=2&ArticleID=82 |
| Access to rights of way and open space | Leicester: 2002-3 878ha of publicly accessible green space Leicestershire QoL indicator data – 71% of residents finding it easy to access publicly accessible green space (2002-3 data) | Leicester Environmental Statement Target 10.1 to maintain this level to 2020 | Slight increase since 1997 (2.1ha) | Limited space for outdoor pursuits has placed visitor pressure on areas such as Charnwood Forest | Leicester Environmental Statement 2002-3 ENABLE |
| Economic growth | | | | | |
| Environmental awareness & education/waste minimisation | July 2003 14 Leicestershire schools had the Eco-schools award | 20 further schools working towards accreditation | | Objective: DES 2003 – all learners will develop skills, knowledge & value base to be active citizens in creating a more sustainable society Many districts did not meet 2003/4 targets. While significant investment has been made to improve performance, there is a risk some 2005/6 targets may not be met | ENABLE Strategic overview of Leicestershire's 2004; |
| Waste Recycling (household/industrial/commercial) | District recycling performance for 2003/4 is: Blaby 21.2% Charnwood 16.5% Harborough 14.9% Hinckley & Bosworth 21.7% Melton 31.5% | Targets for 2003/4 and 2004/5 are: Blaby – 20% / 30% Charnwood – 33 / 36 Harborough – 10 / 18 Hinckley & Bosworth – 18 / 27 | | | LCC Data |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|---|--|---|--------|---|--------|
| | NW Leics 14.2% Oadby & Wigston 21% Leicester City 14.7% | Melton – 33 / 40 N W Leics – 16 / 24 Oadby & Wigston – 33 / 36 Leicester City – 18 / 27 National recycling target in 2004/2005 at least 14% of household waste. Achieving the statutory target of recycling or composting 10% of domestic waste in 2003/04 18% 05/06 and 30% by 09/10: (2002/2003 just over 7% of household rate recycled); | | | |
| Waste Transfer Streams (internally in Council) | No data identified | No targets identified at present | | | |
| Waste disposal data (household/industrial/commercial) | With small exceptions, 100% of household, industrial and commercial waste landfilled. Tonnages for each disposal method are: Transfer station - 453,464 tonnes but most still ends up at landfill Licensed composting - 27,136 tonnes Exempt composting - No returns Materials Recycling Facilities - 4268t (Biffa Ball Mill start) Scrap Metal Recycling - 2345t (limited returns available) Waste storage - 1129t Sewage treatment - 24,170t Physical treatment i.e. screening of inerts - 55,645t | No comparators identified | | Waste taken to transfer stations is largely landfilled rather than treated by other means | |

| General Indicator | Quantified Data | Comparators and Targets (if applicable) | Trends | Issues | Source |
|---|--|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | (excludes exemptions) Landfill - 878,711tonnes. Dozens of exempt facilities for which there is no info on tonnes exist but EMRWS estimates that 706,800 tonnes of Construction and Demolition Waste was processed by exempt facilities in Leics. | | | | |
| Hazardous waste data | In 2002 Leicestershire imported 57,819 tonnes of hazardous waste and exported 25,927 tonnes (most recent data) | No comparators identified | | Leicester now have no licensed hazardous waste sites and therefore all waste is now exported. | Atkins internal review. |
| % value recovered from waste | No data identified at present | | | | |
| Amount of waste carried by road vehicle and by rail and other modes | 100% transported by road | No comparators or targets identified | No trends identified | Little potential for non-road transport, though disused Ivanhoe rail line exists | |

APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT OF DRAFT FINAL PREFERRED CORE STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>POLICY 1: SUSTAINABLE MINERAL DEVELOPMENT</p> | <p>Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development unless it can be demonstrated that the Government's objectives for sustainable minerals development have been appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Government's objectives are as follows (as in supporting text to policy):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to conserve and safeguard mineral resources as far as possible; to protect nationally and internationally designated areas of landscape and sites of nature conservation value from minerals development, other than in exceptional circumstances where it has been demonstrated that the proposed development is in the public interest; to secure supplies of the material needed by society and the economy from environmentally acceptable sources; to ensure, so far as practicable, that outcomes for the minerals industry are consistent with the Government's aims for productivity growth and strong economic performance; to secure sound working practices so that the environmental impacts of extraction and the transportation of minerals are kept to a minimum, unless there are exceptional overriding reasons to the contrary; to minimise production of mineral waste; to promote efficient use and recycling of suitable materials, thereby minimising the net requirement for new primary extraction; to protect, and where possible, to enhance the overall quality of the environment once extraction has ceased through high standards of restoration and to safeguard the long-term potential of land for a wide range of afteruses. |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|----|----|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| 01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer directly to objective although the Government's objectives refer to protection of nationally and internationally designated sites of nature conservation. Policies 24 and 25 address this objective but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. See also assessments of policies 24, 25 and 36. |
| 02 To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | Uncertain effect. | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer directly to objective although the Government's objectives refer to protection of nationally and internationally designated areas of landscape. Policies 24 and 25 address this objective but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. See also assessments of policies 24, 25 and 36. |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 03 | To conserve geodiversity | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | No specific policy in the minerals development framework to cover this objective and no mention to conservation of geodiversity in any of the other policies. |
| 04 | To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer to objective. Policies 24 and 25 address this objective (see assessments) but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. See also assessment of policies 26, 38 and 39. Policy does not refer to objective. Policies 24 and 25 address partially this objective (see assessments) but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. In addition there is no specific policy covering the promotion of use of local building materials and no mention to in any of the other policies. |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to the objective. Policy 34 addresses this objective but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. See also assessments of policies 34 and 36. |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to the objective. Policy 31 addresses this objective but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to the objective. Policies 37 and 38 (see assessments) address this objective partially but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer directly to objective. However reference is made to the environment as a whole and transportation. Policies 32 and 35 (see assessments) address this objective but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to the objective. Policy 31 addresses this objective but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to objective. Policy 30 (see assessment) addresses this objective partially but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to objective. Policy 29 (see assessment) addresses this objective partially but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to objective. However it refers to conserving and safeguarding mineral resources as far as possible. Policies 7 and 7a deal specifically with sterilisation of mineral reserves but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective. |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | With reference to the government objectives to sustainable mineral development this policy has the ability to achieve this objective. | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | In addition see assessments of policies 3 and 30. |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Policy does not refer specifically to objective. Policy 28 addresses this objective partially but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | With reference to the government objectives to sustainable mineral development this policy could achieve this objective by ensuring transportation of minerals is minimised | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | See also assessment of policy 32. |
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective |

| | | As economic performance is referred to in the governments objectives for sustainable mineral development this policy could achieve the objective | +/? | +/? | +/? | |
|----|---|--|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | | | | | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | The Government's objective to protect, and where possible, to enhance the overall quality of the environment once extraction has ceased through high standards of restoration will have positive effect. | + | + | + | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | Uncertain effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective. Policies 34 and 37 (see assessments) address this objective partially but Policy 1 does not refer to other relevant policies in the minerals development framework making it a weak overarching policy with regards to this SA/SEA objective. |

POLICY 2: ENSURING A SUSTAINABLE SUPPLY OF MINERALS
 Planning permission will only be granted for the extraction of non-energy minerals where it is necessary to maintain stocks of permitted reserves having regard to agreed sub-regional apportionment figures or, where no apportionment exists, the demonstrated need and nature of the particular industry concerned.

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|----|----|----------------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| 01 <i>To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 02 <i>To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 03 <i>To conserve geodiversity</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 04 <i>To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 05 <i>To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 06 <i>To protect the quality of ground and surface waters</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>POLICY 3: AGGREGATE RECYCLING</p> | <p>Recycling initiatives will be encouraged, subject to proposals according with other policies contained in the minerals development framework.</p> <p>Provided that proposals accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework, planning permission will be granted for aggregate recycling facilities and for development involving production of secondary and recycled aggregates in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing mineral operations; • Existing waste management operations; • Appropriate industrial estate locations; and • Other appropriately located sites close to the source of materials with good infrastructure links. |
| <p>POLICY 4: TEMPORARY RECYCLING FACILITIES</p> | <p>Subject to proposals according with other policies contained in the minerals development framework, temporary aggregate recycling facilities will be encouraged at demolition, construction, land reclamation, highway and other smaller-scale reclamation projects. In particular, temporary planning permission will be granted for the use of plant to recycle site clearance waste where the materials are to be used in further development of the same site, provided the environmental and amenity impact is acceptable. The district planning authorities within the framework area will also be encouraged to adopt this approach.</p> |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; - slightly negative; -- moderately negative; --- strongly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|----|----|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| 01 <i>To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 24 and 25. |
| 02 <i>To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 24 and 25. |
| 03 <i>To conserve geodiversity</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 04 | To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 26, 38 and 39. |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 34 and 36. |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessment of policy 31. |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 37 and 38. |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessment of policies 32 and 35. |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | Recycling of minerals could indirectly help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from reducing the need for further mineral development | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | Recycling may reduce the need for further mineral development elsewhere thereby reducing nuisance at other future proposed sites | + | + | + | + | + | See also assessment of policy 29 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | Recycling of aggregates may lead to the use of previously developed sites | + | + | + | + | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | Both policies directly encourage the recycling and consequent efficient use of raw materials | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ | |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessment of policy 28. |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | Siting of recycling facilities at the location offers the opportunity to minimise transportation of minerals, particularly where lorries can be prevented from making 'empty' trips. Long term, increased recycling, particularly locally, can reduce the need for transportation of new minerals | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | Maintains diversity of employment and geographical spread. However there may be some indirect loss of employment in the medium/long term through reduced minerals extraction. This is likely to balance overall to give a positive effect in the medium/long term. | +/- | + | + | + | Based on assumption that the market for recycled materials remains stable or grows. However, if this does not happen, any lack of employment in this area is likely to be compensated by employment in extraction. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----|---|---|---|--|
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | Diversification from extraction to recycling activity maintains local employment and generates new businesses. However, there is possible economic loss for transport companies and possible lack of expansion of extraction operations. Overall balance likely to be neutral | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | Recycling will indirectly affect health overall through likely reduction in traffic. However there may be some local adverse effects on health related to dust. | +/- | 0 | 0 | + | Effect uncertain and dependent on traffic patterns, pollution control measures and locations of sites. |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>POLICY 5: MINERAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN PREFERRED AREAS</p> | <p>Specific sites and areas will be allocated to provide sufficient mineral reserves to meet anticipated need over the period of the minerals development framework. Planning permission will be granted for proposals that accord with the type of mineral development that is identified as being appropriate to the site or area, provided that such proposals accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 6: MINERAL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE PREFERRED AREAS</p> | <p>Planning permission for non-energy minerals development outside the preferred areas will not be granted unless it accords with other policies contained in the minerals development framework and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It can be demonstrated that it is required to meet a proven need that cannot otherwise be met from a more sustainable source or ii. It consists of a small-scale extension to an existing site or iii. It involves significant net environmental benefits or iv. The sterilisation of resources would otherwise occur. |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| <p>01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</p> | <p>No effect</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 24 and 25.</p> |
| <p>02 To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</p> | <p>No effect</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 24 and 25.</p> |
| <p>03 To conserve geodiversity</p> | <p>No effect</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>04 To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value</p> | <p>No effect</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 26, 38 and 39.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|----|----|----|--|
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 34 and 36. |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessment of policy 31. |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 37 and 38. |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 32 and 35. |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. Policy 30 (see assessment) addresses this objective partially. |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | No effect | | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessment of policy 29. |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | Sub-section iv is positive in avoiding sterilisation | | ++ | ++ | ++ | Also see assessment of policies 7 and 7a |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | Restriction of site location in general offers protection. Policy 6 (through i and iii) has the potential to allow development on best and most versatile land. | - | - | - | Also see assessment of policies 28 and 36 |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | In policy 6, i and iv have potential for increasing traffic, dependent on location ii, if the extension is to maintain output and replace worked-out areas, is unlikely to generate additional traffic to the baseline situation. The effects of iii are unclear as this requires overall assessment; however, this clause allows for a site to have potential adverse traffic impacts | +/- | +/- | +/- | |
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | Allows creation and maintenance of employment at new and existing sites | + | + | + | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | Allows creation and maintenance of minerals operations in Leicestershire | + | + | + | |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies do not refer specifically to objective but requires proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. See assessments of policies 34 and 37. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>POLICY 7: SAFEGUARDING MINERAL RESOURCES</p> | <p>Development that would result in the sterilisation of mineral resources will not be permitted except where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The mineral is of no commercial interest and is unlikely to be so in the future; or ii. it would be highly unlikely that the mineral will be worked due to current or foreseeable future environmental constraints; or, iii. There is a clearly demonstrated overriding case for allowing the proposed development to proceed without the prior extraction of the mineral. |
| <p>POLICY 7A: MINERAL CONSULTATION AREAS</p> | <p>Development will only be permitted within or adjoining a Mineral Consultation Area as shown on the proposals map where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) it would not sterilise significant quantities of potential mineral resources; or b) it represents infill development within an established built up area; or c) it is otherwise acceptable and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) no other suitable locations are available; and ii) development would not lead to the sterilisation of mineral reserve (in accordance with Policy 7). |
| <p>POLICY 17: ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT</p> | <p>Planning permission will not be granted for industrial development ancillary to mineral extraction operations unless it has been demonstrated that there are environmental benefits in providing a close link with the extraction site.</p> |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| <p>01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</p> | <p>No effect</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessments of policies 24 and 25.</p> |
| <p>02 To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</p> | <p>No effect</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessments of policies 24 and 25.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 03 | To conserve geodiversity | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 04 | To protect places and of buildings archaeological, cultural and historic value | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessments of policies 26, 38 and 39. |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessments of policies 34 and 36. |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessment of policy 31. |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination safeguard soil quality and quantity | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessments of policies 37 and 38. |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessments of policies 32 and 35. |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. Policy 30 (see assessment) addresses this objective partially. |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessment of policy 29. |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | Policies 7 and 7A specifically address this issue, preventing sterilisation | +++ | +++ | ++ | ++ | Some uncertainty exists in the level of protection in the long-term future from clause ii in Policy 7. Proposed development should be comprehensively assessed for potential future constraints, as these may be less restrictive than the baseline situation and thus would allow working of the mineral. |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective See assessment of policies 5, 6 and 28. |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | Uncertain effect | -/? | -/? | -/? | -/? | If permission was granted for development under Policy 17, reduction in vehicle trips may result between the industrial development and the mineral development. |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | Policy 7 helps protect future minerals employment but may restrict other development with its associated employment benefits | +/- | +/- | +/- | Also see assessment of policies 3 and 4 |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | Policy 7 helps protect future minerals employment but may restrict other economic benefits. Given the relatively small contribution of minerals extraction to the local economy compared with other land uses, this policy has overall, a non-significant adverse effect on economic growth. | - | - | - | Scale and significance of effect is very dependent on proposed alternative land use and value of mineral potentially sterilised, therefore effect is uncertain. |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective See assessment of policies 3 and 4. |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy does not refer specifically to objective |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policies does not refer specifically to objective and do not require proposals to accord with other policies contained in the minerals development framework. This is a weakness and the wording of the policies must be revised. See assessment of policies 34 and 37. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>POLICY 9: Aggregates Extraction</p> | <p>Proposals for extensions to existing aggregate extraction sites will only be permitted where they are required to meet a proven need provided that such proposals accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework.</p> <p>No new aggregate extraction sites will be permitted unless it is demonstrated that the landbank and production capacity cannot be maintained from existing sites and appropriate extensions to existing sites.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 10: Brickclay</p> | <p>Proposals for extensions to brickclay sites will only be permitted where they are required to meet a proven need having regard to the provision of an appropriate landbank, provided that such proposals accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework.</p> <p>No new brickclay extraction sites will be permitted unless it is demonstrated that the landbank and production capacity cannot be maintained from existing sites and appropriate extensions to existing sites.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 11: Fireclay</p> | <p>Planning permission for fireclay extraction will be granted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The clays are required to meet a proven need having regard to the provision of an appropriate landbank; ii. Particular qualities of clay are required that cannot be obtained from existing permitted reserves; iii. Provided that such proposals accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework. |
| <p>POLICY 12: Gypsum</p> | <p>Proposals for new gypsum extraction sites and extensions to existing gypsum extraction areas will only be permitted where they are required to meet a proven need, provided that such proposals accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 13: Building Stone</p> | <p>Proposals for new building stone operations will only be permitted where they are required to meet a proven need, provided that such proposals accord with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 14: Coal Extraction and Colliery Spoil Disposal</p> | <p>Proposals for coal extraction and for the disposal of colliery waste, including lateral and depth extensions to existing sites, will not be permitted unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposal is environmentally acceptable, or can be made so by planning conditions or obligations; or, ii. The proposal provides local or community benefits which clearly outweigh the likely environmental impacts. <p>The requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework shall be satisfied in all cases. Where appropriate, consideration will be given to the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> iii. The effect on efforts to attract or retain investment in the area [we may decide to delete this criterion]; iv. Any environmental improvements or other material planning benefits to the community likely to result from the proposals; v. The employment and other economic effects of the proposals; vi. The avoidance of unplanned piecemeal working of deposit |
| <p>POLICY 15: Opencast Coal and Fireclay Joint Working</p> | <p>Where proposals for coal extraction meet the tests in the Policy 14, the recovery of fireclays will be granted provided that no unacceptable environmental impact results and that acceptable restoration of the site can be achieved within appropriate time scales.</p> <p>The requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework shall be satisfied in all cases.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>POLICY 16: Oil and Gas Exploration, Appraisal and Production</p> | <p>Proposals for oil and gas exploration, appraisal and production will be permitted provided that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is environmentally acceptable, or can be made so by planning conditions or obligations; The proposal would be appropriately sited to ensure the least impact; The proposal would facilitate the full appraisal and development of the resource. <p>The requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework shall be satisfied in all cases.</p> |
| <p>Policy 21: Borrow Pits</p> | <p>Planning permission will only be granted for borrow pits to supply materials for major construction projects where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need for a particular type of mineral which cannot reasonably be supplied from existing sites, including alternative materials, or where the supply of mineral from existing sites would be seriously detrimental to the environment and local amenities because of the scale, location and timing of the operations; The site is in close proximity to the proposed construction project it is to serve so that mineral can be transported to the point of use without leading to harmful conditions on a public highway; The site can be restored to a satisfactory after-use without the need to import material other than that generated by the construction project itself and which can be brought to the site without using the public highway; the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework <p>Where planning permission is granted conditions will be imposed to ensure that operations are time-limited and that all mineral extracted is used only for the specified project.</p> |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|---|-----------------|----------|----------|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| <p>01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</p> | <p>Generally, the provision of new extraction sites in greenfield or brownfield sites with biodiversity value is likely to have a negative effect on biodiversity and could result in damage and fragmentation. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.</p> <p>These policies in combination with Policies 24 and 25 offer protection to designated sites and sites that support protected species. Policies 37-40 require consideration of habitats and species, including during restoration phase.</p> |
| <p>02 To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</p> | <p>The provision of new extraction sites in the countryside could have a negative effect in the quality of the countryside and landscape. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain.</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|----|----|----|--|
| 03 | To conserve geodiversity | characteristics. The provision of new extraction sites is likely to have a significant negative effect on geodiversity | -- | -- | -- | These policies in combination with Policies 24, 25 and 27 offer protection to landscape. Policies 37-40 require consideration of landscape, including during restoration phase. Encourage other Local Development Framework documents and strategies to incorporate measures to maximise reuse and recycling of minerals, in order to minimise need for extraction |
| 04 | To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | The provision of new extraction sites in areas of archaeological or cultural significance is likely to have a negative effect on these features. Potential effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site-specific characteristics. | - | - | - | Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain. These policies in combination with Policies 24, 25 and 26 offer protection to cultural heritage. Policies 37-40 require consideration of archaeology, including during restoration phase. |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | Extraction of minerals may affect ground and surface waters, but would normally be controlled by operating and environmental regulations. Effects would be dependant on the type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics | - | - | - | Adverse effects should be mitigated against at an early stage in the development proposal through consideration of design and location. Planning conditions could incorporate a degree of mitigation and control. However, it is likely that residual negative effects will remain. |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | To the extent that new extraction sites can be located on woodland areas, negative effects are likely to occur. | - | - | - | Minimise woodland landtake. Encourage planting as part of planning or restoration conditions. |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Extraction of minerals will normally result in the loss of topsoil. Effects would be dependent on the type of extraction and the Agricultural Land Class affected | - | - | - | In line with Policy 28: Agricultural Land, planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development that would result in the loss irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a). |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | Potential effects would be dependant on the type of mineral extraction, its location and site-specific characteristics. Transport from sites is a major contributing factor to emissions. | - | - | - | Location according to proximity principle or where rail is an option would minimise transport and associated emissions. |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | Potential effects would be dependant on the type of mineral extraction, its location and site-specific characteristics. Transport from sites is a major contributing factor to emissions. | 0/- | 0/- | 0/- | Location according to proximity principle or where rail is an option would minimise transport and associated emissions. |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | Extraction of minerals has the potential to have negative effects on receptors, although the scale of the effect is dependent on the proximity of receptors, type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics. | - | - | - | Policy 27 requires planning applications to be supported by information in relation to public nuisance, where appropriate. |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To prevent irremediable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | Extraction of minerals will normally result in the loss of topsoil. Effects would be dependent on the type of extraction and the Agricultural Land Class affected | - | - | - | In line with Policy 28: Agricultural Land, planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development that would result in the loss irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a). |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | Overall, continued and new minerals extraction will normally not contribute to reducing travel by road. Policy 15 - Dual working may result in additional transportation. Would increase over time due to depleting resource?? Policy 21- Due to nature of borrow pits traffic movements should be minimal; therefore emissions to air should be low?? | - | - | - | - | Policy 32 on transportation may assist in encouraging sites with potential for road transport. |
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | The development of the site is likely to have a slight positive effect through the provision of new employment opportunities. | + | + | + | + | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | The development of the site is likely to have a slight positive effect through the provision of new employment opportunities thus help promote economic growth. | + | + | + | + | |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | Effect dependent upon implementation of Policy 34. There is potential for a negative effect if Policy 34 is not adhered to, although potential effects are site specific. | - | - | - | - | Policy 34: The Water Environment – Planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development which would: ii. Exacerbate flood risk in areas prone to flooding. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>POLICY 18: DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE</p> | <p>Planning permission will only be granted for new sites for the disposal of mineral wastes where it is not feasible to retain the waste materials on the extraction site and where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The re-use of the material to be disposed of is not practicable; and, ii. The proposed site will not adversely affect the character and distinctiveness of the countryside. <p>The requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework shall be satisfied in all cases.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 19: REWORKING OF MINERAL WASTE</p> | <p>Proposals for the reworking of mineral waste requiring planning permission will be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The deposit is not host to established ecological interests or has not become an attractive landscape feature; and, ii. An environmental improvement results. <p>The requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework shall be satisfied in all cases.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 20: DISPOSAL OF NON-MINERAL WASTE</p> | <p>Planning permission for the disposal of non-mineral waste in association with the working and reclamation of mineral operations will not be granted unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal complies with policies contained in the Leicestershire and Leicester Waste Development Framework.</p> <p>Where permission is granted, conditions will be imposed to ensure that operations are regulated to minimise effects on the environment and local communities and to ensure that the site is satisfactorily reclaimed to an acceptable after-use within a reasonable time period.</p> |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; -- strongly negative; --- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|---|-----------------|----|----|----------------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| <p>01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</p> | <p>The permission of new sites for disposal of mineral and non-mineral waste and reworking of mineral waste is likely to have a negative effect on biodiversity. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependent on location and site specific characteristics.</p> | - | - | - | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| 02 | To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | The permission of new sites for disposal of mineral and non-mineral waste and reworking of mineral waste in the countryside is likely to have a negative effect on the quality of the countryside and landscape. The scale and magnitude of potential effects would be dependent on location and site specific characteristics | - | - | - | - |
| 03 | To conserve geodiversity | No effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04 | To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | Disposal of mineral and non mineral waste and reworking of mineral waste may bury or destroy unidentified archaeological, cultural or historic places or buildings of value. Scale of effect is dependent on the location and site specific characteristics. | - | - | - | - |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | Disposal of mineral and non mineral waste and reworking of mineral waste may affect surface and ground water quality through leachate and disturbance. Scale of effect is dependent on the location and site specific characteristics. | - | - | - | - |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | No effect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Movement of soil in the process of disposal or reworking has the potential to contaminate soil or alter its quality. There is also potential for losses of the best and most valuable agricultural land. Scale of effect is dependent on the location and site specific characteristics. | - | - | - | In line with Policy 28: Agricultural Land, planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development that would result in the loss irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a). |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | These policies would have a negative effect as relocating or reworking mineral waste will involve the use of transport. | - | - | - | |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | Increased movement of waste will involve greenhouse gas creation. | - | - | - | Effect is certain and should be temporary for the period of movement/reworking. |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | Disposal of mineral and non-mineral waste, and the reworking of Mineral Waste has the potential to have negative effects on receptors, although the scale of the effect is dependent on the proximity of receptors, type of facility, its location and site specific characteristics. | - | - | - | Policy 27 requires planning applications to be supported by information in relation to public nuisance, where appropriate. |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | Policy 18 restricts development of new sites but has a slight negative effect on this objective as it specifically refers to new sites Policy 19 may have a positive effect as reworking is intended to create environmental improvements | - | - | + | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | Policies are worded to restrict disposal of mineral waste (policy 18) and the use of minerals sites for the disposal of non-mineral waste (policy 20). Policy 19 may have a positive effect as reworked waste may replace the need for raw materials. However policies permit landfilling of wastes; the overall effect is likely to be slightly negative | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | To prevent irremediable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | Policy 18 and 20 could have negative effect on this objective depending on the location of the site of disposal. | - | - | - | Uncertain impacts – economic factors mean that operator may seek nearest site for disposal of mineral waste – this may be of higher agricultural value than more distant land. However, in line with Policy 28: Agricultural Land, planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development that would result in the loss irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a). |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | Policy allows the transport of mineral waste to a satellite location | - | - | - | |
| 17 | To promote stable and employment diversity in Leicestershire | All policies would require additional personnel for a period beyond the period of extraction. Numbers would, however, be small. | + | + | + | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | Restoration of the sites in the long term may help achieve this objective | 0 | + | + | + | Difficult to establish the scale of the impact but would be permanent, if achieved. |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | Uncertain effect; dependant on site locations. Policies 18 and 20 may have a negative effect on this objective as they may be filling voids which would otherwise have been able to act as flood storage. Policy 19 may have a positive or negative effect depending on the nature of the reworking which may reduce or increase flood risk by creating barriers against flood waters or barriers to the flow of water. | ? | ? | ? | ? | |

| | |
|---|--|
| POLICY 22: MINERAL EXPLORATION | Planning permission for mineral exploration will be granted provided that operations are only for a temporary period and that the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework. Where planning permission is granted, conditions will be imposed to ensure that the site is restored to a satisfactory after-use. |
| POLICY 23: INCIDENTAL MINERAL EXTRACTION | Planning permission for mineral extraction that forms a subordinate and ancillary element of other development, or is in advance of approved surface development where the reserves would otherwise be permanently sterilised, will be granted provided that operations are only for a temporary period and that the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework. Where planning permission is granted, conditions will be imposed to ensure that the site can be adequately restored to a satisfactory after-use should the main development be delayed or not implemented |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term

0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|----|----|----------------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| 01 <i>To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 02 <i>To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 03 <i>To conserve geodiversity</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 04 <i>To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value</i> | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|----|----|----|----|--|
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No Effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Exploration and extraction could cause contamination to the water but both policies are permitted on a temporary basis, with correct management and/or mitigation the effect could be short term if at all |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Landscape and woodland affected by the workings should be kept to a minimum |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Uncertain effect | ? | ? | ? | ? | Exploration and extraction could cause contamination to the soil but both policies are permitted on a temporary basis, with correct management and/or mitigation the effect could be short term if at all |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | Policy 23 will have a positive effect on this policy | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|----|----|----|--|
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | Policy 22 may have a positive effect on this objective if exploration of a previously developed site reveals either new reserves of a previously extracted mineral or reserves of a new mineral | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>POLICY 24: SITES OF INTERNATIONAL OR NATIONAL IMPORTANCE</p> | <p>Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development that would be likely to have a significant adverse effect on the character, appearance, ecological or geological value and/or setting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves, Ancient Woodlands, and sites that support protected species; (ii) Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other nationally important archaeological sites; (iii) Historic Parks and gardens, battlefields and historic landscapes; (iv) Listed Buildings. <p>unless there are overriding reasons of national importance for the proposed development to proceed.</p> <p>In circumstances where planning permission is to be granted measures in mitigation and/or compensation for any impacts caused will be required.</p> |
| <p>POLICY 25: SITES OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL IMPORTANCE</p> | <p>Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development which would have a significant adverse effect on the character, appearance, ecological, geological or amenity value and/or setting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Sites of importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs); (ii) Local Nature Reserves; (iii) Priority habitats or species identified in relevant Biodiversity Action Plans; (iv) Special landscape areas and landscape features of importance; (v) Regionally Important Geological sites (RIGs); (vi) Protected woodland areas; (vii) Country parks, common land and village greens and other important areas of open space or green areas within built-up areas; (viii) Conservation areas, and (ix) Land or buildings in sport, recreational or tourism use |

| | |
|--|--|
| | unless it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the development and any impacts can be mitigated or compensated for. |
| POLICY 26: ARCHAEOLOGY | Proposals for minerals development which are likely to affect areas with potential archaeological interest will not be granted planning permission, unless they have been the subject of a preliminary archaeological assessment to determine the nature and significance of any archaeological remains; and i. adequate provision for preservation in situ, excavation or recording of any interest is made in accordance with the level of importance of the finds. ii. Planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development that will damage the open and undeveloped character of Green Wedges or adversely affect the general appearance and character of the landscape and the countryside, unless it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the development. |
| POLICY 27: GREEN WEDGES AND THE COUNTRYSIDE | Planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development which is likely to generate significant adverse levels of disturbance from noise, dust, vibration, odour, fumes, illumination, visual intrusion or traffic to the detriment of adjoining land uses. i. There is an overriding need for the development; ii. There is no suitable alternative site of lower agricultural quality that provides the same benefits in terms of sustainability, provided the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework. |
| POLICY 28: AGRICULTURAL LAND | Planning permission will not normally be granted for minerals development that would result in the irreversible loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a), unless it can be demonstrated that: (i) There is an overriding need for the development; (ii) There is no suitable alternative site of lower agricultural quality that provides the same benefits in terms of sustainability, provided the proposal accords with the requirements of other policies contained in the minerals development framework. |
| POLICY 29: AMENITY | Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development which is likely to generate significant adverse levels of disturbance from noise, dust, vibration, odour, fumes, illumination, visual intrusion or traffic to the detriment of adjoining land uses. |
| POLICY 30: DESIGN | Proposals for minerals development will be required to demonstrate that they have been designed to ensure impact on the environment is minimised by appropriate measures to: i. reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other forms of pollution ii. minimise levels of energy and water consumption; iii. minimise production of waste, and iv. maximise the re-use or recycling of materials |
| POLICY 31: LANDSCAPING AND WOODLAND | In granting planning permission for minerals development, opportunities for landscaping and new woodland planting will be sought, where appropriate. |
| POLICY 32: TRANSPORTATION OF MINERALS | Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development involving the transport of minerals by road except where: i. There is no practicable alternative to road transport which would be environmentally preferable; ii. The proposed access arrangements would be safe and appropriate to the proposed development and the highway network is able to accommodate the traffic that would be generated; iii. The impact of the traffic generated would not be detrimental to road safety nor have an unacceptable impact on the environment or local residents. |
| POLICY 33: PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY | Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development that would adversely affect a public right of way, unless: (i) it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the development. (ii) satisfactory proposals are made for its diversion or the creation of an alternative route, and (iii) where appropriate, provision is made to increase opportunities for enhancing the rights of way network. |
| POLICY 34: THE WATER ENVIRONMENT | Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development which would: i. have a detrimental impact on the quality or flow of groundwater or surface water drainage, or ii. exacerbate flood risk in areas prone to flooding |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| POLICY 35: SAFEGUARDING AIR | Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development which would give rise to new or increased hazards to aviation. |
| POLICY 36: CUMULATIVE IMPACT | Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development which would result in an unacceptable cumulative impact on the environment of an area or on the amenity of a local community, either in relation to the collective effect of different impacts of an individual proposal, or in relation to the effects of a number of minerals developments occurring either concurrently or successively. |

Scale of effect (se): St – short term, Mt – medium term, Lt – long term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA objectives | Description of effect | Scale of effect | | | Comments/explanation |
|---|---|-----------------|-----|-----|--|
| | | St | Mt | Lt | |
| 01 <i>To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora</i> | <p>Policies 24 and 25 prevent minerals development on internationally, nationally, regionally or locally important sites. However non-designated sites and wildlife corridors are not given specific protection, leading to potential for fragmentation and damage.</p> <p>By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective</p> | +/- | +/- | +/- | <p>Although the policies endeavour to protect sites, the caveat that if permission may be given if mitigation and/or compensation measures are applied counteracts the positive effects. It is likely that residual impacts would remain after mitigation. Lack of reference to fragmentation may lead to potential for cumulative effects.</p> <p>The level of protection for flora, fauna, habitats and species offered by these policies is judged as weak, leading to an overall neutral assessment.</p> <p>Suggest incorporate 'unless there is a nationally or internationally significant overriding need for the development' into policy wording of Policy 24 at a minimum, or remove reference to option of compensation/mitigation in order to protect national/international sites.</p> <p>Suggest Policies 24 and 25 should pro-actively seek the protection of biodiversity through habitat enhancement and creation as part of minerals development activities.</p> |
| 02 <i>To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape</i> | <p>Policies 24 and 25 prevent minerals development on internationally, nationally, regionally or locally important sites, giving a positive effect.</p> <p>Policies 27 and 28 offer specific protection to Green Wedges and agricultural land. Overall the level of protection offered by these policies is seen as positive.</p> <p>Policy 33 offers effective protection to rights of way therefore giving positive effects on access to countryside.</p> | +/- | +/- | +/- | <p>Although the policies endeavour to protect sites, the caveat that if permission may be given if mitigation and/or compensation measures are applied counteracts the positive effects. It is likely that residual impacts would remain after mitigation.</p> <p>Suggest remove word 'normally' from Policy 27 as this weakens policy protection</p> <p>Lack of reference to fragmentation in Policies 24, 25, 27 and 28 may lead to potential for cumulative effects but Policy 36 deals with cumulative effects for minerals development in general (see corresponding assessment).</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|
| 03 | To conserve geodiversity | Policy 31 may offer potential benefits in enhancing the quality of the countryside and landscape. By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective Uncertain effect | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Policies 24 and 25 may have a significant positive effect on this objective but it is unclear if it relates only to designated sites |
| 04 | To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | Policy 24 and 25 prevent mineral development on internationally, nationally, regionally and locally important sites Policy 26 offers strong protection to archaeological resources, giving positive effects on archaeology Policy 33 offers effective protection to rights of way | +/- | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Undesignated local historic elements and character are not offered protection; this leads to potential for fragmentation and cumulative effects. Suggest refer to avoiding fragmentation of and cumulative adverse effects on local landscape character, cultural heritage in Policy 16. Suggest incorporate 'unless there is a nationally or internationally significant overriding need for the development' into policy wording of Policy 15 at a minimum, or remove reference to option of compensation/mitigation in order to protect national/international sites. |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | Policy 34 will have a positive effect on this objective By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | Policies 24 and 31 will have significant effect on this objective even extending to ancient woodland, specifically protected by policy 24 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | By protecting agricultural land policy 28 safeguards agricultural soil quality and quantity | + | + | + | + | |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | Policy 30 is likely to have a positive effect on this objective by ensuring aspects of design reduce emissions and other pollution By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective | + | + | + | + | |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | Policy 30 will have a positive effect on this objective as reducing greenhouse gas emission is seen as an important measure within design | + | + | + | + | |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | Policy 29 will have a positive effect on this objective By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective | + | + | + | + | |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | Policy 28 offers protection to best and most versatile agricultural land. Policies restricting location of development (Policies, 24, 25, 27 and 29) are also likely to encourage the use of developed land, leading to positive effect. | + | + | + | + | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | Policy 30 is likely to have a positive effect on this objective through promoting minimised production of waste and maximised re use and recycling | + | + | + | + | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|------|------|------|------|--|
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | Policy 28 will have a direct positive effect on this objective By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective. | + | + | + | + | Suggest remove the word 'normally' from policy 28 as this weakens the policy.. The justification establishes a preference for a search sequence before the use of agricultural land. |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | Policy 32 will have a direct significant positive effect on this objective. Other policies have no effect | 0/++ | 0/++ | 0/++ | 0/++ | |
| 17 | To promote stable and employment diversity in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | Policy group collectively offers protection to the natural environment. This is likely to offer positive indirect effects to human health. Policy 35 is likely to ensure no air crashes and hence have an indirect positive effect on human health | + | + | + | + | Potential for cumulative effects |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | Policy 34 will have a direct positive effect on this policy By rejecting minerals development which would result in unacceptable cumulative effects, Policy 36 will have a positive effect on this objective | + | + | + | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>POLICY 37: INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> | <p>Planning applications for minerals development will not be considered unless they are supported by sufficient relevant supporting drawings, plans and information, including details where appropriate of the matters listed in Box 7</p> <p>Box 7 – Information required by the MPA in support of planning applications (as in supporting text to policy) Where appropriate, details should be provided of the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local geology, including the extent, quantity and quality of the mineral reserve; 2. Need for the mineral and the markets to be served; 3. Estimated output and time scale of the operations including restoration works; 4. Measures to maximise the potential for re-use and recycling of materials; 5. Anticipated employment levels; 6. Present use, condition and ground levels of the site and its surroundings; 7. Site layout, means of access, and the design and siting of buildings; 8. Fixed and mobile plant and machinery to be used; 9. Method of working including depths, direction and phasing; 10. Depth and nature of topsoil, subsoil and overburden horizons; 11. Stripping, storage and re-spreading of soils and overburden; 12. Transport arrangements including the estimated volume, nature and routing of traffic; 13. Highway safety measures; 14. Likely sources of emissions of dust or any other form of pollution from the site and measures for minimisation; 15. A noise assessment and proposals for mitigation; 16. Hours of operation; 17. Protection of local amenity and adjacent land-uses; 18. Provision of a Buffer Zone between the site and neighbouring sensitive areas; 19. A landscape assessment and landscaping proposals; 20. An assessment of the ecological and geological impact of the proposed development and proposals for mitigation or compensation; 21. An assessment of the impact of the proposed development on sites of conservation value; 22. An archaeological evaluation of the site and proposals for safeguarding remains; 23. An assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological impact of the proposed development and proposals for mitigation; 24. A flood risk assessment and proposals for compensation; 25. Site drainage details; 26. Screening, landscaping works and site boundary treatments; 27. Measures for protecting public rights of way; 28. Measures to prevent new or increased risk to aviation from the proposed development; 29. Restoration proposals including finished levels, depths and source of soils and landscaping; 30. Infilling proposals, including the type and source of materials proposed; 31. Aftercare proposals; 32. After-use and long term management proposals 33. Any other measures in mitigation or compensation for the effects of the development |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>POLICY 38: PLANNING CONDITIONS</p> | <p>In granting planning permission for minerals development, conditions will be attached to control the effect of the development on the environment and the local community. Matters to be covered by conditions may include those listed in Box 8 as appropriate to the development to be granted.</p> <p>Box 8 Matters for control by the imposition of conditions (as in supporting text to policy) <i>Where appropriate, the following matters will be controlled by conditions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Commencement and duration of the permission; b) Access and road safety; c) Hours of working; d) Working programme; e) Topsoil, subsoil and overburden handling; f) Production and outputs; g) Depth and area of working; h) Permitted development rights; i) Location, design, size and life of buildings, fixed plant and machinery; j) Emissions of dust, smoke and fumes; k) Site illumination; l) Noise generation; m) Blasting impacts; n) Visual intrusion; o) Screening and boundary treatments; p) The establishment of a Buffer Zone; q) Management of on site waste materials; r) Importation of waste materials; s) Water environment including drainage and surface and groundwater resources; t) Traffic and vehicle cleansing; u) Archaeological interests; v) Ecological interests; w) Geological and geomorphological interests; x) Landscape attributes; y) Restoration form and programme of operations; z) Aftercare provision; aa) After-use proposals; bb) Provision of interim and alternative reclamation details; cc) Subsidence and support |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>POLICY 39: PLANNING OBLIGATIONS</p> | <p>Planning obligations will be sought where appropriate to achieve suitable control over and to mitigate or compensate for the effects of minerals development where such objectives cannot be achieved by planning conditions. Matters to be covered by such planning obligations may include those listed in Box 9 as appropriate to the proposed development.</p> <p><i>Box 9 Matters to be considered for inclusion in planning obligations (as in supporting text to policy)</i> <i>In circumstances appropriate to the proposed development the following matters may be covered by obligations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Revocation and consolidation of planning permission; b) Highways and access improvements; c) Traffic management measures including the regulation of lorry traffic; d) Provision and management of off-site or advance tree planting and screening; e) Extraction in advance of future development; f) Environmental enhancement and the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan Targets; g) Protection or replacement of locally, regionally and nationally important sites; h) Provision of an alternative water supply should existing supplies be affected; i) Archaeological, investigation, recording and keeping of artefacts; j) Establishment of a liaison committee; k) Provision of noise, dust and blast monitoring equipment; l) Long-term site management provision to establish beneficial after-use; m) Improvement of the rights of way network; n) Financial guarantees to ensure restoration is undertaken; o) measures for environmental, recreational, economic and community gain in mitigation or compensation for the effects of mineral development |
| <p>Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear</p> | |

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|--|-----------------|-----|-----|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| 01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora | <p>Policy 37 point 20 by requiring an assessment of the ecological impact of the proposed development could have a positive effect on this objective through mitigation or compensation for impacts on ecology</p> <p>Equally, Policy 38 point v by attaching conditions relating to ecological interests could have a positive effect on this objective</p> <p>Policy 39 point f and g could also have a positive effect as planning obligations could be sought with regards to environmental enhancement and the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan Targets and protection or replacement of locally, regionally and nationally important sites.</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |
| 02 To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | <p>Policy 37 points 19 and 26 may have a positive effect on this objective as a landscape assessment and screening and landscaping work are likely to be required.</p> <p>Policy 38 points n, x could have a positive effect on this objective by attaching if necessary planning conditions with regards to visual intrusion and landscape attributes</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 03 | To conserve geodiversity | <p>Policy 37 point 20 could have a positive effect on this objective through mitigation or compensation for impacts on geology</p> <p>Policy 38 point would have a positive effect on this objective</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |
| 04 | To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | <p>Policy 37 point 22 will have a positive effect on this objective through safeguarding archaeological remains</p> <p>Policy 38 point u could have a positive effect on this objective by attaching conditions with regards to archaeological interests</p> <p>Policy 39 points g and i could also have positive effect by seeking planning obligations for the protection of important sites and archaeological investigation</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |
| 05 | To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | <p>Policies referred to in assessment above could have a positive effect with regards to the cultural heritage associate with Leicestershire's mining.</p> <p>None of the policies deals with the use of local building materials</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |

Recommend that Policies 37 and 38 include the use of local building materials in the lists provided in the corresponding boxes.

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----|-----|-----|--|
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | <p>Policy 37 point 23 could have a positive effect on this objective but could go further by referring specifically to water quality since it only deals with hydrological and hydrogeological impacts</p> <p>Policy 38 point s could have a positive effect on this objective as specific conditions may be attached covering the water environment.</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | <p>Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures</p> <p>Recommend that Policy 37 point 23 refers to water quality.</p> |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | <p>Policy 37 point 10 and 11 and Policy 38 point e by covering soil specifically could have a positive effect on this objective</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | <p>Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures</p> |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | <p>Policy 37 point 14 by requiring information on likely sources of pollution is likely to have a positive effect.</p> <p>Policy 38 point j by covering conditions relation to emissions of dust, smoke and fumes could have a positive effect.</p> <p>The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals.</p> | +/? | +/? | +/? | <p>Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|------|-----|-----|--|
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | Policy 37 point 14 by requiring information on likely sources of pollution is likely to indirectly have a positive effect. However, it could go further by requiring the provision of information on greenhouse gas emissions | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures Recommend that provision of information on greenhouse gas emissions is required in Policy 37. |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals. Policy 37 point 14 could have a positive effect on this objective through the minimisation of dust and pollution Policy 37 point 15 could have a positive effect on this objective by requiring mitigation for noise Policy 38 point j to n would have a positive effect on this objective Policy 39 point j could have a positive effect on this objective by allowing the public to voice their concerns The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals. | +/? | +/?+ | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | See assessment of Policies 40: Restoration and After Care and Policy 41: After Use |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | Policy 37 point 4 will have an effect on this objective through requiring information on measures to re use and recycle materials The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals. No effect | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |
| 15 | To prevent irremediable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | Policy 37 point 12 could indirectly have a positive effect on this policy by requiring information on transport arrangements. It could go further by emphasising the need to reduce transport by road The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals. No effect | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures Recommend that Policy 37 refers to the need to provide information showing that ways to transport waste other than by road have been covered |
| 17 | To promote stable and employment diversity in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | Policy 37 point 14 and 15 and policy 38 point j, l, m, n, could have a indirect positive effect on this objective through dealing with pollution, noise and intrusion The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals. No effect | + | + | + | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | | 0 | 0 | 0 | See assessment of Policies 40: Restoration and After Care and Policy 41: After Use |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | Policy 37 point 24 by requiring a flood risk assessment and proposals for compensation will have a positive effect on this objective The scale and duration of the above effects will, however, be determined by details and location of specific proposals. | + | + | + | Site allocations DPD and project EIA where required will determine effects in more detail and suggest mitigation measures |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>POLICY 40: RESTORATION AND AFTERCARE</p> | <p>Planning permission for minerals development will not be granted unless satisfactory provision has been made for the reclamation and after-use of the site and where necessary its long term management.</p> <p>Reclamation plans should be submitted with the planning application and where appropriate include details of those matters that are set out in Box 10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The key landscape opportunities and constraints; b) The site boundaries and areas allocated for soil and overburden storage; c) An assessment of soil resources and their removal, handling and storage; d) An assessment of the overburden to be removed and stored; e) The type and depth of workings and information relating to the water table; f) Significant waste material locations and quantities of waste involved; g) Proposed infilling operations and sources of fill; h) Potential directions of working; i) The need for additional screening taking account of degrees of visual exposure; j) Implementation of progressive reclamation; k) A projected plan of contours and final levels of the site; l) Target restoration profiles for soil-making materials, subsoil and topsoil; m) Soil placement, relief of compaction and provision of surface features; n) Achievement of the landscape and landform objectives for the site; o) The removal of all plant, buildings, structures, machinery, roads and hardstandings; p) Aftercare proposals for planting, cultivating, fertilising and other treatments; q) Site infrastructure including drainage proposals; r) Proposed after-uses and preferred character for the reclaimed landscape; s) The means to maintain or enhance the long-term quality of the land and landscape; t) Proposals for nature conservation enhancement indicating how they fit with local strategies and LBAP targets. u) Provision of annual aftercare reports for monitoring progress of the establishment of the new use. |
| <p>POLICY 41: AFTER-USE</p> | <p>Proposals for the after-use of the site shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Take account of the pre-working character of the site and its landscape setting; ii. employ restoration techniques that ensure the land is retained as a long-term agricultural resource, where best and most versatile agricultural land is affected; iii. provide for the enhancement of the quality of the landscape and local environment to the benefit to the local or wider community <p>The following after-uses will be sought in appropriate cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Woodland planting, particularly in the National Forest; ii. Creation of new wildlife habitats; iii. Water-based recreational schemes; iv. Public access and improvements to the public rights of way network. |

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative; ? unclear

| SA/SEA Objectives | Description of Effect | Scale of Effect | | | Comments/Explanation |
|--|---|-----------------|----|----|----------------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | |
| 01 To conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and species, avoiding damage to or fragmentation of major features of importance for fauna and flora | Policy 40 point t would have positive effects on this objective by requiring proposals for nature conservation enhancement. Policy 41 after use point ii would have a positive effect on this objective through seeking the creation new habitats. | 0 | + | + | |
| 02 To conserve and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | Policy 40 point S and Policy 41 point iii would have positive effects for this objective | 0 | + | + | |
| 03 To conserve geodiversity | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 04 To protect places and buildings of archaeological, cultural and historic value | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 05 To recognise, protect and enhance the cultural heritage associated with Leicestershire's mining and to promote the use of local building materials | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|-----|-----|--|
| 06 | To protect the quality of ground and surface waters | Policy 40 Q would have a positive effect by requiring the inclusion of drainage proposals | 0 | + | + | |
| 07 | To protect and enhance woodland and forestry | Policy 41 after use i could have a positive effect on enhancing woodland and forestry | 0 | + | + | |
| 08 | To avoid soil contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Policy 40 point c and d could have a positive effect on this objective by requiring an assessment of soil resources and their removal to relief of soil compaction | 0 | +/? | +/? | |
| 09 | To limit emissions to air to levels that will not damage natural systems and affect human health | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | To minimise the contribution of minerals development to adverse climate change through reduced greenhouse gas emissions. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | To minimise public nuisance from minerals workings | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 12 | To minimise the irreversible sterilisation of mineral reserves | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To encourage better use of previously developed land and effective remediation of degraded land | No effect | | | | | |
| 14 | To promote the efficient use of raw materials (including aggregates), minimise waste and maximise re-use and recycling in order to reduce the need for landfill. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To prevent irretrievable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 16 | To reduce the need to travel. In particular, to reduce the transportation of minerals by road, and thereby vehicle emissions | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 17 | To promote stable employment and employment diversity in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | To promote sustainable economic growth in Leicestershire | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 19 | To improve human health and well-being | Policy 41 points iii and iv. could have an indirect positive effect on this objective through the enhancement of recreational value | + | + | + | | |
| 20 | To support the creation of public access and nature reserves on restored minerals workings, particularly in proximity to urban areas. Include the provision of interpretation facilities relating to the historic land use. | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 21 | To avoid or reduce flood risk as a result of minerals development | Policy 40 point q covering the installation of drainage could have a positive effect on this objective | 0 | + | + | | |