

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

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Resource Management Policy 2: Energy Efficiency</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <p>Two Representations of Support.</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <p>None.</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 Ms Sally Smart</p>

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Resource Management Policy 3: Energy Installations</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern about the balance between the detrimental effect of technology, such as wind turbines on residents, and the benefits of that technology for the environment. 2. The policy does not recognise the importance of the reduction in climate change the use of renewable energy sources produces. 3. The policy does not take account of policy 56 of RPG8. 4. The fourth bullet point is unclear. <p>Four Representations of Support, one with a general comment.</p>

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy is in line with PPG 22, which states that Authorities will have to consider both the immediate impact on the local environment and their wider contributions to the reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.
2. Not accepted. The policy encourages the generation of renewable energy and gives particular emphasis to their wider environmental benefits.
3. Not accepted. The policy reflects locational criteria referred to in policy 56 of RPG8. There is no need for the Structure Plan to repeat RPG.
4. Not accepted. This is a matter for the Explanatory Memorandum which provides clarification of the policy and consideration will be given to clarifying this bullet point when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Glenfield Parish Council, Friends of Ratby Action Group, Terence o'Rourke plc, Harborough District Council.

Mr A Brooks, Ms Sally Smart,

Policy No.

Resource Management Policy 4: The Water Environment

Summary of Issues

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

Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. **Not** accepted. Development that would impede the flow of flood water or affect the capacity of the floodplain to store water are examples of how development could increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. However, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The effect of development on archaeology is adequately dealt within other policies of the Plan.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

English Heritage, Environment Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Harborough District Council, Ibstock Property & Minerals Service

Policy No.

Resource Management Policy 5: Agricultural Land

Summary of Issues

1. The policy does not reflect advice in PPG7 that development of the best and most versatile land should not be permitted unless opportunities for accommodating development on previously developed land or within urban areas have been assessed.
2. The term “sustainability considerations” renders the policy vague, contrary to advice in PPG12 Annex A paragraph 16.

One Representation of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This wording was put forward by GOEM at the EIP and recommended by the Panel. The Policy should be read in conjunction with Strategy Policy 3A, which sets out the sequential approach to development and requires priority be given to development of previously developed land in urban areas before land in other locations. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. This wording was put forward by GOEM at the EIP recommended by the Panel. The term “sustainability considerations” is also used in paragraph 2.17 of PPG7. The policy should be read in conjunction with Strategy Policy 3B, which identifies the criteria to be taken into account in considering the suitability of land for development. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

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

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

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 8: Land Release: Waste Management
<u>Summary of Issues</u> 1. Appears to promote waste production and landfill One Representation of Support
<u>Reasoned Response</u> 1. Not Accepted. The modification refers to current best practice, and is in accordance with processes set out in PPG 10 and the National Waste Strategy. It has been established (nationally) that waste arisings are currently growing at a rate of around 3% per annum. New and replacement waste management facilities are therefore required on an on-going basis, and these will be assessed in the light of points i) to iv) detailed in the modification, including waste minimisation initiatives which are at the top of the waste hierarchy. The anticipated scale of provision required for future waste disposal after 2006, is a matter for the review of the Waste Local Plan, and will be guided by the review of RPG.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification
<u>List of Respondents</u> Government Office for the East Midlands, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service, Harborough District Council Mr A Brooks

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

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

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

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Resource Management Policy 12: Transportation of Minerals and Waste</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The phrase ‘wherever reasonably practical’ is open to interpretation and would benefit from clarification, particularly in terms of the financial aspects of waste transportation. 2. There is drafting error in the Proposed Modification to the policy. It should refer to “Rail, canal and pipeline as a means of transporting minerals and waste....”, the subject of the policy. <p>One Representation of Support</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted. This policy now echoes policy 9 of the Waste Local Plan, and was tested at the public local inquiry. In reaching his recommendation on this matter, the Inspector concluded, “it would be difficult for the policy to go further than this since much will depend upon the nature of the waste management proposals”. The term “wherever reasonably practical” would be treated as a planning judgement, therefore, and weight attached accordingly on a case by case basis. 2. Accepted. The policy should be amended.
<p><u>Proposed Policy Action</u></p> <p>Amend the Policy to read:</p> <p>“...Rail, canal and pipeline as a means of transporting minerals and waste should be used wherever reasonably practicable.”</p>
<p><u>List of Respondents</u></p> <p>Railtrack Plc, Ibstock Property and Minerals Service</p>

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

<u>Policy No.</u> Resource Management Policy 14: Recovery of Waste
<u>Summary of Issues</u> Two Representations of Support.
<u>Reasoned Response</u> None.
<u>Proposed Policy Action</u> No change to Proposed Modification.
<u>List of Respondents</u> Environment Agency, Harborough District Council

