

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 1: Development and the Transport System

Summary of Issues

1. Travel Plans should contain achievable targets.
 2. There should be a policy reference to work on transport and social exclusion.
- Four Representations of Support.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This issue is covered more appropriately in Strategy policy 5. Travel Plans when required will include suitable targets.
2. Not accepted. Strategy Policy 5 and the opening lines of this policy does this implicitly.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification

List of Respondents

Harborough District Council, Highways Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Railtrack, Cawrey Ltd.

Sally Smart, Andy Brooks

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 4: Buses

Summary of Issues

1. The policy is too onerous because not all development warrants bus provision and it is not always practical for all parts of development to be within convenient walking distance. It does not accord with PPG13 (para.6) or with the EIP Panel recommendations.
2. The original policy gave clear guidance on the maximum walking distance for access to buses. The identification of thresholds in the Explanatory Memorandum gives no opportunity to analyse or object.

Three Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. The policy establishes the importance of the principle of accessibility to bus routes for new development. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The level of detail in the original policy was not appropriate for a Structure Plan. Consideration will be given to this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification

List of Respondents

Birstall Parish Council, Cawrey Ltd., Glenfield Parish Council, GO-EM, Harborough District Council, HBF, Miller Homes, Soar Valley Preservation Soc.
Andy Brooks, Sally Smart.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 5: Development of Rail Passenger Services

Summary of Issues

1. Objection to exclusion of the Ivanhoe Line and other stations in the policy as it is contrary to the EIP Panel's recommendations.

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. There is not a reasonable degree of certainty that the proposals will proceed within the plan period, which would warrant their inclusion in the policy. However, consideration will be given to referring to these proposals when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Highways Agency, Glenfield Parish Council, Railtrack, Cawrey Ltd.
Sally Smart, Andy Brooks

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 6: Freight

Summary of Issues

1. There needs to be a reasonable degree of certainty for identifying rail or waterway freight connections in local plans. If there is uncertainty over the matter, the land should be safeguarded rather than identified.
2. The Proposed Modification omits the phrase “overriding sustainable benefit” which was included in the pre-EIP changes and accepted by the EIP Panel.
3. The policy should provide protection for Waterways, which have historic interest.

Five Representations of Support

Reasoned Response

1. Not accepted. This modified policy already provides for both identification and protection and is the EIP Panel’s recommended form of wording.
2. Accepted. The phrase was inadvertently omitted in the Proposed Modification. It should therefore be re-instated.
3. Not accepted. Covered by Environment Policy 1.

Proposed Policy Action

Amend the last paragraph of the Policy to read:

“Rail or waterway based proposals that do not satisfy the above criteria may be permitted ***if there is an overriding sustainability benefit***, provided that the main justification for the development is the need for rail or waterway access for the movement of goods or raw materials.”

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, English Heritage, English Nature, Gazeley Properties, GO-EM, Harborough District Council, Railtrack, RSPB, UK Coal Mining

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 7: Parking Provision in New Development</p>
<p><u>Summary of Issues</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unclear what the policy is intending to do, over and above giving strategic direction to maximum parking standards in individual plans. 2. The policy does not address parking levels below minimum standards. 3. The policy should specify that maximum parking standards are defined in PPG13 and RPG8. <p>Two Representations of Support</p>
<p><u>Reasoned Response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not accepted. The intention of this policy is indeed to give strategic direction to the provision of maximum parking standards in individual plans. 2. Not accepted. PPG13 states that there should be no minimum standards for development 3. Not accepted. The wording of the policy was recommended by the EIP Panel and drafted in accordance with PPG13 and RPG8. Structure Plan policies should not include references to other policy guidance, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
<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, Harborough District Council, Hinckley & Bosworth District Council.</p> <p>Andy Brooks, Sally Smart.</p>

<p><u>Policy No.</u></p> <p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 8: Public Car Parks</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>

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 9: Park and Ride

Summary of Issues

1. Discussions between the Highways Agency and the Councils should take place before proposals for Leicester West are developed.
2. The policy does not reflect the advantages of locating Park and Ride at transport interchanges.

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. This is not a comment on the content of the Plan. However, the Highways Agency will be consulted on proposals for the Leicester West Transport Scheme.
2. Not accepted. This is not a valid objection as no Proposed Modification has been made to amend this policy.

Proposed Policy Action

None

List of Respondents

Atis Real Wetheralls, Highways Agency.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 10: New Roads, Road Improvements and Management of Traffic

Summary of Issues

1. A reference in the Explanatory Memorandum to the safeguarding of the Kibworth Bypass would be welcomed.
2. The policy should include proposals from the Road Management Studies and the M1 Multi Modal Study, including particular nodes and land approved for road construction.
3. Concern about the design of the Earl Shilton Bypass.
4. Object to the decision not to accept the EIP Panel's recommendation that the Loughborough Inner Relief Road (LIRR) should be listed in the policy and the reference to the £5m qualifying criteria changed.

One Representation of Support

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however consideration will be given to referring to this proposal when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The policy relates to major transport schemes that are firm proposals in current Local Transport Plans and are strategic in nature. Consideration will be given to referring to such proposals when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
3. Not accepted. This is a matter for the detailed design and planning application stage.
4. Not accepted. The Loughborough Inner Relief Road should not be referred to in the policy because the cost of the project does not exceed £5million and therefore it is not defined as a major transport scheme. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.

Proposed Policy Action

No changes to the Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Carlton Parish Council, Borough of Charnwood, Harborough District Council.

Andy Brooks.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 11: Transport Routes

Summary of Issues

1. Local plans cannot reserve the continuity of long distance rail routes. Add words "Notwithstanding the above" at beginning of 2nd para.
2. Reference should be made in the Explanatory Memorandum to the M1 alterations and Park & Ride sites, subject to the sites not being identified.

One Representation of Support.

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. Local Plans can safeguard rail routes from other development and therefore reserve their continuity. The proposed amendment is unnecessary.
2. Not accepted. Not appropriate to identify sites within a Structure plan.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Blaby District Council, Carlton Parish Council
Andy Brooks.

Policy No.

Accessibility and Transport Policy 13: Airports and General Aviation

Summary of Issues

1. The Explanatory Memorandum should clarify the practical interpretation of improved surface access, including the need for a rail link to the airport, and include a reference to the Airport's Transport Forum.
2. The policy should state that surface access must be sustainable and set targets for modal split.
3. The blanket restriction on other airports is too onerous and does not accord with national and regional guidance, the EIP Panel or the balanced approach proposed in respect of general aviation.
4. Economic benefits cannot be balanced against environmental benefits.

Three Representations of Support

Reasoned Response.

1. Not accepted. The Explanatory Memorandum is not being considered as part of the Proposed Modifications, however, consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.
2. Not accepted. The first paragraph of the policy refers to the evaluation of access provision against sustainability criteria. Modal split targets are a matter for Local Transport Plans.
3. Not accepted. It is considered that there is no justification for the establishment or physical expansion of any other commercial airports that would over-ride the potential environmental damage.
4. Not accepted. Sustainability Appraisals enable proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on a range of criteria including economic and environmental considerations.

Proposed Policy Action

No change to Proposed Modification.

List of Respondents

Derbyshire County Council, East Midlands Airport, GO-EM, Harborough District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council.

Andy Brooks

