

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Environment Policy 1: Historic Environment.</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>1. Would be beneficial to include information about recent schemes that are being employed nationwide by County Archaeology section.</p> <p>Four Representations of Support</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>1. Not accepted. It is not appropriate to include this in the policy, however, consideration will be given to making reference to this when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.</p>
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>No change to Proposed Modification.</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>Glenfield Parish Council, County Museums Service, Harborough District Council.</p> <p>Ms Sally Smart</p>

<u>Policy No.</u> Environment Policy 3: Biodiversity Enhancement.
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Eleven Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modifications.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Environment Agency, English Nature, Friends of Ratby Action Group, CPRE Leicestershire, Carlton Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council. Ms Sally Smart

Policy No.

Environment Policy 3A: Protection of Important Species and Habitats.

Summary of Issues

1. The amendment to the EIP Panel's recommendation in relation to Habitats of International Importance misinterprets Reg. 49 of the Habitats Directive. Support the EIP Panel's recommended wording with suggested slight amendment.
2. The policy exceeds the EIP Panel's recommendations and runs contrary to the advice of English Nature, the RSPB and PPG9.
3. The word "local" should be inserted between overriding and need in relation to Habitats of Local Importance to ensure consistency with parts (I) and (ii) of this policy and Environment Policy 4.
4. Criteria iii) and v) c): Protection of Important Species and Habitats. A development plan policy should not be made reliant upon another document.
5. The policy appears to extend law relating to environmental protection, which is a matter for Parliament. It skips several important steps in 1994 Regulations and applies tests appropriate to Habitats of International Importance to other sites. Uncertainty about terms such as "national need" and "local need".

Five Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Accepted in part. The wording should be amended to be consistent with EIP Panel's recommendations. Do not accept other minor amendments as these were not recommended by the EIP Panel.
2. Accepted. The wording should be amended to be consistent with the EIP Panel's recommendations and national policy.
3. Accepted in part. Further modification consistent with the EIP Panel recommendation will ensure consistency with national policy.
4. Not accepted. The debate at the EIP and the subsequent panel report was very supportive of stronger links in the policy to Biodiversity Action Plans.
5. Accepted. The wording should be amended to be consistent with the EIP Panel's recommendations and national policy.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend section (i) Habitats of International Importance to read:

“Developments will only be acceptable where it would not adversely affect designated or proposed Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation or Ramsar sites, unless ~~an overriding international need for the development can be shown to outweigh the sites' ecological interest and there are no alternative solutions available for that development~~ **and the development is needed for imperative reasons of overriding public interest.**”

Amend the last sentence of section (iii) Habitats of Local Importance to read:

“unless an overriding ***national or local*** need can be shown to outweigh the ecological interest ~~and there are no alternative solutions.~~”

Amend the last sentence of section (iv) Species of Acknowledged Importance to read:

“and development will not be permitted unless an overriding ~~need~~ ***interest*** can be proven and there are no alternative solution”

List of Respondents

Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Environment Agency, English Nature, Friends of Ratby Action Group, CPRE Leicestershire, Carlton Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council.

Ms Sally Smart

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

