

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 1: Overall Strategy**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Six Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

Burbage Matters!. County Museums Service. Glenfield Parish Council. Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. Northamptonshire County Council. Revelan Group. Sport England. The National Forest.

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 2: Central Leicestershire Policy Area**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Four Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

1. Not accepted. It is not appropriate to outline administrative arrangements in policy, however, consideration will be given to this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. Reference to infrastructure provision is made in Strategy Policy 3B and Strategy Policy 12. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. Totals for the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA) are set out in Housing Policy 1 and Employment Policy 1. This policy sets the strategic framework for development in the CLPA, so it is necessary to include housing and employment totals.
4. Not accepted. The QUELS study is intended to inform the revision of the East Midlands Regional Planning Guidance. Nevertheless, the policy is not inconsistent with the results of the QUELS study because Employment Policy 2 allocates additional land for employment in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area.
5. Not accepted. The deposit draft Explanatory Memorandum refers in para 2.6 to the aim of locating 55 % of **new** development in the Central Leicestershire Policy Area (CLPA). At the EIP, it was made clear that this was an aspirational target. It would also be unrealistic to apply the target to the total amount of development over the Plan period. This is because the Plan's strategy for distribution has been unable to influence the distribution to date so only 42% of development in the first five years of the Plan

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

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

A Brooks, Mr and Mrs Hall.

**Policy No.**

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

**Summary of Issues**

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

Eight Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

A Brooks, Mr and Mrs Hall.

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

1. The policy should not include criterion (v).
2. The policy should include reference to forms of development falling outside standard classification, e.g. storage and distribution.
3. The policy should include criterion relating to impact on health of development.
4. There should be reference to the need for infrastructure provision to be in place before further development takes place.
5. The policy should include the criterion referring to “the capacity for development at transport nodes within good public transport corridors” recommended by the EIP Panel.

## Five Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

1. Not accepted. This criterion was recommended by the EIP Panel and is consistent with RPG8. It is important in assessing the relative merits of sites to take into consideration their deliverability. This will help to create certainty, and ensure sites are not allocated that may not be implemented within the Plan period.
2. Not accepted. This policy deals with most types of development. However, storage and distribution is one of a number of other types of development which have special circumstances that require exceptions to the sequential approach. Whilst the principles included in the criterion are generally accepted, such circumstances would be more appropriately dealt with in specific policies relating to that development, (see Proposed Modification to Employment Policy 8), rather than as an exception to this generic policy. This is the approach adopted by RPG8.
3. Not accepted. The impact on health of development proposals is adequately dealt with in other relevant controls.
4. Not accepted. Reference to infrastructure provision is made in criterion (ii) of the policy and Strategy Policy 12. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
5. Not accepted. There is no reference to transport nodes in RPG8, so such a criterion would be inconsistent with regional guidance. However, the policy would not preclude development at particular transport nodes, provided it meets the requirements for access by non-car nodes and the capacity of existing public transport as set out in criteria (i) and (ii).

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

Blaby District Council, Burbage Matters! County Museums Service, CPRE Leicestershire, Donington Park Estates, Environment Agency, Gazeley Properties Ltd, Glenfield Parish Council, House Builders Federation, J S Bloor (Measham)

Ltd, John Littlejohn Ltd.

Sally Smart.



**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 3C: Rural Centres**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Four Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

A Brooks, Sally Smart.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 4: Greenfield Development**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Six Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 5: Transport Objectives and Priorities**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Four Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart.

**Policy No.****Strategy Policy 6: Green Wedges.****Summary of Issues**

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

Ten Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

grouping of acceptable land uses.

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Ms Sally Smart, Mr Brookes

**Policy No.****Strategy Policy 7: Review of Green Wedges.****Summary of Issues**

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

Ten Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modifications

**List of Respondents**

Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, North West Leicestershire

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

Mr and Mrs Hall.



**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 8: Separation of Settlements**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Three Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

A Brooks.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 9: Development in the Countryside**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Ten Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

1. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel. It would not prevent district councils from providing additional protection for landscape features of local importance, particularly if justified by a landscape character assessment.
2. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel. PPG7 recommends landscape character assessments as a helpful approach to local planning authorities in reviewing their development plans. However consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. The reference to “overriding need” was recommended by the EIP Panel. The EIP Panel’s concern was that a requirement to demonstrate an overriding need for a development “in principle” goes beyond government policy. The policy has been amended to indicate that demonstration of a countryside location is necessary, as recommended by the EIP Panel.
4. Not accepted. This approach was recommended by the EIP Panel. It is considered appropriate to identify which types of development will be acceptable in the countryside in order to minimise unnecessary development in the countryside. Other types of development would be considered on their merits, as departures from the policies of the plan.
5. Not accepted. This wording was recommended by the EIP Panel. It is considered appropriate to require an overriding need in order to minimise unnecessary development in the countryside. PPG8 stresses the need to minimise impact of development and in particular the need to protect the best and most sensitive environments.
6. Not accepted. The order of items in the policy does not imply priority order. Resource Management Policy 3 encourages energy from renewable sources and takes into

account the wider environmental benefits of using renewable energy resources. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

7. Not accepted. It is not necessary to give examples in the policy, however consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Sally Smart

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 10: Mixed Use Development**

**Summary of Issues**

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

One Representation of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

Amend criterion b) of the Policy to read:

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

**List of Respondents**

Railtrack plc and Government Office for the East Midlands.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 11: Good Design**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Four Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

Amend criterion (a) of the Policy to read:

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

**List of Respondents**

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

Sally Smart.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 14: The National Forest**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Three Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Mr A Brooks.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 15: Charnwood Forest**

**Summary of Issues**

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

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

Amend the second paragraph of the Policy to read:

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

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

Sally Smart.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 16: Rutland Water**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Six Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Mr A Brooks, Sally Smart.



<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Strategy Policy 17 Junction 23a / 24 / 24a Area</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy should be deleted as recommended by the EIP Panel.</li> <li>2. Terminology in the policy should be defined.</li> <li>3. The Explanatory Memorandum should take into account the results of multi-modal studies.</li> <li>4. The deposit draft of the policy is relevant and should remain.</li> <li>5. The policy should take into account the results of QUELS study.</li> </ol> <p>Nine Representations of Support</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended that consideration be given to deleting the policy. It is considered that the policy should be retained as modified to provide greater certainty for the area concerned.</li> <li>2. Not accepted. Consideration will be given to how the terminology is defined when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised. The Explanatory Memorandum will provide guidance for local plans in which exact boundaries are defined.</li> <li>3. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to taking into account the results of the multi-modal studies in amending the Explanatory Memorandum.</li> <li>4. Not accepted. The EIP Panel recommended that consideration be given to deleting the policy. The deposit draft policy is inconsistent with RPG8. It is considered that the policy should be retained as modified to provide greater certainty for the area concerned.</li> <li>5. Not accepted. The Quality Employment Land Study is intended to inform the review of the RPG. However, the study recommendations generally support this policy.</li> </ol>
<p><b><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></b></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><b><u>List of Respondents</u></b></p> <p>Andrew Granger &amp; Co, CPRE Leicestershire, Derbyshire County Council, Donington Park Estates, Glenfield Parish Council, Hallam Land Management, Highways Agency, Leicestershire &amp; Rutland Transport 2000, North West Leicestershire District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Miller Homes East Midlands and Clowes Developments.</p> <p>Mr A Brooks, Sally Smart.</p>

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 18: Green Belt**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Four Representations of Support.

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Sally Smart.

**Policy No.**

**Strategy Policy 19: Strategic River Corridors.**

**Summary of Issues**

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

Nine Representations of Support

**Reasoned Response**

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

**Proposed Policy Action**

No change to Proposed Modification.

**List of Respondents**

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

Mr and Mrs Hall, Sally Smart and Mr Brooks.

