

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Central Areas and Shopping 2: Belgrave Road</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>No representations</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>None</p>
<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>None</p>

<p><b><u>Policy No.</u></b></p> <p><b>Central Areas and Shopping 3: Retail Development and Community Facilities to Serve Local Need</b></p>
<p><b><u>Summary of Issues</u></b></p> <p>1. The planning system is not designed to protect existing shops, services and facilities yet this policy seeks to sustain or enhance local centres to meet people's day-to-day needs, to reducing the need to travel.</p>
<p><b><u>Reasoned Response</u></b></p> <p>1. Not accepted. The policy should not be read as an attempt to protect individual shops. It is a legitimate policy objective to secure the vitality and viability of centres which may involve restriction of changes of use in certain circumstances. Consideration will be given to clarifying this matter when the Explanatory Memorandum is revised.</p>
<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>GOEM</p>

**Policy No.**

**Central Areas and Shopping 4: Out-of-centre retailing**

**Summary of Issues**

1. Policy presumption against out-of-centre retail development is not supported by PPG6 or the planning system in general.
2. Criterion (b) does not reflect the sequential approach to site selection set out in paragraph 1.11 of PPG6.
3. It is not clear why Shepshed is considered to be a "Main Town" for the purposes of Strategy Policy 3A, but its centre is not considered to be a preferred location for new retail or leisure development.
4. In criterion (c) the combined consideration of whether a proposed out-of-centre retail development would adversely affect the vitality and viability of nearby town centres and the presumption against retail development of land allocated for other uses is confusing. Criterion (d) covers the issue of the impact on the vitality and viability and private investment in nearby town centres and would therefore appear to duplicate criterion (c).
5. Criterion (c) conflicts with Employment Policy 6.
6. Explanatory Memorandum, paragraphs 8.3 & 8.16, is out of date in relation to definition of warehouse clubs.
7. In advance of the retail assessment, the Proposed Modifications provide no assessment of retail need or justification that town centres in sequentially preferred locations have sufficient capacity therefore the statement that there is no requirement for a new regional or sub-regional shopping centre cannot be justified.
8. The policy does not reflect RPG8 Policy 17 and supporting text:
  - (a) the qualification that out-of-centre facilities should be located to encourage sustainable development;
  - (b) pressure to redefine out-of-centre facilities as town or district centre facilities in development plans is unlikely to be justified (rather than resisted).

**Four Representations of Support**

**Reasoned Response**

1. Not accepted. Out-of-centre retail developments will be subject to the key tests in Section 4 of PPG6 as clarified by Ministerial statement in 1999. The Proposed Modification to Strategy Policy 2 stresses the importance of strategic considerations.
2. Not accepted. The policy is worded in a way that is consistent with Strategy Policy 3, as recommended by the EIP Panel.
3. Not accepted. Charnwood Local Plan treats Shepshed as a district centre for shopping and leisure purposes. Changes to Shepshed's position in the hierarchy would be premature pending completion of work at the regional level.
4. Not accepted. The wording of criterion c) does not refer to vitality and viability of

centres but to prejudicing sites allocated to ‘retail or leisure and entertainment’ (the subject of the policy) and to other development.

5. Not accepted. There is no conflict with Employment Policy 6. The policy states that the development of other sites should not be prejudiced and Employment Policy 6 states that key employment sites will be safeguarded from other development proposals. Employment Policy 6 then sets out the criteria when other (non-key) employment sites might be released for development for other purposes. Employment Policy 6 does not suggest that a sequential approach for retail and leisure development can be circumvented.
6. 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.
7. Not accepted. The need for further development is being addressed through the revision of the Central Leicestershire Retail Strategy. A sequential approach to site selection should be followed in line with PPG6 ‘Town Centres and Retail Developments’ if such a need is identified. The Retail Assessment for Leicester (1998) also provides an indication of capacity for new retail development on the edge of the Leicester’s Central Shopping Core and the LRC Masterplan Strategic Framework and subsequent Supplementary Planning Guidance will do the same. A capacity study has been commissioned by the Planning Forum of the EMRLGA to address these issues. When completed it would provide a regional context for development in town centres. The evidence of retail need and justification that town centres in sequentially preferred locations have sufficient capacity will need to be taken into account in subsequent reviews of strategic guidance.
8. Not accepted. Such matters should, more appropriately, be covered in the Explanatory Memorandum. 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**

Glenfield Parish Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, B & Q plc, GOEM, Wm Morrisons Supermarkets, Costco Wholesale, Blaby District Council, David Cooper & Co, Harborough District Council, Borough of Charnwood, Sally Smart.

