

MATTER 2: LOCATIONAL STRATEGY

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>2.39 That Strategy Policies 2 and 3 in the Deposit Draft of the Structure Plan be deleted.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation for reasons given in the Panel report (paragraphs 2.15 to 2.19).</p>
<p>2.40 That new Strategy Policy 2 be inserted as follows:</p> <p>STRATEGY POLICY 2: CENTRAL LEICESTERSHIRE POLICY AREA</p> <p>In order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make optimum use of the available urban capacity for development in the existing built-up areas within the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area; • balance housing and employment development within the Central Leicestershire Policy Area; and • secure integration between land use and transport policy objectives, <p>provision will be made within the Central Leicestershire Policy Area for 35,450* dwellings and for 376 hectares of employment land for the period 1996-2016.</p> <p>*The figure of 35,600, as set out in the Panel Report, is incorrect. The Panel has confirmed the figure should be 35,450.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation for reasons given in the Panel report (paragraphs 2.1 to 2.14) subject to reducing the provision for housing in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.</p> <p>The Panel supports the Pre-EIP Change to include a new Strategy Policy 2 'Central Leicestershire Policy Area' but recommends some rewording to refer to the optimum use being made of the available urban capacity for development in the existing built up areas within the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area. The Panel Report also recommends that provision should be made within the CLPA for 35,450 dwellings compared with the 28,750 dwellings put forward by the Structure Plan Authorities. Whilst it is considered that the wording changes better reflect the intention to make optimum use of urban capacity in the existing built-up area of the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area, the Structure Plan Authorities do not accept an increase in housing provision, outside Leicester as all the increase would be on greenfield land. This would compete with the increased provision in Leicester itself and could frustrate this policy objective.</p>
<p>2.41 That the explanatory memorandum be amended as follows:</p> <p>(i) by further clarification in the glossary of the</p>	<p>Accept recommendation for reasons given in the Panel report (paragraphs 2.5 to 2.14)</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>boundaries of the CLPA;</p> <p>(ii) by review of paragraphs 2.4 to 2.6 of the explanatory memorandum and their relocation to enable them to serve as supporting text for new Strategy Policy 2;</p> <p>(iii) by clarification of the 55% target for development within the CLPA, including specification of separate targets for housing and employment.</p>	
<p>2.42 That new Strategy Policies 3A and 3B be inserted as follows:</p> <p>STRATEGY POLICY 3A: A SEQUENTIAL APPROACH TOWARDS THE LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Land for development will be allocated in development plans in the following priority order:</p> <p>(a) previously developed land and buildings within or adjoining the central area of Leicester and the town centres of the Main Towns (Ashby, Coalville, Hinckley/Earl Shilton, Loughborough, Lutterworth, Market Harborough, Melton Mowbray, Shepshed and Oakham);</p> <p>(b) previously developed land and buildings elsewhere within the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area and the Main Towns;</p> <p>(c) other land within or adjoining the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area and the Main Towns, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land;</p>	<p>Accept recommendation for reasons given in the Panel report (paragraphs 2.15 to 2.27), subject to the following further amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In considering which settlements should be designated as Main Towns it is important to have regard to the local context in terms of the character of the area and the relative sustainability of settlements for development. While Uppingham is smaller than Oakham it clearly possesses the characteristics of a market town. Uppingham has performed a major role in Rutland as an important focus for local services in a highly rural area, far greater than those provided by settlements in Rutland, previously and currently designated as rural centres. <p>While planning policy has accorded Oakham and Uppingham similar status in the past, it has consistently been successful in ensuring that the distribution of growth between the two has reflected the differences in their respective sizes and their suitability for sustainable development.</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>(d) land within or adjoining Rural Centres, or other settlements which are or will be well served by public transport, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land, and</p> <p>(e) in other locations, subject where relevant to the considerations in Strategy Policies 6, 7 or 9.</p> <p>STRATEGY POLICY 3B: SUITABILITY OF LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>In considering the suitability of land within the context of Strategy Policy 3A, the following criteria will also be taken into account:</p> <p>(i) the actual or potential accessibility of sites by non-car modes, including pedestrian, cycling and public transport links to central areas and district or local centres;</p> <p>(ii) the capacity for development at transport nodes within good transport corridors;</p> <p>(iii) the actual and potential capacity of existing public transport, utilities and social infrastructure to support further development;</p> <p>(iv) the land-extensive characteristics of warehousing and distribution development, and the extent to it needs to have direct access to the strategic road or rail network;</p> <p>(v) physical constraints on development, including ground contamination and stability and flood risk;</p>	<p>Therefore, the suitability of Uppingham, as the second most sustainable settlement in Rutland, to accommodate a limited amount of future development, should therefore be acknowledged in the Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RPG8 policy on the locational priorities for development has been redrafted to give a higher priority to locations within urban areas than those adjoining urban areas. It is considered that criterion (c) should be split accordingly, to ensure consistency with RPG8. ▪ The addition of criterion (ii) relating to transport nodes within good transport corridors as recommended by the Panel was at the time in line with both national and regional policy. However, this criterion is not included in RPG8. It is also considered unnecessary, as criterion (i) takes into account the actual or potential accessibility of sites by non-car modes. ▪ The addition of criterion (iv) relating to warehousing and distribution recognises the special locational requirements of such uses. However, there are a number of other uses which have special circumstances that require exceptions to the sequential approach. Whilst the principles included in the criterion are generally accepted, such circumstances would be more appropriately dealt with in specific policies relating to that development, rather than as an exception to this generic policy (see Proposed Modification to Employment Policy 8). This is the approach adopted by RPG8.

Decisions and Reasons

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>(vi) the impact of development on natural resources and environmental and cultural assets;</p> <p>(vii) the cost of development, the economic viability of sites and the availability of public and private resources to bring forward land and buildings for development;</p> <p>(viii) the need to secure a balance of land uses within the area, including by mixed use development; and</p> <p>(ix) the contribution that development could make towards the strengthening of a local community, supporting local services and meeting local needs, particularly within Rural Centres designated in local plans.</p>	
<p>2.43 That the basis for monitoring the 80% target for development within and adjoining urban areas should be clarified in the explanatory memorandum.</p>	<p>Accept Panel recommendation for the reasons given in the Panel report (paragraph 2.32).</p>
<p>2.44 That a new Strategy Policy be inserted as follows:</p> <p>NEW STRATEGY POLICY: RURAL CENTRES</p> <p>Rural Centres may be designated in local plans, which serve a rural hinterland and contain all or most of the following functions:</p> <p>(a) a primary school;</p> <p>(b) a post office;</p> <p>(c) a general store;</p> <p>(d) a general medical practice;</p> <p>(e) a pharmacy (if not within the general medical</p>	<p>Accept Panel recommendation for the reasons given in the Panel report (paragraphs 2.28 to 2.29) subject to the inclusion of an additional clause, in relation to community and leisure facilities, to provide a more appropriate list of functions for a settlement to perform the function of a rural centre.</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>practice); (f) additional employment to that provided by (a) to (e) above; (g) a regular, six day a week return bus service.</p>	
<p>2.45 That Strategy Policy 4 be replaced by the following:</p> <p>STRATEGY POLICY 4: GREENFIELD DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Where, after applying the sequential approach in Strategy Policy 3A and the criteria in Strategy Policy 3B it is necessary to consider new development on greenfield land, such land should generally be identified as urban extensions and allocated for development in local plans.</p> <p>Any site thus identified should, unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) be of significant size and scale; (b) be of a form and character appropriate to the surroundings; (c) incorporate good quality mixed use development including employment uses, or be capable of integration with existing development to the same end; (d) incorporate open space to prescribed standards, and contribute to existing and proposed green networks; (e) be large enough to enable significant developer contributions to be made towards transport and 	<p>Accept Panel recommendation for the reasons given in the Panel report (paragraphs 2.33 to 2.38) subject to a rewording of criterion (f), relating to phasing of greenfield sites. It is considered that the alternative wording is clearer than that suggested by the Panel.</p>

Decisions and Reasons

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>other infrastructure provision;</p> <p>(f) be programmed for the implementation of the development at a stage in the local plan period consistent with the principle of previously developed land being developed first; and</p> <p>(g) be capable of development in a phased sequence that enables new residents to have early access to local employment, public transport and other facilities.</p>	