

Appendices B

Preferred Options Consultation

Appendix B1 List of Consultees

Consultees: 774

11 O'Clock Group	14th Leicester Boys Brigade Company
21st Century Tanning	Abington High School
Access Group	Action Homeless (Leicester) Ltd
Aerodrome Standards, Civil Aviation	Affordable Appliances
Age Concern	Age Concern
Age Concern	Age Concern (Leics. & Rutland)
Age Concern (Leics. & Rutland)	Age Concern (Luncheon Club)
Age Concern Bhavic Group	Age Concern Oadby
Age Concern Wigston	Air Speed Taxis
All Saints Church Of England Primary School	All Saints Thursday Senior Citizens Club
All Weather Windows & Conservatories	Allseasons Angling Centre
Alpha Land & Planning	Amelia Hair Salon
Anand Group	Anchor Housing Trust
Andrew Bourne & Co	Andrew Granger & Co
Andrew Granger And Co	Ann Kathryn Hairdressers
Apollo Cash & Carry	APT Design Ltd
Arriva Midlands	Asda Stores Ltd
Asian Arts Association	Asian Arts Association
Asian Arts Association	Asian Arts Association
Asian Families Support Group	Aylestone Lane Allotment Association
Barclays Bank Plc	Bargain Booze
Barratt East Midlands	Barry's Barbers Shop
Barton Willmore Planning	Barton Willmore Planning
Bassett Street Friendship Club	BBC East Midlands
BBC Leicester	Beauchamp College
Beauchamp College	Beauchamp Physically Handicapped Group
Beauchamp Tuesday Group	Bidwells Property Consultants
Birkett House School And Hostel	Birthdays Ltd
Blaby District Council	Blaby Parish Council
Bloor Homes	Boots The Chemist
Boots The Chemist	Bradford & Bingley Building Society
Branded Clothing	British Airports Authority (Corporate Office)
British Gas	British Gas Connections Ltd
British Gas Pipelines Ltd	British Limbless Ex-Servicemen's Association
British Red Cross (Adult Activities)	British Red Cross Family Support Service
British Red Cross Wigston (Junior Activities)	British Red Cross Wigston (Youth Activities)
British Telecom (Leicester)	British Telecommunications Plc
British Waterways South East	British Youth Council
Brockshill Primary School	Brookside County Primary School
Brookside Punjabi Club	Bryant Homes East Midlands Ltd
Bryant Homes East Midlands	Budworth Brown
Buildings Preservation Trust	Bushloe High School
Buy-Cycles	BWEA
Cafe Maromme	Calor Gas Ltd
Campaign For Real Ale	Cancer Research UK
Capricorn Hairdressing	Carers Group
Carol's Hairdressing	Carter Jonas Property Consultants
CBI East Midlands	Central Networks
Centre 88 Project & Mental Health Project	Cerebral Palsy Support Group
CGMS Consulting	Charnwood Borough Council
China Garden	Choice Videos
Chris Sharpe Motorcycles	Christadelphian Church
Christina Louise	Church Commissioners

Church Commissioners For England	Citizens Advice Bureau
Civil Aviation Authority	Clarke Homes Limited
CLASP The Carers Centre	Cleaning Cupboard
Coffee Break	Coffee Pot Group
Commission For Architecture & The Built Environment	Commission For Racial Equality
Confederation Of British Industry	Connell Shakespear
Connells Residential Sales	Conservative Association
Coombes Bakers	Co-Operative Retail Services Ltd
Copyright Libraries Agency	Coral Racing
Corals	Costas Fish And Chip Shop
Council For British Archaeology	Council For British Archaeology
Council For Education Of Romany & Travellers	Countesthorpe Disabled Adults Group
Countesthorpe Parish Council	Countesthorpe Visually Impaired Group
Country Land & Business Association	Country Land & Business Association
CPRE (Leicestershire Group)	CPRE (National Branch)
CPRE, Leicester Branch	Cromwell Logistics
CT Planning	CT Planning
Cub Scouts	Curtis Weston Day Centre
David B Williamson	David Bedder Sports
David Wilson Homes	Davis Hill Opticians
Davis Hill Opticians	DCLG
Defra	DEFRA
Del Rosa Developments	Denbydale Residents Group
Department For Education And Employment	Department For Education And Skills
Department For Trade And Industry	Department For Transport
Department Of Constitutional Affairs	Department Of Culture Media And Sport
Department Of Work And Pensions	Dept Of Transport (London)
Development Land And Planning	Devplan UK
Dialogue	Diamond Knitwear Ltd
Diocese Of Leicester	Direct Carpet Supplies Ltd
Disability Right Commission	Divine Innovations
Dominos Pizza	Down's Parent & Toddler Group
Dr M D Glasse	DTZ Pieda Consulting
Dudrich (Holdings) Ltd	Early Bird Computers
East Midlands Ambulance Service	East Midlands Development Agency
East Midlands Electricity	East Midlands Public Health Group
East Midlands Regional Assembly	Edward Coles
Edward Garnier MP	Elisabeth Simon
Energy Watch Central	English Heritage
English Partnerships	Environment Agency
Epic Accessories	Equal Opportunities Commission
Equity Insurance Brokers	Eric Wright Carpets
ES Pipelines Ltd	Eskay Jewellers
ESP Networks Ltd	Essential Carpets & Beds
Evergreen (Oadby)	Evergreen (South Wigston)
Evergreen (Wigston)	Exquisite Displays
Eye Check	Fairclough Homes Midlands Division Ltd
Fairfax Management Consultants	Fairfield Community Primary School
Fairfield Disabled Group	Fairfield Friendly Club
Fairfield Partially Sighted Group	Fairfield Tuesday Club
Fairfield Visually Handicapped Group	Farm Gate
Farmfoods	Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group
Federation Of Mosceua	Feel Good Factor
Fields In Trust	Fine Pine
First Leicester	Fisher Hargreaves Proctor
Five Winds Pine Shop	Floors To Go
Flower Company	Forbuoys (TM Retail)
Forestry Commission	Forestry Commission

Frail Elderly Group	Framptons
Frank The Barber	Free Church
Freight Transport Association	Friends Of The Earth
Friends Of The Earth	Friends Of The Earth (Leicester Forum Group)
Friends Of The Earth (London HQ)	Friends Of Willow Park
Friends, Families And Travellers	Fruitas Ltd
FWAG	Gartree High School
Gateway Club	George Wimpey
Gifts & Jewellery Centre	Ginger Bread Cottage
Girl Venture Air Cadet Corps	Glen Craft Jewellers
Glen Gorse Golf Club	Glen Parva Parish Council
Glenmere Community Primary School	Global Utility Connections
Going Places	Gordon Davis Pharmacy
Gordon Davis Pharmacy	Gordon Smith Associates
Gough Planning Services	Government Office For The East Midlands
Government Office For The West Midlands	Granary Pets
Great Glen Group For The Disabled	Great Glen Parish Council
Greater Wigston Historical Society	Grevayne Properties Limited
GTC Pipelines Ltd	Guide Dogs For The Blind
Guiding Oadby And Wigston Division	Guthlaxton College
Guthlaxton College	Guthlaxton School Over 60's Club
Guthlaxton Young Peoples Centre	GVA Grimley
GVA Grimley	Gypsy And Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Gypsy Council	Gypsy Council For Health, Ed. And Welfare
Hair Elite	Halifax Estate Agents
Halifax Estate Agents Ltd	Hallcross Dental Practice
Hampshires Bakery	Harborough District Council
Hardys And Hanson	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy
Harrison Murray Ltd	Hartnell Taylor Cook
Hayes & Barrajo Vets	Health And Safety Executive
Healthy Living	Heards Butchers
Hearing Impaired Pre-School Group	Heating & Bathroom Studio
Helping Hands Advice Centre	Henry Smith Hamylton (Opticians) Ltd
Henry Walker & Son	Hensons PVC Supplies
High Gain House	Highways Agency
Hinckley And Bosworth Borough Council	Hindu Religious And Cultural Society
HM Prison Service	HM Railway Inspectorate
Holland Park Amusements	Home Office
Honda 2000	House Builders Federation
House Builders Federation	Housing Corporation
HSBC Bank Plc	HSBC Plc
Iceland	Ilkeston Travel
Immaculate Conception Catholic Church	Impressions
In Home	In Line TV
Independent Pipelines Ltd	India Cottage
Indigo Planning Ltd	Institute Of Directors
Invicta Plastics	Irish Traveller Movement In Britain
ITV Central	ITV Central News East
J & G Cottage	J P Voyle Shoes
J Sainsbury Plc	Jacobs Bakery Ltd
Jakin Pregnancy Care And Counselling	James Walker Estate Agents
Jasmine Court Social Club	Jeannes Fashions
Jelson Ltd	Jewel In The Crown
John F Milner Bakers	John Hardy Antiques
John Rain	John Woods Hairdressers
Johnsons Dry Cleaners	Johnsons Fruitiers
Jones Day	K J Featherby & Son
Kilby Parish Council	La Croix Hair Design

Ladbroke Racing	Lancaster Bell Senior Citizens
Landmark Planning	Langmoor Primary School
Launde Primary School	Lawson-West LLP
LDA Urban Design	Leicester & Rutland Sport
Leicester Cable Television	Leicester City Council
Leicester Fish Bar	Leicester Housing Association
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Malaysian Society
Leicester Malaysian Society	Leicester Mercury
Leicester Neighbourhood Watch Association	Leicester Racecourse
Leicester Shire Promotions Ltd	Leicester Tigers
Leicester Victims Of Crime Support Scheme	Leicestershire & Rutland Bat Group
Leicestershire & Rutland Playing Fields Association	Leicestershire Badger Group
Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce	Leicestershire Chamber Of Commerce & Industry
Leicestershire Constabulary	Leicestershire Constabulary
Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire County Council
Leicestershire County Council	Leicestershire Economic Partnership
Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service	Leicestershire Learning & Skills Council
Leicestershire Records Office	Leicestershire Wildlife Trust
Leics And Rutland Facilities Consortium	Leics, Northants, Rutland Health Authority
Link Into Learning	Little Gems
Little Hill Primary School	Little Stretton Parish Council
Lloyds Pharmacy	Lloyds TSB
Lockhart Garratt	Lords Electrical
Loros	Los Amigos Pizzas
Lou Men's Hairdressers	Lovell Johns
Lucky House Chinese Takeaway	Lunn Poly
Magna Fish Bar	Magna Windows
Malcolm Judd & Partners	Manor High Gujarati Club
Manor High School	Mario Hair Studio
Mark Jarvis Racing Service	Mark Jarvis Turf Accountants
Market Harborough Building Society	Marks And Spencers
Marquis Of Queensbury	Marrons Solicitors
Mazu Hairdressing	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd
Meadow Community Primary School	Meadows Estate Resident Association
Melton Borough Council	Mencap Head Office
Menphys Centre	Mercury News
Mercury News	Mercury News
Methodist Church	Midland Co-Op Travel
Midland Screenprinters Ltd	Midlands Co-Op
Midlands Co-Operative Funeral Service	Midlands Co-Operative Society Ltd
Mike Hardy	Miller Homes Ltd
Mind	Ministry Of Defence
Minit Services	Mobile Phone Operators Association
Moments	Moon Salon Ltd
Moonlit Chemist	Moss Pharmacy
Mowlem Energy Ltd	Mr & Mrs A C Serjeant
Mr & Mrs Fahey	Mr & Mrs Linsley
Mr & Mrs Moloney	Mr & Mrs P M Cooper
Mr & Mrs Rawson	Mr & Mrs Tebbutt
Mr A Baker	Mr A Newton
Mr B A Marlow	Mr B Marvin
Mr C Hames	Mr E Sewell

Mr E Stanger	Mr Hewitt
Mr J Rumball	Mr K Rouse
Mr M Kanth	Mr N Samani
Mr P Freer	Mr P Lakin
Mr P Tyler	Mr R Ellis
Mr R Laycock	Mr T Sumpter
Mrs E Spencer	Mrs P Burton
Mrs R Lee	Mrs S Wilkins
Mrs V Hill	Ms F Burgess
Ms K Aucott	Ms P Ward
Ms S Briars	Ms V Brown
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	National Disability Council
National Farmers Union	National Federation Of Women's Institutes
National Grid	National Grid
National Offender Management Service	National Playing Fields Association
National Travellers Action Group	National Westminster Plc
Natural England	Natural England
Network Rail	Network Rail
Neville Chadwick Photography	North West Leicestershire District Council
Northwood Residential Lettings	NTL
O2 (UK) Ltd	Oadby & Wigston Local Strategic Partnership
Oadby & Wigston Muslim Association	Oadby Angling
Oadby Carpets	Oadby Civic Society
Oadby DIY LTD	Oadby Evangelical Free Church
Oadby Furnishers	Oadby Travel Worldchoice
Office Of Government Commerce	Olive Tree Cyprus Taverna
Oliver's	On Yer Bike
Orange Personal Communication Services Ltd	Osbourne Office Stationers
OWBC Graham Norman	OWBC Gil Crisp
OWBC Steve Bruce	OWBC Nikki Heap
OWBC Anne Court	OWBC Jim Walker
OWBC Councillor Lesley Thornton	OWBC Clare Sharpe
OWBC Martin Cregg	OWBC Cllr LA Bentley
OWBC Cllr LM Broadley	OWBC Cllr M Griffiths
OWBC Cllr RI Sylvester	OWBC Cllr HE Loydall
OWBC Cllr SA Dickinson	OWBC Cllr EM Connell
OWBC Cllr PA Hings	OWBC Cllr MO Carrara
OWBC Cllr KMA Brown	OWBC Cllr JM Gore
OWBC Cllr L Eaton	OWBC Cllr JW Boyce
OWBC Cllr TS Biring	OWBC Cllr J Kaufman
OWBC Cllr CS Gore	OWBC Cllr CL Edmonston
OWBC Cllr J Vickerstaff	OWBC Cllr GA Boulter
OWBC Cllr SB Morris	OWBC Cllr GA Gamble
OWBC Cllr P Swift	OWBC Cllr MH Charlesworth
OWBC Cllr RER Morris	OWBC Cllr KJ Loydall
Owner/Occupier 66 London RoadOadbyLeicesterLE2 5DH	Owner/Occupier 47 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA
Owner/Occupier 90 The ParadeOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BF	Owner/Occupier 3 Stoughton RoadOadbyLeicesterLE2 4DS
Owner/Occupier 20 Canal StreetWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PL	Owner/Occupier 76 The ParadeOadbyLeicesterLE2 5BF
Owner/Occupier 22 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4SB	Owner/Occupier 39 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA
Owner/Occupier 53 Leicester RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 1NR	Owner/Occupier 37 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA
Owner/Occupier50E Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4SD	Owner/Occupier 9 The ArcadeLeicester RoadWigstonLeicestershire
Owner/Occupier 33 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PA	Owner/Occupier 95 Blaby RoadWigstonLeicestershireLE18 4PB

Owner/Occupier 73 The Parade Oadby Leicester LE2 5BB	Owner/Occupier 89 Blaby Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 4PB
Owner/Occupier 51 Blaby Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 4PA	Owner/Occupier 52 Blaby Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 4SD
Owner/Occupier 3 Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 1NR	Owner/Occupier 3 The Arcade Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire
Owner/Occupier 71 Long Street Wigston Leicestershire LE18 2AJ	Owner/Occupier 34 Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 1DR
Owner/Occupier 52 Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 1DR	Owner/Occupier 11B Leicester Road Oadby Leicester LE2 5BD
Owner/Occupier 48 Chestnut Avenue Oadby Leicester LE2 5JG	Owner/Occupier 5 The Arcade Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire
Owner/Occupier 28 The Parade Oadby Leicester LE2 5BF	Owner/Occupier 50 Long Street Wigston Leicestershire LE18 2AH
Owner/Occupier 9 - 11 Bell Street Wigston Leicestershire LE18 1AD	Owner/Occupier 4 Leicester Road Wigston Leicestershire LE18 1DR
Oxfam	Oxfam
P R M Wray	Parivar Group
Parkinson's Disease Society	Parkland Primary School
Paul & Company	Peacock & Smith
Pegasus Planning Group	Pennywise Discount
Percy Lord & Son Ltd	Perfect Pizza
Persimmon Homes	Persimmon Homes
Pet Care	Peter Jackson Associates
Phillips & Powell Solicitors	PJ Leather Goods/Kimberley Blinds
Planning Issues	Pound World
Poundstretcher	Professional Dog Grooming
Profile Vision	Quadrant Pipelines Ltd
R F Brookes	R Jones Insurance Brokers Ltd
Radleigh Homes	Rail Freight Group
Railtrack Property	RE:Active Young Peoples Forum
Readings Hope & Mann	Red Carpets
Red Lantern Chinese Take Away	Redrow Homes Ltd
Remit	Retail Property Consultancy
Retreads 50+ Group	Rich & Carr Solicitors
Riverside Housing Association	Robinson's Jewellers
Roger Hairdressers	Roger Tym & Partners
Roshni Asian Women's Group	Route 55
Royal British Legion	Royal Mail Group (c/o Agent)
Royal Mail Property Holdings	Royal National Institute For The Blind
RPS Planning, Transport & Environment	RSPB (Central England Offices)
Rural Community Council	Rural Housing Trust
Rutland County Council	Sab-Ki-Awaaz
Saffron Trees Action Group	Sai Superstores
Salsa Wrap	Sandwich
Sapphire & Steel	Savak Samaj
Savers Health And Beauty	Scottish Power Gas Ltd
Scotts Estate Agents	Scout Group
Scout Group Wigston	Severn Trent Water Limited
Sharpe Lanham Accountants Plc	She!
Shoe Zone	Shoefayre Ltd
Sight On Sound Support Group	Sixth Sense Group
Sixty Plus	Skins And Needles
Skylark Ltd	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Society For Protection Of Ancient Buildings	Society For The Blind
Someone Somewhere	South Leicestershire College
South Leicestershire Day Service	South Leicestershire Primary Care Trust
South Wigston Cycle Centre	South Wigston High School
South Wigston Methodist Ladies Circle	South Wigston URC

SP Gas Ltd	Special Needs Family Resource Centre
Special Needs Family Support Centre	Spencers Estate Agents
Spencers Estate Agents Ltd	Spice Of India
Spire Leicester Hospital	Sport England (East Midlands Region)
SSE Pipelines	SSE Pipelines Ltd
St. John Fisher RC Primary School	Stamford Homes
Stonleigh Planning Partnership	Stoughton Parish Council
Super Dry Cleaners	Swatlands
Sweet Tooth	T J Burgers & Alfa Kebabs
Talk About Group	Tartan Cafe
Taylor Estate Agents	Tele 2 (UK)
Tesco C/o Cushman And Wakefield Healey And Baker	The Ankur Group
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Ankur Group	The Ankur Group
The Barbers Shop	The Bed Place
The Black Dog Public House	The British Library
The British Youth Council	The Coal Authority
The Crown Estate	The Environment Agency
The Fairfield Partnership	The Fox Inn Public House
The Garden History Society	The Gooseberry Bush Nursery
The Gypsy Council	The Housing Corporation
The Inland Waterways Association	The Littman Partnership
The National Trust	The National Trust
The New Inn Public House	The Office Of Government Commerce
The Old Library Public House	The Redfern Kirton Partnership
The Retreat Beauty Salon	The Robert Doughty Consultancy
The Royal British Legion	The Sikh Welfare And Cultural Society
The Three Bells Public House	The William Wyggeston Public House
Thresher Wine Merchants	Thythorn Field Community Primary School
Time Display Screen Printers	Tippetts Florist
T-Mobile (UK) Ltd	Transco
Traveller Education Service	Travellers Advice Team
Travellers Advice Team	Travelling Family Services
Trevor N Coleman	Tubs Taps & Tiles
Turley Associates Ltd	University Hospitals Of Leicester NHS Trust
University Of Leicester	Utility Grid Installations
Video Box	Vision Care Optical Ltd
VISTA	Vodafone Ltd
Voluntary Action For Oadby & Wigston	Wans Kitchen Restaurant
Water Leys Primary School	Waterloo Housing Group
Westbury Homes	Westleigh Development Ltd
Wheelers And Shunters Club	WI Leicestershire And Rutland
Wigston Balti House	Wigston Bathroom Centre
Wigston Chippy	Wigston Civic Society
Wigston Club For Young People	Wigston Co-Op Women's Group
Wigston DIY	Wigston Framework Knitters Museum
Wigston Gallery	Wigston Garage & MOT Centre
Wigston Gingerbread	Wigston Jewellers
Wigston Pharmacy	Wigston Townswomens' Guild
Wiling & Able	Wilkinsons
William Davis Ltd	Wilson B Ragg
Winchester Snooker Club	Wistow & Newton Harcourt Parish Council
Womens National Commission	Woodland Grange Primary School
Woods Of Wigston	York And Cooper Opticians
Young Mum's Group	Yum Sing



Borough of Oadby & Wigston

Directorate of Consumer Services
Planning Department

DIRECTOR OF CONSUMER SERVICES
Mrs. W. Back M.C.I.H.

Email: Planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk
Web Site: www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Please ask for: Adrian Thorpe
Extension: 645/Direct Line: 2572645
Our ref: AT/P
Your ref:

21st April 2006

Dear Sir/Madam

Core Strategy Preferred Options Pre-Submission Consultation Paper

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council have prepared a Core Strategy Preferred Options Pre-Submission Consultation Paper. Once adopted this document will become a Development Plan Document (DPD) that will form part of the Local Development Framework for the Borough.

Copies of the document, draft sustainability report, DPD matters and public notice can be downloaded from our website at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk, are available by telephoning 0116 288 8961 or can be collected from the Council Offices.

Comments are invited during a six week public consultation period beginning on Monday 24th April 2006 and **ending at 4.45pm on Monday 5th June 2006.**

You are strongly encouraged to comment by using our online representation forms at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk as this will allow us to handle your representations quickly and efficiently, thus progressing the Local Development Framework faster.

Yours faithfully,

Adrian Thorpe
Forward Plans Manager



Borough of Oadby & Wigston

Directorate of Development and Consumer Services

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Proposals Matters

Proposed Title: Draft Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan Document (DPD): Regulation 26 Pre-submission Public Participation Stage

Proposed Subject Matter: The Core Strategy DPD is a strategic document setting out the vision and objectives and spatial strategy for the Borough with policies to facilitate sustainable delivery. It identifies the amount of major new development proposed in the Borough up to 2021 and includes a key diagram. The Preferred Options version of the document outlines the preferred approach that has been established following consultation with the local community and key stakeholders.

Proposed Area: The draft Core Strategy Preferred Options relate to the whole Borough of Oadby and Wigston.

Consultation Period: The Statutory Consultation Period runs for 6 weeks from Monday 24 April 2006 to Monday 5 June 2006.

Address for Comments: Objections to, and representations in respect of, the proposals should be sent in writing preferably using the appropriate representation form (available from www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk) to the Forward Plans Manager, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DR.

Alternatively, an online representation form can be completed and submitted at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Notification of Submission: Please indicate when making representations in respect of the draft Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD if you would like to be notified when it is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination (scheduled for August/September 2006) and of its adoption (scheduled for October 2007), and provide

details of the address to which you would like notification to be sent.



Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Notice of Deposit of pre-submission proposals documents for a Local Development Framework

Draft Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan Document (DPD) and draft Sustainability Report

Oadby & Wigston Borough Council have prepared proposals for the preparation of a Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD). If, and when, these proposals are adopted they will form part of the development plan for Oadby & Wigston. The development plan forms the basis for decisions on spatial planning affecting that area.

The draft Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD is a strategic document setting out the vision, objectives and spatial planning strategy for Oadby & Wigston with policies to facilitate sustainable delivery. Copies of the draft Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD and the Proposals Matters are available for public inspection at Oadby & Wigston Borough Council Offices, Station Road, Wigston, LE18 2DR free of charge between the hours of 8.45am and 4.45 pm on Mondays to Thursdays and 8.45am and 4.15pm on Fridays. They will also be available at Oadby Library, Wigston Library, South Wigston Library, Oadby Helping Hands Community Trust and South Wigston Community Trust free of charge during their normal opening hours.

Objections to, and representations in respect of, the proposals should be sent in writing preferably using the appropriate representation form (available from www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk) to the Forward Plans Manager, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DR before Monday 5th June 2006. Objections and representations should specify the matters to which they relate and the grounds on which they are made. They may also be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the withdrawal, adoption, approval or rejection of the proposals. Only objectors whose objections are made in writing and arrive at the address specified above within the six week period ending Monday 5th June 2006 will have a right to have their objections considered at the examination.

Further information is available from Oadby & Wigston Borough Council on 0116 288 8961 or www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Wendy Back
Acting Chief Executive



Borough of Oadby & Wigston

Directorate of Development & Consumer Services
Planning Department

DIRECTOR OF CONSUMER SERVICES
Mrs. W. Back M.C.I.H.

Email: Planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk
Web Site: www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Please ask for: Adrian Thorpe
Extension: 645/Direct Line: 2572645
Our ref: AT/P1
Your ref:

24 April 2006

Dear Sir/Madam

Core Strategy Preferred Options Pre-Submission Consultation Paper

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council have prepared a Core Strategy Preferred Options Pre-Submission Consultation Paper. Once adopted this document will become a Development Plan Document (DPD) that will form part of the Local Development Framework for the Borough.

A Copy of the document, draft sustainability report, representation forms, DPD matters, public notice and database update form is enclosed. Comments are invited during a six week public consultation period beginning on Monday 24th April 2006 and **ending at 4.45pm on Monday 5th June 2006.**

You are strongly encouraged to comment by using our online representation forms at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk as this will allow us to handle your representations quickly and efficiently, thus progressing the Local Development Framework faster. Alternatively you may return the enclosed form by post or fax – full contact details are provided on this letter.

Further copies of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Pre-Submission Consultation Paper and associated documents can be downloaded from our website at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk, are available by telephoning 0116 288 8961 or can be collected from the Council Offices.

Yours faithfully,

Adrian Thorpe



Borough of Oadby & Wigston

Directorate of Development and Consumer Services

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Proposals Matters

Proposed Title: Draft Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan Document (DPD): Regulation 26 Pre-submission Public Participation Stage

Proposed Subject Matter: The Core Strategy DPD is a strategic document setting out the vision and objectives and spatial strategy for the Borough with policies to facilitate sustainable delivery. It identifies the amount of major new development proposed in the Borough up to 2021 and includes a key diagram. The Preferred Options version of the document outlines the preferred approach that has been established following consultation with the local community and key stakeholders.

Proposed Area: The draft Core Strategy Preferred Options relate to the whole Borough of Oadby and Wigston.

Consultation Period: The Statutory Consultation Period runs for 6 weeks from Monday 24 April 2006 to Monday 5 June 2006.

Address for Comments: Objections to, and representations in respect of, the proposals should be sent in writing preferably using the appropriate representation form (available from www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk) to the Forward Plans Manager, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DR.

Alternatively, an online representation form can be completed and submitted at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Notification of Submission: Please indicate when making representations in respect of the draft Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD if you would like to be notified when it is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination (scheduled for August/September 2006) and of its adoption (scheduled for October 2007), and provide

details of the address to which you would like notification to be sent.



Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Notice of Deposit of pre-submission proposals documents for a Local Development Framework

Draft Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan Document (DPD) and draft Sustainability Report

Oadby & Wigston Borough Council have prepared proposals for the preparation of a Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD). If, and when, these proposals are adopted they will form part of the development plan for Oadby & Wigston. The development plan forms the basis for decisions on spatial planning affecting that area.

The draft Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD is a strategic document setting out the vision, objectives and spatial planning strategy for Oadby & Wigston with policies to facilitate sustainable delivery. Copies of the draft Core Strategy Preferred Options DPD and the Proposals Matters are available for public inspection at Oadby & Wigston Borough Council Offices, Station Road, Wigston, LE18 2DR free of charge between the hours of 8.45am and 4.45 pm on Mondays to Thursdays and 8.45am and 4.15pm on Fridays. They will also be available at Oadby Library, Wigston Library, South Wigston Library, Oadby Helping Hands Community Trust and South Wigston Community Trust free of charge during their normal opening hours.

Objections to, and representations in respect of, the proposals should be sent in writing preferably using the appropriate representation form (available from www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk) to the Forward Plans Manager, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire, LE18 2DR before Monday 5th June 2006. Objections and representations should specify the matters to which they relate and the grounds on which they are made. They may also be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the withdrawal, adoption, approval or rejection of the proposals. Only objectors whose objections are made in writing and arrive at the address specified above within the six week period ending Monday 5th June 2006 will have a right to have their objections considered at the examination.

Further information is available from Oadby & Wigston Borough Council on 0116 288 8961 or www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

Wendy Back
Acting Chief Executive

Envision: A New Strategy for Planning Homes and Employment in Oadby and Wigston



Oadby and Wigston Borough Council's Planning Department are seeking the views of local people on a new planning strategy for the Borough that aims to protect important green space whilst accommodating new housing and employment growth to 2021.

A Regional Plan is currently being prepared that will require local councils to accommodate growth within their areas. Councillor John Boyce, Leader of the Borough Council, said: "The Borough is small and space is very restricted. We are working closely with regional partners to ensure that we can properly deliver and benefit from any housing and employment requirement. The new strategy, on which we would like to receive the views of our community, will ensure that the protection of open space and countryside – a key priority of the Borough Council - will not be compromised in accommodating new development".

The strategy also recognises the importance of the Borough's three town centres, the need to provide land for community and leisure facilities, and much more besides.

The Borough Council is liaising with Harborough District Council and Blaby District Council who are currently consulting local people on similar planning strategies. This will ensure some consistency in the eventual planning strategies that will be adopted by the three councils.

Over the next few weeks staff will be available at the following venues to give residents the opportunity to discuss the draft strategy:

Tesco, South Wigston	Thursday 27 April	5 - 7.30 pm
Bell Street, Wigston	Wednesday 3 May	1 - 4 pm
Asda, Oadby	Tuesday 9 May	12 noon - 2 pm
Bassett Street Centre	Thursday 18 May	10 - 12 noon

In addition, a travelling display will be visiting the following venues:

Council Offices, Wigston	24 April 2006 to 28 April 2006
Wigston Library, Wigston	29 April 2006 to 7 May 2006
Oadby Library, Oadby	8 May 2006 to 14 May 2006
Council Offices, Wigston	15 May 2006 to 21 May 2006
Brocks Hill Environment Centre	22 May 2006 to 29 May 2006
Council Offices, Wigston	30 May 2006 to 5 June 2006

Alternatively, copies of the draft strategy are available to view on Oadby and Wigston Borough Council's website: www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk. Alternatively they are available from council offices; local libraries or by telephoning 0116 288 8961.

Comments, which can be made via the website, must be received by 4.45 pm on Monday 5 June 2006.

For further information please contact a member of the Forward Plans Team on 0116 288 8961 or Email: planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk

-ends-

Notes for Editors

The new planning system

The official name for the draft planning strategy referred to in the press release is the Core Strategy Preferred Options Pre-Submission Consultation Paper.

It will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the Borough that is currently being prepared and which will replace the Oadby & Wigston Local Plan. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has led to a new planning system whereby Local Plans and Structure Plans are being replaced with Local Development Frameworks. The Borough Council is required to prepare a set of documents which together will form part of the Development Plan.

Why do we need a Core Strategy?

The Core Strategy is a strategic document setting out the vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the Borough with policies to facilitate sustainable delivery. It will identify the amount of major new development proposed in the Borough up to 2021 and will include a key diagram.

The Key Diagram

The key diagram illustrates how various types of development and land uses will relate together. It shows the broad strategy, drivers for change and the land use constraints for the Borough in diagrammatic format, including:

- where the built up (urban) areas of the Borough are;
- what area of the Borough is in the countryside and areas designated as important open spaces for example Green Wedges;
- the general extent of the town centres and the location of neighbourhood shopping facilities;
- areas where there are regeneration priorities which require specific action plans;
- the main transport routes through the Borough;
- constraints to development such as known contaminated land (known as Cordon Sanitaires); and
- the location and extent of main bodies of water.

The Key diagram is a useful visual interpretation of the Core Strategy document and can be made available for publication.

Policies to support the Core Strategy

Policies are being developed that will assist the implementation of the strategy. The policies cover a range of issues such as housing, transport, retail, leisure and open space. Policies on design and sustainable buildings are also being developed.

Neighbouring Councils

Blaby District Council and Harborough District Council are currently consulting on their respective Core Strategy documents.

Dates of Consultation

The public consultation runs for 6 weeks from Monday 24 April to Monday 5 June.

Photo Opportunity

There will be an opportunity to photograph the travelling display, along with Borough Council staff and local people at any of the staffed venues on the dates listed above.

Envision Logo



The Borough Council's Envision logo is used to promote public consultation events associated with the Local Development Framework.

Contacts for Further Information

Adrian Thorpe	Forward Plans Manager	0116 257 2645
Kirstie Rea	Senior Forward Planning Officer	0116 257 2740

Appendix B5 Poster

Envision Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

Oadby and Wigston Local Development Framework
Core Strategy: Preferred Options
Have your say!

New local guidelines are being prepared by the Council to outline how we intend to plan for new homes, jobs, and other development in the Borough to 2021. As planning affects all of us we want to ensure that everyone is able to shape the future of the Borough through community involvement.

We have prepared a Core Strategy: Preferred Options paper which is a strategic document setting out the vision and objectives and spatial strategy for the Borough with policies to facilitate sustainable delivery. It will identify the amount of major new development proposed in the Borough up to 2021 and will include a key diagram.

To find out more visit one of our exhibitions or staffed roadshows which will be visiting the following venues:

Roadshows

Wednesday 3 May – 1.00 – 4.00 pm	Bell Street, Wigston
Tuesday 9 May – 12.00 - 2 .00 pm	ASDA, Oadby
Thursday 18 May 2006 – 10.00 12.00 am	Bassett St Centre, South Wigston

Exhibitions

24 April 2006 to 28 April 2006	Council Offices, Wigston
29 April 2006 to 7 May 2006	Wigston Library, Wigston
8 May 2006 to 14 May 2006	Oadby Library, Oadby
15 May 2006 to 21 May 2006	Council Offices, Wigston
22 May 2006 to 29 May 2006	Brocks Hill Country Park and Environment Centre
30 May 2006 to 5 June 2006	Council Offices, Wigston

Copies of the Core Strategy: Preferred Options document are available to view at the Council Offices, local libraries and our website – www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

The closing date for making your comments is Monday, 5 June 2006.

For further information please contact planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk or telephone 0116 2888961.

This is your opportunity to help shape the future of the Borough – get involved and tell us what's important to you.



Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

**Oadby & Wigston Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Preferred Options**

For official use only

Customer ref
Contribution ref

Representation Form

This form should be used to comment on the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report only.

Personal Details	Agents details
Name:	Name:
Organisation (if applicable):	Organisation (if applicable):
Address:	Address:
Post Code:	Post Code:
Email:	Email:
Telephone number:	Telephone number:

A separate form is available for commenting on the Sustainability Appraisal documents.

An online version of the response form is available on the Borough Council's website (www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk). This is the Council's preferred method of receiving comments as it will help us handle your representations quickly and efficiently.

PART 1 OF THE CORE STRATEGY

Nature of representation

A) Supporting B) Objecting C) General comment

If you ticked A) or B), which section of part 1 does your representation relate?

Section (e.g. 1)

Paragraph (e.g. 1.1)

If you ticked A) B) or C), please enter any additional comments here

PART 2 OF THE CORE STRATEGY

Nature of representation

A) Supporting B) Objecting C) General comment

If you ticked A) or B), which section of part 2 does your representation relate?

Theme (e.g. Balanced housing market)

Paragraph (e.g. A-E)

Policy (*where applicable*) (e.g. P1)

If you ticked A) B) or C), please enter any additional comments here

Signature:

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Date:

Please return all comments:

Online response form: Complete our online response form available at www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk

By Email: planning@oadby-wigston.gov.uk

By Post : Forward Plans Team, Planning Department, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council, Station Road, Wigston, Leicestershire LE18 2DR

By Fax: 0116 2887828

ALL COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 4.45 p.m on Monday, 5 June 2006

Appendix B7 List of comments received and responses of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Andrew Granger	General	The University is a large employer in the Oadby area and I consider it would be appropriate to have a special policy for the University in line with the RSS and the recently adopted Leicester City Local Plan. I would be happy to agree wording for a specific policy.	Disagree. The Core Strategy is expected to deal with broad strategic issues. Although it is accepted that the University has a significant part to play in the future development of the Borough it is a very site specific entity and therefore, in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 we do not consider the Core Strategy is the appropriate policy mechanism for highlighting the University's significance. However, CS4 - Regeneration Schemes and Areas of Large Scale Change will provide the strategic framework by which policies in relation to the University can be prepared in later specific DPDs.
Blaby Dc	General	Blaby District Council welcomes production of the document. In the interests of consistency with the emerging Regional Plan, the only comment I wish to make is that the end date should be 2026. This would allow housing and employment requirements that are consistent with emerging regional guidance.	Disagree in part. Although support for production of this document is noted, in relation to the comment regarding the end date of the plan, the Council have concerns that the evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 "...the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years" and paragraph 4.19 "...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy".

Central Networks	General	No specific comments to make about the content of the Core Strategy	Noted. No specific comments were received in relation to the Core Strategy therefore no action is necessary.
Disability Rights Commission	General	No specific comments to make about the content of the Core Strategy	Noted. No specific comments were received in relation to the Core Strategy therefore no action is necessary.
Emda	General	No specific comments to make about the content of the Core Strategy	Noted. No specific comments were received in relation to the Core Strategy therefore no action is necessary.
Garden History Society	General	The Garden History Society have submitted a generic paper entitled 'Advice on the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens in Development Plans' which the Borough Council are asked to take into account in the preparation of the Core Strategy DPD.	Noted. The publication "Advice on the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens in Development Plans" will be considered in relation to development of the Core Strategy where relevant.
Goem	General	You have created a functional framework of Spatial Objectives, Policy Themes and Key Issues. The 14 Spatial Objectives provide the document with strategic direction, the 10 Key Issues providing the means to achieve the objectives. However, it is unclear what value the Policy Themes play, and they give the impression of being a throwback to the chapters of the old Local Plan. You might consider that the Policy Themes do not add to the clarity of the proposals and could be dispensed with.	Agree. The Policy Themes were included as a formatting mechanism to assist stakeholder understanding in the transition from land-use planning to the new spatial planning system. However, policy themes will not be included in the submission Core Strategy.
Goem	General	Though the Core Strategy does not identify the main issues facing the Borough, the Sustainability Appraisal does identify Socio-Economic and Environmental Sustainability Issues (paragraphs 5.2.6 and 5.3.10 respectively). Are these the issues the Core Strategy intends to address? If so, how do these flow from consideration of the evidence that should be in the Spatial Portrait? No mention is made of	Agreed. The spatial portrait does not go far enough in identifying all the issues in the Borough that the LDF will seek to address.

		either the Leicester University campus at Oadby, the industrial estates of South Wigston or the emerging need for large residential properties for the Borough's growing ethnic population. These matters may give rise to spatial planning issues in their own right.	
Goem	Part 2 General comments	Broadly speaking, the 10 Key Issues provide genuine spatial options for the development of the Borough. However, the attempted expression of these through detailed Potential Policies tends to lose the clear strategic focus of the Key Issues themselves. Greater focus could be provided by structuring this part of the document around the Key Issues, rather than around the more abstract Policy Themes. This would help the selection of relevant Core Policies to deliver the Key Issues.	Agreed. It is intended to revise the draft policies to render them more spatial and also strip out the non-strategic elements more suited to other DPDs and SPD. The spatial strategy element of the Core Strategy will be based more solidly around expression of the Key Issues are spatial policies. Other policies not directly linked to a key issue will form part of a new Strategic Development Control policy section in the submission Core Strategy.
Goem	General	Many of the Core Policies currently proposed read like old fashioned Local Plan policies, being over-detailed and not related to measurable outputs. Some could function as generic development control policies, whilst the detail of others would be more appropriate to SPD than DPD. No monitoring and implementation framework is yet proposed. The discipline of such a framework is required and would greatly assist the formulation of functional LDF Core Policies.	Agreed. It is intended to revise the draft policies to render them more spatial and also strip out the non-strategic elements more suited to other DPDs and SPD. Other policies not directly linked to a key issue will form part of a new Strategic Development Control policy section in the submission Core Strategy.
Martin Gough	General	I don't know what I am supporting or objecting to as your documents are incomprehensible. Your leaflets are well distributed yet tell us nothing. The web pages well advertised, yet one has to be incredibly intelligent and motivated to wade through the web links and dense text explaining the process. I am still baffled about what you propose. If it is	Noted, criticism of the new spatial planning system and the format of the pre-submission Core Strategy document.

		<p>to build houses in the countryside around Kilby Bridge, why is this consideration so hidden and not spelt out clearly? You are disenfranchising the public whilst going through the motions of consultation. Your assessment of zero adverse effects for environment, social and economic in developing the countryside is highly dubious. Zero adverse impact on the environment?? You develop on the countryside and it is lost forever. You deprive generations of the countryside on our doorstep. Instead of masses of documentary assessment and gobbledegook and a skimpy superficial leaflet, please spell out for all to understand in 1 or 2 pages the proposals, the justification for the proposals, perceived benefits and disadvantages. Without such a transparent process it just looks like you are determined to press ahead with your plans without serious engagement with the public.</p>	
Gordon Smith Associates	General	<p>I refer to my telephone conversation with you yesterday (22 May 2006) when I told you I wanted to be sure of safeguarding my clients position with regard to making proposals and representations in respect of the above land (Garden land to 53 London Road, Oadby) in the Oadby Development Framework. I reminded you of the representation I submitted on the 23 August 2005 on the Core Strategy Issues and Options. I shall be glad therefore if you will take the representations in my letter of the 23 August 2005 as resubmitted.</p> <p>Representation dated 23 August 2006</p>	Noted. The stated Expression of Interest has been noted.

		<p>Key issue 1: Location of development I enclose a plan comprising part garden land to 53 London Road, Oadby which my clients of 'Oadby House' 53 London Road, Oadby would like to see allocated for residential development in addition or as an alternative to secondary shopping and offices.</p> <p>I would just like to comment at this stage that this site can be said to be a brownfield site because there were six cottages situated on the land between 53 London Road and the building 55a London Road up to their demolition in approximately 1975. Perhaps this would also imply an existing use as residential.</p> <p>Key issue 3: Affordable housing Whilst I have sympathy with option 2 in my view option 1 should remain because of the advantage stated - the policy is well known. Not having a clear policy - or by having a variable policy - could have a delaying effect of bringing land forward for development. There could be some advantages in adopting option 3 with option 1.</p> <p>My comment on key issue 1 is in fact a representation on behalf of my clients and my comments on key issue 3 are my own professional view though I believe my clients generally concur with them.</p>	
Mobile Phone Operators	General	<p>We write to your planning authority on behalf of the Mobile Operators Association (MOA), which consists of: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hutchison 3G UK Limited ("3"), ▪ 02 (UK) Limited W), ▪ Orange PCS Limited ("Orange"), ▪ T-Mobile UK Limited ("T-Mobile"); 	

		<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vodafone Limited ("Vodafone"). <p>The MOA monitors all emerging development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance that relate to telecommunications development and those which would have an impact on their member's agreements to supply a mobile telecommunications service in the UK. Mono Consultants undertake this project on behalf of the MOA.</p> <p>The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has introduced significant proposals for change within the development plan framework in England and Wales. We are aware that one of these changes is the move away from Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance to a Local Development Framework (LDF).</p> <p>The LDF comprises of a number of Local Development Documents (LDDs) some of which will have statutory status and some which will take a more informal role. As we understand it, the new legislation requires your Council to draw up a Local Development Scheme which would indicate what documents your Council is intending to produce.</p> <p>One of the main aims of the new Act is to slim down both the number and the content of policies. We consider it important that there remains in place a telecommunications policy. It is noted that the Council's Core Strategy Preferred Options pre-submission paper does not contain any reference to telecommunications development. It is</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>recognised that telecommunications plays a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. National guidance recognises this through PPG8. PPG8 gives clear guidance as to the main issues surrounding telecommunications development. These include the legislative framework, siting and design issues, levels of consultation and issues surrounding electromagnetic fields (EMFs). Clear guidance is also given regarding what should be included within local plan (now LDD) policy.</p> <p>This guidance states that local plans (LDDs) should set out criteria based policies to guide telecommunications development and that whilst regard should be had to siting and design considerations operational efficiency should not be inhibited. PPG8 also makes clear that "Criteria should be flexible enough to allow for the efficient development of the network and the demands imposed by the technology".</p> <p>Since the revision of PPG8 in 2001, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) has produced in conjunction with the industry, a Code of Best Practice. This builds on the Ten Commitments to ensure that the industry is alive to the concerns of local communities and consultation is built into the development process.</p> <p>As indicated above the formulation of policy does not exist in isolation and there are numerous documents which will affect the formulation of any telecommunications policy, the most important of these being PPG8 On this</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>basis we would suggest that within the Local Development Framework there should be a concise and flexible telecommunications policy contained within one of the Council's statutory Local Development Document. This should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues which development will be assessed against. We would suggest a policy which reads;</p> <p>Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures ▪ should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area; ▪ if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and ▪ designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building; ▪ if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has ▪ explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or ▪ other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the ▪ (local) planning authority. ▪ If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an ▪ unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural ▪ or historic interest. <p>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology. It will of course depend on your Local Development Scheme as to which documents are produced, which documents have a statutory role in development control and which would be considered as material considerations. We would suggest that this policy be a stand alone policy within one of the main LDDs, with any background information, such as electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and public health, being contained within a separate LDD or what is currently termed Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). This could then be read with PPG8, the Code of Best Practice to give a comprehensive background to any proposed development. We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following; Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The Council are keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and location on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document</p> <p>In summary, we recognise the early stage of LDFs and the early stage of the consultation process at which we are being asked for comment. We are suggesting that a clear and flexible telecommunications policy be introduced in one of the main LDDs. This should be introduced by a short paragraph outlining the development pressures and the Councils policy aims. We have suggested text for both above. In keeping with the aims and objectives of the new legislation any background information should be contained within a separate LDD which would not need to go through the same consultation process (like a current SPG).</p>	
Pegasus Planning Group	Part 2 General comments	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>General</p> <p>Objection is raised to the format of the Core Strategy Preferred Options as it is difficult to understand exactly what the Council's Preferred Options are in comparison to the alternative considered.</p> <p>First, the sub-heading under Part 2</p>	<p>Disagree. The pre-submission draft of the Core Strategy was prepared in accordance with paragraph 4.12 of PPS12 which states "The options must be of sufficient detail for the type of development plan document envisaged". The Core Strategy is a very broad document that deals with a wide range of policy themes and does not contain site specific references. Therefore, the level of detail contained in the pre-submission document was felt sufficient.</p>

		<p>states 'key spatial principles and core policy examples'. What does this mean? Reference to examples infers the document does not include the Council's preferred options, but just sets out some examples of potential core policies.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>To present the Core Strategy Preferred Options in a much clearer format so that the rationale and reasoning for the Preferred Options is more easily understood</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.12 further states, "Local planning authorities should set out clear reasons for their selection of the referred options, together with a précis of the alternatives that were also considered". The Council feels that the proforma style format used provided the most appropriate way of setting out the Council's preferred approach and those alternatives considered and rejected.</p> <p>With reference to the respondent's objection to the use of the term Examples in relation to Core Policy, there is no requirement within the Regulations to provide polices within the pre-submission Preferred Options Document. However, Checklist 8b of PPS12 Companion (page 93) provides the likely content of a Preferred Options Document. The seventh check point relates to the need to include a "Summary of proposed strategy" which can include "an outline of draft polices". It was this Council's decision to accord with this checklist and provides a raft of policy examples in order to aid discussion and understanding by stakeholders on how the preferred options could be achieved.</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	General	<p>A further criticism of Part 1 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options is that it fails to identify a time horizon. Paragraph 2.14 of PPS12 states that the time horizon for the Core Strategy should be for a period of at least ten years from the date of adoption, noting that it should aim to look ahead to any longer time horizon which is set out in the relevant Regional Spatial strategy.</p> <p>RSS8 is presently being reviewed and plans to a time horizon of 2026; this is</p>	<p>Agreed in part. Part 1 of the Core Strategy will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 ("... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...") and</p>

		<p>thus the appropriate time horizon for the Core Strategy to consider and this should be set out under Part 1 of the document.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>For Part 1 of the Core Strategy to state that the time horizon for the document will be to 2026.</p>	<p>paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”).</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	Part 2 General comments	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>General</p> <p>Objection is raised to the format of the Core Strategy Preferred Options as it is difficult to understand exactly what the Council’s Preferred Options are in comparison to the alternative considered</p> <p>References to ‘preferred approaches’ is again confusing ‘are these the Council’s preferred options?’</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>To present the Core Strategy Preferred Options in a much clearer format so that the rationale and reasoning for the Preferred Options is more easily understood</p>	<p>Agreed. Preferred Approaches are the Preferred Options. The submission Core Strategy will revert to using the term Preferred Options.</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	Part 2 General comments	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>General</p> <p>Objection is raised to the format of the Core Strategy Preferred Options as it is difficult to understand exactly what the</p>	<p>Agreed in part. The implications of the Key Issues were outlined in the Issues and Options Report. It was felt unnecessary to repeat the implications in the Preferred Options report as the Issues and Options report was available (on the council's web site and hard copies at various locations and on request from the Council offices) during</p>

		<p>Council's Preferred Options are in comparison to the alternative considered.</p> <p>A number of key issues are referred to under preferred approaches, but there is a complete lack of explanation as to what the implications are of the key issues identified.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>To present the Core Strategy Preferred Options in a much clearer format so that the rationale and reasoning for the Preferred Options is more easily understood</p>	<p>the preferred options consultation stage so could be read in conjunction with the pre-submission Core Strategy. The accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and previous Scoping Report would also provide information in relation to implications of the Key Issues.</p> <p>However, the submission draft of the Core Strategy will contain a fuller explanation and supporting information in relation to the referred options and resultant policies.</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	Part 2 General comments	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>General</p> <p>Objection is raised to the format of the Core Strategy Preferred Options as it is difficult to understand exactly what the Council's Preferred Options are in comparison to the alternative considered.</p> <p>Further, the key issues identified under preferred approaches often have no apparent connection with the potential policies as identified under particular policy themes. For example, under policy theme 1 a preferred approach is Key Issue 1 Location of Development brownfield sites and one large urban fringe site. However, there is no reference to this in the reasoned for preferred option choice or in the potential policies. This is very confusing.</p>	<p>Agreed in part. It is accepted that the omission of a draft sustainable urban extension policy has led to some confusion and this will be rectified through the submission Core Strategy. However, the decision to include draft policies was intended to highlight such omissions and foster discussion about further/amended policies required to achieve the preferred options. This approach to the pre-submission document has thus succeeded.</p> <p>In relation to the respondent's comment regarding the apparent lack of linkage of some potential policies to the preferred options, this is correct. Some of the draft polices included relate to recommendations in National/Regional guidance that require a local strategic policy to be included in the Core Strategy such as those relating to Renewable Energy.</p>

		<p>Proposed change</p> <p>To present the Core Strategy Preferred Options in a much clearer format so that the rationale and reasoning for the Preferred Options is more easily understood.</p>	
Wigston Civic Society	General	<p>This part is well set out and contains useful and helpful information about the Borough and about the way in which the strategy and its associated documents have been developed. Despite the Society's overall support, it holds some concerns about the achievability of the strategy.</p>	Noted. General support for the Core Strategy
Wigston Civic Society	General	<p>The Society feels that the Council should request better plans/drawings with applications. There should be minimum requirements including 3D/perspective drawings and sufficient detail to give the reader a very clear picture of what is proposed in relation to existing properties, roads, etc.</p> <p>Application must be considered in the light of the 14 spatial objectives.</p>	Noted. Comments in relation to the provision of more detailed drawings are related to the Council's Development Control function and therefore no action to be taken in respect of the Core Strategy.

COMMENTS RELATED TO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Goem	SO1	SO1 - A key mechanism for delivering balanced housing markets and increased affordability is to build a sufficient volume of housing. If this need is not explicitly incorporated into this objective, it will need to be identified separately elsewhere.	Agreed. SO1 will be revised to include the need to deliver sufficient houses to meet the relevant Regional Plan targets.
Goem	SO1	SO2 - I commend the recognition that concentrating development on brownfield sites will require development at higher densities.	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Barton Willmore	SO2	We object to the wording of SO2 which seeks to concentrate development on previously developed land. We note that 'Key Issue' 1 considers a large urban fringe site. We consider that SO2 should therefore be reworded to fully assess the provision of an urban fringe site or sites.	Agreed in part. To accord with the principles of sustainable development, the re-use of previously developed land will still be the preference for new development unless it can be proven that a greenfield site is more sustainable than an existing brownfield site. However, SO2 does not make this clear and there is also the need to provide the reasoning behind the need to potential allocate land for a sustainable urban extension. SO2 will be revised in order to clarify the above.
Lcc	SO2	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective
Pegasus Planning Group	SO2	Reference to 'suitable sites' in the following spatial objective SO2 is also unclear. Proposed change To reword spatial objective SO2 as follows: 'Identify and provide sufficient employment land in accordance with RSS8 review requirements, having regard to local needs and forecasts, ensuring a breadth of job types'.	Agreed, the alternative wording will be used if SO2 is retained in its current form.

Goem	SO3	SO3 - The objective suggests that the whole Borough has a local aesthetic character that should be preserved. Is this your intention, and if so is that assumption soundly based?	Noted. It was not the intention of SO3 to suggest that the Borough has a local aesthetic character. SO3 will be revised to clarify.
Lcc	SO3	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective
Andrew Granger	SO4	SO4 should be supported and encouraged	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Goem	SO4	SO4 - Is it your intention to encourage mixed use development in all locations, as implied by the objective? Are mixed use developments appropriate in all suburban locations?	Agreed. SO4 was not intended to suggest that mixed use development is appropriate in all locations. SO4 will be revised accordingly.
Lcc	SO4	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective
Goem	SO5	SO5 - Is employment land supply based on local need sufficient, given the potential role of the Borough in meeting sub-regional needs as mediated by the RSS?	Agreed. The Core Strategy should be general conformity with the Regional Plan therefore SO5 will be revised to make reference to any relevant RSS targets.
Lcc	SO5	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective
Goem	SO6	SO6 - Is this possible without transferring highway resources from private car use to other uses? If not, then should the reduction of car use as required by RSS8:2005 Policy 43(v) T1 be implicit in this objective?	Agreed. SO6 will be revised in order to make the reduction of car use implicit in this spatial objective.
Lcc	SO6	This should be supported as far as it goes but it does not fully reflect the approach of the LTP. Reducing congestion and improving air quality also require targeted improvements to road capacity.	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective but also the need to more closely link to the LTP.
Sport England	SO6	Sport England supports the overall vision for the Core Strategy, and particularly welcomes the following in the spatial objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ inclusion of references to non-motorised transport (SO6) 	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Goem	SO7	Support for town centres is encouraged by PPS6.	Considered and noted
Lcc	SO7	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective

Goem	SO8	Could sustainable transport choices also have an impact on healthy lifestyles?	Agreed. SO8 will be revised to include reference to sustainable transport choices having a beneficial effect on healthy lifestyles.
Lcc	SO8	Objective S08 could be improved by recognising the contribution that walking and cycling can make to healthy lifestyles.	Agreed. SO8 will be revised to include walking and cycling as having an impact on healthy lifestyles.
Sport England	SO8	Sport England supports the overall vision for the Core Strategy, and particularly welcomes the following in the spatial objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ linkages between healthy lifestyles and access to leisure facilities (SO8) 	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Goem	SO9	Support	Noted: Support for Strategic Objective SO9
Lcc	SO9	Objective S09 could be improved by including specific reference to the highway network and transport system.	Agreed. SO9 will be revised to make specific reference to the highway network and transport system.
Goem	SO10	Will BAP targets require habitat creation? If so, there would be a benefit in making this explicit.	Agreed. SO10 will be revised to include reference to need to create specific habitats as advocated in the BAP targets.
Goem	SO11	Does this objective strike the right balance between preventing inappropriate uses in Green Wedges, and promoting appropriate uses there?	Agreed. SO11 needs to be revised to highlight the need to protect Green Wedges from inappropriate development whilst promoting appropriate uses.
Sport England	SO11	Sport England supports the overall vision for the Core Strategy, and particularly welcomes the following in the spatial objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ allowing for appropriate uses in Green Wedges (SO11) 	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Goem	SO12	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
National Trust	SO12	Generally these are well worded and appropriate to the local circumstances; the following specific observations are	Agreed. The comments in relation to Conservation Areas will be included in a revised SO12.

		made: SO12 – It would be helpful to make specific reference to Conservation Areas among the historic assets identified. There should be reference to enhancement, not only preservation. There should also be reference to the importance of settings in accordance with RSS Policies 27 and 31 – often historic assets are well maintained but their significance is eroded by inappropriate and ill-considered development within their wider setting.	
Andrew Granger	SO13	SO13 there should be confirmation that there needs to be mixed development for diversification. This would apply especially to the University playing fields	Disagree. The encouragement of mixed use development is implicit in SO4. SO13 would allow for a mix of uses in its current form although it will be revised in favour of "appropriately scaled" development rather than small scale.
Barton Willmore	SO13	We object to draft SO13 which proposes that only small scale development in the countryside would be allowed. We consider that this policy should be seen in context of the allocation of land to meet the housing need which may extend to urban extensions in the countryside. It is important that SO13 does not preclude the development of sustainable and suitable sites in the countryside that provide sustainable options for growth and pre-empt the RSS review, in particular in relation to the housing numbers and distribution. We note paragraph 13 of draft PPS3, which requires Local Planning Authorities to retain a supply of land that is suitable, viable and available.	Agreed in part. It is accepted SO13 is not very clear in terms of potential allocation of greenfield land for a sustainable urban extension. However, the aim of this strategic objective was to discourage large open countryside development. SO13 will be revised to make the distinction more clear.
Goem	SO13	SO13 - Given the urban nature of most of the Borough and the consequent	Agreed. SO13 will be revised to make reference to the residential needs of the

		urban fringe nature of open landscapes in the Borough, is it appropriate to refer to the residential needs of the rural community? Is it rather the residential needs of the rural economy that might be acceptable?	rural economy rather than rural community.
Goem	SO14	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Lcc	SO14	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
National Trust	SO14	Generally these are well worded and appropriate to the local circumstances; the following specific observations are made: SO14 – Although it features in the Policies later on there is no reference here to landscape character. Ensuring that landscape character is safeguarded and reinforced is an important consideration for the Borough and it is contended that this should form part of the key objectives set out in the Core Strategy.	Agreed. Reference will be made to landscape character in revised SO14.

COMMENTS IN RELATION TO PART 1 CHAPTERS

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Pegasus Planning Group	3. What is the Core Strategy	<p>Part 1 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Page No. 6 Paragraph 3.2</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 sets out what the Core Strategy will do. The six bullet points fail to comply with the advice set out in Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks (PPS12: LDFs). Whilst it notes that the Core Strategy will contain a clear spatial vision, paragraph 10 of PPS12 goes on to state that the Core strategy should incorporate the District Housing Requirement as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy and should also set out the broad locations for delivering the housing and other strategy development needs of the Borough over the plan period.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>For paragraph 3.2 to set out that the Core Strategy will identify the appropriate general locations to meet the Borough's future development needs (as prescribed by RSS).</p>	<p>Agreed. Paragraph 3.2 of What is a Core Strategy will be expanded to clarify what can be expected from a Core Strategy particularly in terms of development targets.</p>
Goem	8. Key Statistics about the Borough of Oadby & Wigston	<p>At the front end of the document you provide some Key Statistics, but I do not consider that this amounts to the Spatial Portrait required by PPS12. You have not explained the relevance of the statistics quoted e.g. how they illustrate key features of the Borough. Though you have identified the three town</p>	<p>Agreed. The Spatial Portrait will be significantly revised and a more detailed and consolidated portrait will be created.</p>

		centres, you have not individually characterised them. Neither have you characterised the different open landscapes of the Borough. Perhaps most tellingly, you have not described the relationship of the Borough to Leicester City, e.g. in terms of commuting and use of high order retail, culture, educational and health services. A more detailed Spatial Portrait would provide a firm foundation for subsequent objectives and policies.	
National Trust	8. Key Statistics about the Borough of Oadby & Wigston	The Key Statistics should include information regarding the environmental assets of the Borough, for example the number of Listed Buildings, SAMs, and SSSIs.	Agreed. Information on the key environmental assets of the Borough will be included in a revised Key Statistics section in the submission Core Strategy
Barton Willmore	9. The Spatial Objectives	We note that the plan period for the Core Strategy is to 2021. However, the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy has a timeline for 2026 and as such, we consider that the vision should run in line with, and refer to this Strategy.	Disagree. Part 1 of the Core Strategy will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 (“... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...”) and paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”)
Bwea	9. The Spatial Objectives	Support	Noted, support for this Spatial Objective.
Conservation Association	9. The Spatial Objectives	Support for this section of the document	Noted, support for this section of the document.
Del Rosa Devlps	9. The Spatial Objectives	S013 “Small scale” leisure uses in the countryside may, unnecessarily rule against significant sports and Leisure provision; therefore S013 should be preface with: “Unless special circumstances can be demonstrated,	Disagree. However, it is proposed to amend SO13 and remove the term “small scale” and change to “appropriately scaled” to ensure that appropriate significant leisure and sports provision is not prevented out of

		allow only".	turn.
Del Rosa Devlps	9. The Spatial Objectives	S09 should be expanded to read: "Build a safe and cohesive Borough by empowering community groups, be developing public buildings and spaces and by public and private sector initiatives to promote social inclusion and community cohesion through participation, interaction and understanding".	Agreed, the alternative wording will be used if SO9 is retained in its current form.
Del Rosa Devlps	9. The Spatial Objectives	S08 should be more positive: the words "... ensuring leisure facilities....." should be replaced by "..... encouraging the development of improved, high quality leisure facilities....."	Agreed, the alternative wording will be used if SO8 is retained in its current form.
Emra	9. The Spatial Objectives	Spatial Objectives The 14 spatial objectives have a very strong degree of accordence with the Regional Policy Objectives as set out in RSS8 Policy 1.	Noted, support for the Spatial Objectives.
Goem	9. The Spatial Objectives	I note that the Spatial Objectives themselves are generic in nature, and with a few exceptions could apply to almost any location. Objectives that are more spatially specific to the Borough could help to add focus to the emerging Core Strategy.	Agreed. Spatial objectives will be revised to make them more spatially specific to the borough.
Goem	9. The Spatial Objectives	The Spatial Portrait should give a picture of the Borough as it is now, whilst the Spatial Vision should give a picture of how it will be in the future. I am not certain that the vision proposed achieves this, and consequently consider that it does not add value to the Core Strategy.	Agreed. The Vision for the Core Strategy will be revised to better reflect how the Council and its stakeholders wish to see the Borough evolve in the future.
Leics. Constabulary	9. The Spatial Objectives	PPS1 states that design policies should encourage development which, create safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion. This is a sustainability objective of the Local	Agreed in part. There is a need to ensure that new development does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion. The alternative wording will be included within a revised SO9 rather than creating a new SO15.

		<p>Development Framework and should also be reflected as a spatial objective within the core strategy.</p> <p>Although SO9 states the need to build a 'safe and cohesive borough it does not promote community safety through the way in which buildings and the environment are designed to be built.</p> <p>This objective should be expanded by adding:</p> <p>...and improves community safety, reduces anti-social behaviour and reduces the fear and incidence of crime.</p> <p>Or a new spatial objective included at SO15</p> <p>Promote design that improves community safety, reduces anti-social behaviour and reduces the fear and incidence of crime.</p>	
Lcc	9. The Spatial Objectives	The Proposed Vision is stated in para 9.3 on page 9. Although there is reference to sustainability the vision is not fully consistent with the LTP priorities, and should be improved to ensure better integration of planning and transportation.	Agreed, the Spatial Vision will be revised to ensure there is better integration of planning and transportation.
National Trust	9. The Spatial Objectives	The National Trust believes that the Vision is appropriate for Oadby and Wigston and its future aspirations, accordingly it is fully endorsed.	Noted, support for the Spatial Vision.
Pegasus Planning Group	9. The Spatial Objectives	<p>Part 1 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Page No. 9 Paragraph 9.4</p> <p>The fourteen spatial objectives</p>	Agreed in part. SO1 will be revised to accurately reflect to deliver the level of housing advocated in the draft Regional Plan. However, due to concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026 we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the

		<p>identified for the Core Strategy to seek to deliver. The first objective SO1 does not read well in terms of a spatial objective; it is considered that this should more appropriately refer to delivering the RSS housing requirement, together with addressing affordable housing and choice issues.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>For spatial objective SO1 to be reworded as follows:</p> <p>¿ Deliver the RSS8 Review housing requirement to 2026 and, in so doing, to provide adequate affordable housing to meet identified needs¿</p>	<p>interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 (“... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...”) and paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”).</p>
Sport England	9. The Spatial Objectives	<p>Sport England recommends that the Objectives should be revised to include the protection and enhancement of open spaces for sport and other forms of recreation, in line with RSS Policy 32. Currently, the Core Strategy objectives seek to protect biodiversity assets, but this approach could perhaps be expanded to encompass other forms of “Green Infrastructure”, in line with the current work of the Regional Assembly. This would also be consistent with Policy CS25.</p>	<p>Agreed. Appropriate Strategic Objectives will be revised to include the protection and enhancement of open spaces for sport and other forms of recreation.</p>
Wigston Civic Society	9. The Spatial Objectives	<p>The Society has some concerns about SO4 in so far as there can be conflict in mixed use development when housing is next to industry, commercial, leisure and retail activity.</p> <p>Noise, smell and general activity can cause difficulty for domestic residents. There are already parking problems in mixed use areas.</p> <p>Inevitably local people are not</p>	<p>Agreed in part. When a mixture of uses is advocated the mix needs to be compatible i.e. no heavy industry and residential together. It is intended to re-draft SO4 to reflect the need for mixed use schemes to be compatible development and only in appropriate locations.</p>

		employed locally and, therefore, people do travel some distance, often by car, to their place of employment, thereby causing parking problems.	
National Trust	10. Preferred Approach – Policies and Principles	It is suggested that the fourth bullet point should be amended to read 'Greenfield Land, Natural Environment, Biodiversity and Landscape Character (see also comments re-Objectives under para 9.4 above).	Agreed, this will be actioned.
Barton Willmore	11. Key Diagram	We note that the proposed urban fringe site and the proposed broad areas of growth are not indicated on the diagram. We consider that the key diagram should include both of these areas, to clarify and fully assess options for sustainable urban extensions within the Core Strategy.	Disagree: The Key Diagram has been drafted in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 which states "The Core Strategy should contain clear and concise policies for delivering the strategy which will apply to the whole of the local planning authority's area or to locations within it, but should not identify individual sites". The Council consider that the Borough is too small to indicate a potential urban fringe site without effectively being site specific. In addition, the broad areas for growth are the Borough's 3 main towns which are shown on the Key Diagram at present.
British Waterways	11. Key Diagram	Strongly support reference to the canal on the Key Diagram.	Noted, support for the reference to the canal on the Key Diagram.
Goem	11. Key Diagram	The Key Diagram does not demonstrate the relationship of the Borough to the urban area of Leicester City to the NW, nor the open countryside of Leicestershire to the south and east. Consequently it fails to show the proposals of the Core Strategy in their spatial context.	Agree, this will be rectified through the submission version of the Key Diagram.
Lcc	11. Key Diagram	The EDDR should be shown on the Key Diagram.	Agreed, the Key Diagram will be annotated accordingly.
Pegasus Planning Group	11. Key Diagram	Part 1 of Core Strategy Objection Page No. 11 Paragraph 11.1	Disagree: It is understood that the Key Diagram is intended to be a graphical interpretation of the main strategic matters of the Borough. Paragraph 2.13 of PPS12 states that "general locations for strategic development, major

		<p>The general locations for strategic development are encouraged to be set out in the Key Diagram under paragraph 2.13 of PPS12. As identified below, there will indeed be a need for 'strategic development' to meet the Borough's housing and employment land requirements to 2026. As such, general locations as to where these requirements will be met ought to be set out in the Key Diagram; this is not presently identified under paragraph 11.1 and thus requires amendment.</p> <p>A suggested 'general location' to meet this requirement is identified under the last objection below.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>To add 'the general locations for strategic development' to the list of bullet points under paragraph 11.1.</p>	<p>transportation issues and main patterns of movement and constraints may be set out in a key diagram", therefore there is not a requirement to show on the key diagram the general locations for development. The Council feel that due to the size of the Borough the inclusion of general locations for strategic development on the Key Diagram would effectively be identifying specific sites. As per paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 the Core Strategy should not be site specific.</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	11. Key Diagram	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection Omission Policy - Achieving Sustainable Development</p> <p>As set out under the objections to Part 1 of the Core Strategy, advice in PPS12 is for the Core Strategy to set out the broad locations for delivering the housing and other strategic development needs of the Borough over the plan period. The present Preferred Options fail to accord with this advice. The Borough Council acknowledge that the development needs of the Borough will not be met solely on previously developed land and that land adjacent to the urban area is likely to be needed for development over the Plan period.</p>	<p>Disagree and Noted. Although this Expression of Interest is noted it is disagreed that the land put forward should be identified as an Area of Search on the Key Diagram or within policies under Achieving Sustainable Development. This is because paragraph 2.13 of PPS12 states that "general locations for strategic development, major transportation issues and main patterns of movement and constraints may be set out in a key diagram", therefore there is not a requirement to show on the key diagram the general locations for development. Furthermore, the Council feel that due to the size of the Borough the inclusion of Areas of Search on the Key Diagram would effectively be identifying specific</p>

		<p>Such development requirements will include the need for a significant number of new houses together with the outstanding 15 hectare strategic employment site as required by the LLRSP. It is considered that the most suitable form of provision would be for a large, mixed use urban extension providing both employment and housing development to help meet sustainable development objectives. Such mixed use developments are encouraged through Government advice in PPS1, PPG3, PPG4 and PPG14. The attached plan identifies an appropriate site to meet these requirements in the form of an urban extension to the LLUA the next most sustainable option following previously developed land in the urban area. This is a large site, able to accommodate the future development requirements of the Borough that cannot be accommodated on previously developed land in a sustainable location on the edge of South Wigston. The site has vehicular access available to the A5199 Welford Road to the east and to Newton Lane in the north. There is also the possibility of this development facilitating a new passenger rail halt, together with a park and ride facility, on the Leicester to Market Harborough railway line to provide a convenient service into the centre of Leicester. It is proposed that this general location be identified as an area of search to inform the future housing and employment land development plan documents.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>For land to the south and east of South Wigston to be identified as an Area of</p>	<p>sites. As per paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 the Core Strategy should not be site specific.</p>
--	--	--	---

		Search under the 'Achieving Sustainable Development' policy theme and to identify this on the key diagram.	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	11. Key Diagram	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>It is considered that the Key Diagram should include guidance upon other constraints and opportunities within the Core Strategy. These might include Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGs), nature conservation areas and possibly archaeological areas. This is so that the Diagram fully reflects the constraints within the Borough.</p>	<p>Disagree: It is understood that the Key Diagram is intended to be a graphical interpretation of the main strategic matters of the Borough. Paragraph 2.13 of PPS12 states that "general locations for strategic development, major transportation issues and main patterns of movement and constraints may be set out in a key diagram", therefore there is not requirement to show on the key diagram all the areas the respondent mentions. Further, paragraph 2.13 goes on to state that the Key Diagram will be insufficient where policies need to be contained on an Ordnance Survey map. As in most cases the features mentioned have defined boundaries it would not be appropriate to illustrate on the Key Diagram. They will of course be recorded on the subsequent proposals map.</p>
Smith Stuart Reynolds	11. Key Diagram	<p>It is also suggested that the Key Diagram gives guidance upon future directions of growth to accord with paragraph 2.13 of PPS12. It is acknowledged within the Core Strategy that some Greenfield development will be required within the Borough. Therefore, just as the three towns have been identified for some growth then consideration needs to be given at an early stage of the Plan process, to the direction of growth of the Urban area. It is appropriate to do this now as the intention of a Core Strategy is to give an overview of policy as its omission would undermine the overall objectives.</p>	<p>Disagree: The Key Diagram has been drafted in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 which states "The Core Strategy should contain clear and concise policies for delivering the strategy which will apply to the whole of the local planning authority's area or to locations within it, but should not identify individual sites". The Council consider that the Borough is too small to indicate directions of growth without effectively being site specific.</p>

COMMENTS IN RELATION TO KEY ISSUES

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Goem	Key Issue 1	I commend the Borough Council on the clear commitment to a consolidated urban extension. This clear strategy gives stakeholders, including the local community, a clear indication of the strategic choices open to the Borough and of the preferred option of the Borough Planning Authority. A Core Strategy containing this commitment will significantly assist the preparation of a future Area Action Plan / Allocation DPD to deliver such an urban extension. However, the commitment to brownfield development is not so clear. Is the intention to promote strategic redevelopment of the three town centres, intensification of particular suburbs, redevelopment of some industrial districts, or a combination of the above? A more explicit statement in this regard would be very useful.	Agreed. A more explicit statement in regard to strategic development in the borough will be included in the submission draft of the Core Strategy.
Goem	Key Issue 2	I am not convinced that the option expressed here fully reflects your strategic intentions. There is no need to state that Green Wedge boundaries will be reviewed, if you are not recreating them through publishing the Core Strategy. Rather, you may consider that the role of the Core Strategy is to define the purpose, function and characteristics of Green Wedges. This would then give you strategic criteria against which to assess the extent of any Green Wedge designations made through future Allocation DPDs.	Agreed in part. The draft Three Cities SRS Policy 3, its supporting text and the Spatial Diagram identify and support the established Green Wedges that are found within some areas of the Sub-area. Therefore, we are not recreating the Green Wedge boundaries through the Core strategy per se; rather we are stating that the established boundaries, in accordance with the above Regional Plan policy, may be subject to review should the needs of necessary strategic development require this in the future. In addition, the preferred option supported by the Council and its stakeholders was to specifically maintain the existing boundaries until necessary development dictates

			otherwise. However, it is agreed that the Core Strategy should provide clearer guidance in relation to defining the purpose, function and characteristics of Green Wedges.
Goem	Key Issue 3	Support	Noted, support for this Key Issue.
Goem	Key Issue 4	Clearly, any requirements for employment supply apportioned to the Borough through the RSS Review will have to be reflected in the Core Strategy. In this regard I encourage the Borough Planning Authority to seek all opportunities to engage in the production of the RSS Review in general, and of the 3 Cities Sub-Regional Strategy in particular. A local perspective on the contribution likely to be made through occupant turnover on existing industrial estates in the Borough may assist this debate.	Noted. The Council are taking every opportunity to engage in the production of the Regional Plan.
Goem	Key Issue 5	Support	Noted, support for this Key Issue.
Goem	Key Issue 6	Though the principle of this issue is supported, it is noted that the emphasis of the approach is on controlling transport generating development. As the location of development is determined by Key Issue 1, there will be little scope to reject development in these locations simply on the basis of transport impact. A preferable approach would be to identify those transport improvements required at the proposed development locations e.g. serving the town centres and a major urban extension. Better links to proposals in the relevant Local Transport Plans e.g. quality bus corridors should also be included.	Agreed. Required transport improvements in the preferred areas for growth will be identified where able in the submission draft of the Core Strategy. In addition, better links will be made to proposals in the LTP.
Goem	Key Issue 7	This Key Issue is supported, with the caveat that the balance of new development needs is likely to require significantly more housing than other forms of development, and that this will	Agreed. An additional policy or policy clause to implement the density aspirations of Key Issue 7 will be included in the submission draft.

		limit the potential for mixed use development in some locations. An additional policy or policy clause to implement the density aspirations of Key Issue 7 is required.	
Goem	Key Issue 8	This issue is supported. However, as a spatial concept it clearly embodies two separate strands, open space recreation in green wedges and built recreation in town centres. Might these be better expressed as part of Key Issues 2 (Green Wedges) and 5 (Town Centres) respectively?	Agreed. Key Issue 8 will be revised and the issue of recreation in towns and Green Wedges will be included in Key Issue 5 (town centres) and Key Issue 2 (Green Wedges) respectively.
Goem	Key Issue 9	This issue is in accord with PPS7.	Noted: Support for this Key Issue
Goem	Key Issue 10	The recognition that this rural hamlet is an area of change and tourism potential is commendable, and a strategic policy to manage this change is supported. However, as discussed under Key Issue 2 (Green Wedges), it is not clear if the intention is to deposit a village boundary through the Core Strategy, or to do so through a later DPD. Nor is it clear how a village boundary, which would encourage development, would necessarily prevent the sprawl through redevelopment that is currently feared. The Core Strategy could apply alternative policy tools to ensure that redevelopment here maximised tourism benefits and minimised impact on this sensitive area.	Agreed in part. A development boundary around Kilby Bridge is thought appropriate to manage development and redevelopment in this area. It is intended that the delineation of this boundary would be decided through the later Allocations DPD. However, it is agreed that the Core Strategy could contain policies in the interim to ensure that redevelopment here maximised tourism benefits and minimised impact on this sensitive areas.

COMMENTS IN RELATION TO PART 2 - THEMES

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Barton Willmore	Theme 1 – Achieving Sustainable Development	<p>The Council's Residential Land Availability Study 2004/2005 indicated that a residual balance (less commitments) of 570 dwellings was to be provided to meet the Structure plan requirement to provide 1,700 dwellings to 2016. Options for Change, part of the review of RSS 8, suggested that based on the 2002 ODPM Interim Household Projections (unadjusted) & 2003 Population Projections that the trend figure for growth would be 230 dwelling per annum. The Preferred Option for housing growth in Leicester and Leicestershire was confirmed at the East Midlands Regional Assembly Joint Board meeting on 18th May 2006. The Preferred Option, based on the 2003 Household Projections was 3,790 dwellings per annum, slightly above the ODPM trend figure.</p> <p>We support the Councils approach to promote an urban fringe site to meet the housing requirements for the Borough. We also note, given the likely need to accommodate more housing as part of the RSS review this is likely to result in the need for more sites to accommodate this increased requirement. The scale and scope of an urban extension has not been considered by the Core Strategy, we feel that this should be fully assessed and clarified within the Core Strategy. In light of revised housing figures as part of the RSS Review we consider that the Council should consider the allocation of more than one urban extensions and would welcome the opportunity to</p>	<p>Noted. The Allocations DPD will be the mechanism by which the necessity for more than one sustainable urban extension will be decided.</p>

		<p>discuss with the Council the possible location of growth. We would reserve the right to comment on the locations identified should it be considered that a sustainable growth option has not been adequately considered by the Council, particularly as the option has yet to be identified.</p>	
Highways Agency	Theme 1 – Achieving Sustainable Development	<p>In order to meet the sustainability objective, the council propose to steer most new development toward the boroughs three larger settlements of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston, which provide the best access to services and facilities. In addition, small scale development will be considered in Kilby Bridge if it meets local needs or the needs of tourism associated with the canal.</p> <p>The use and development of land will be determined on the basis of a variety of criteria, which consider the function and character of each area and the existing or potential capacity to provide the necessary infrastructure to support new development. One of the sustainability criteria is an assessment of 'the need to travel'. Locating development in existing settlements should minimise the need to travel by providing access to local services and facilities, such as public transport networks.</p> <p>The proposed hierarchy for locating development reflects strategic guidance and local circumstances as well as national and regional policies which prioritise urban areas for accommodating growth.</p> <p>These aims of the sustainable</p>	Considered and Noted: Support for Paragraph

		development policy reflect local circumstances and are consistent with national, regional and local guidance. They prioritise the development of land within and surrounding existing urban centres where facilities and services already exist to minimise the need to travel.	
Lcc	Theme 1 – Achieving Sustainable Development	<p>Policy Theme 1 seeks to achieve sustainable development that makes reference in the preferred approach to the location of development on brownfield sites together with one large urban fringe site. Whilst there is no reference to one large urban fringe site in the proposed policies, reference to it in the preferred approaches is considered unhelpful given the lack of justification for this approach. Structure Plan Strategy Policy 3 requires greenfield sites to be of a significant size and scale, but also to respect the size of the settlement it relates to.</p> <p>Recommended changes To delete reference to Key Issue 1 Location of Development – brownfield sites and one large urban fringe site under Preferred Approaches of Policy Theme 1.</p>	<p>Disagree. Although it is accepted that a draft sustainable urban extension policy was not included in the potential policies, the Council and its stakeholders agreed through the Issues and Options stage that a single urban fringe site following on from re-development of previously developed land was the preferable approach. This is because the Borough is unlikely to be able to deliver the Regional Plan housing targets on previously developed and therefore greenfield release is inevitable. Rather than having several piecemeal sites developed to accommodate the residual housing grown after brownfield the Council and its stakeholders felt it would be more sustainable to plan one new community with the all the necessary community infrastructure included rather than putting pressure on existing established communities.</p> <p>In addition, as per PPS12 paragraph 4.22; following commencement of the Act, Local Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans.</p>
Marrons	Theme 1 – Achieving Sustainable Development	Standard objection	Disagree. The aim of the preferred approach is to locate the majority of new development on previously developed land and/or buildings. However, it is unlikely that the Borough can accommodate all development

			needs in this way over the plan period so greenfield development is inevitable. The Borough feels that the most sustainable solution in this instance is to plan for a large urban extension rather than a series of fragmented small fringe developments across the Borough. In this way a sustainable community comprising a mix of compatible uses and any necessary community/environmental infrastructure can be created. In addition, in relation to the respondents reference to Structure Plan Policy 3, as per PPS12 paragraph 4.22, following commencement of the Act, Local Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans.
Conservation Association	Theme 2 – Town Centres and Regeneration	Make sure areas of empty shops are filled; empty site A6 (next to Fludes Lane) old garage. Jelsons cleared up previous derelict site (Edward Close) now you have let this site deteriorate why not get Jelsons to look at purchase upgrade small maisonettes with nice landscaped area with shrubs, trees to keep within theme of green area 'Fludes Lane' looking after wildlife preservation.	Noted and considered. However, comment does not relate to the Core Strategy.
Harris Lamb	Theme 3 – Transport & Accessibility	On behalf of The Cooperative Group We note that there is no reference to the provision of major road infrastructure which may be required to support the development aspirations for the Three Cities sub area. The Highways Agency have identified the fact that infrastructure will be required to support the development requirements being identified in the RSS. We believe that the Core Strategy should refer to the fact that highways infrastructure will be supported.	Agreed. The core Strategy will be revised in order to strengthen the reference to the need to provide adequate major infrastructure to development the aspirations of the Three Cities Sub-area.

Highways Agency	Theme 2 – Town Centres and Regeneration	<p>The council propose to develop individual town centre action plans to meet the needs of each urban centre. These action plans will define the role of each centre and will provide a clear basis for the implementation of policies and proposals to guide development. As well as guiding the location of retail, leisure and employment development, it will enable the promotion of high density residential areas where access to facilities is good.</p> <p>Each of the town centre action plans will seek to address a number of priorities over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More shopping opportunities ▪ Improved accessibility ▪ Additional car parking ▪ More leisure opportunities ▪ Better access to local services ▪ Pedestrian preference ▪ Enhancement schemes ▪ Town square / events area ▪ Better quality design ▪ Employment opportunities <p>In considering new development, the borough will assess the need for development; identify the appropriate scale of development; apply the sequential approach to site selection; assess the impact on existing centres; ensure locations are well served by a range of transport modes; and use CPO powers to bring forward some sites for further growth.</p> <p>To ensure that land is used efficiently and that opportunities are maximised, priority will be given to mixed land uses on brownfield sites. In connection with</p>	<p>Agreed. Priority parking provision will be considered as part of the wider approach to demand management with priority given to short term parking over long term. The Highways Agency is considered a key stakeholder in all aspects of Town Centre AAP production.</p>
-----------------	---	--	---

		<p>this, underground parking schemes will be considered.</p> <p>The council intends to minimise the need to travel in the borough by promoting development opportunities in and around existing centres that have the transport facilities to support it. As part of the selection criteria the council propose to assess the potential to access the centres by modes of transport other than the private car.</p> <p>It is proposed that town centre action plans will be produced for each of the main centres to guide development in the future. One of the priorities that each of the action plans will seek to address is car parking. It is recommended priority parking provision should be considered as part of the wider approach to demand management and that priority should be given to short stay parking and that long stay parking should be restricted.</p> <p>We recommend that the Highways Agency is consulted on all aspects of the City Centre Action Plans at an early stage. This will ensure that the most sustainable options and measure can be agreed at an early stage in order to allow a fully front loaded system.</p>	
Highways Agency	Theme 3 – Transport & Accessibility	The transport routes which currently exist across the borough are poor and therefore access needs to be improved to essential services. However, it is recognised that it is important to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network and that opportunities are taken to promote sustainable forms of	Noted. Information on the transport route requirements of the Highways Agency will be included in the supporting text of relevant policies in the Core Strategy.

		<p>travel. Developments should be planned to ensure safe access for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and applicants should demonstrate that there will not be a substantial increase in trips to the development which could potentially overburden the highway network.</p> <p>Where proposals could have significant transport implications, a full transport assessment will be required to identify potential impacts and propose suitable mitigation measures. In the case of minor developments a 'transport statement' will have to be produced outlining localised transport issues. For non-residential developments a travel plan will enable the promotion of more sustainable forms of movement.</p> <p>The strategy identifies that 'new development and the provision of essential services should be located and designed so as to reduce the need to travel, in particular by private car, enhance pedestrian and road safety and improve accessibility to those with poor transport choice and availability'. As well as promoting sustainable modes of travel, the council also propose to limit car parking by providing only 'necessary vehicle parking facilities which do not exceed defined maximum standards'.</p> <p>We recommend that the HA requests that the safety and free flow of traffic is maintained on the trunk road network in line with PPG13 and circular 04/2001. Transport assessments and travel plans should be provided with all developments which impact on the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>trunk and local road network. Any resultant impacts should be fully mitigated against.</p> <p>All developments should be complemented by sustainable travel modes and restrictions imposed on car parking to ensure that use of the private car is not encouraged.</p>	
Lcc	Theme 3 – Transport & Accessibility	Does not fully carry forward the accessibility and transport policies of the Structure Plan, which may cease in 2 years prior to any replacement Local Development Document on Transport. Some of these will require inclusion in the Core Strategy.	Noted. As per PPS12 paragraph 4.22, following commencement of the Act, Local Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans. However, all LDDs will need to be in general conformity with the Regional Plan.
Andrew Granger	Theme 4 – Greenfield Land, Natural Environment and Biodiversity	I believe that land uses which are most appropriate within the countryside are different to green wedges and should be amended to include diversification, for example, sports fields and equestrian.	Agreed in part. Uses in relation to the countryside can in some circumstances be appropriate to Green Wedges also. However, the policy will be amended to include diversification as a suitable use in the countryside and potentially in Green Wedges.
Harris Lamb	Theme 4 – Greenfield Land, Natural Environment and Biodiversity	<p>On behalf of The Cooperative Group</p> <p>Policy Theme 4 - Green Wedges We fully support the Core Strategy's identification of the need to amend the boundaries of Green Wedges. We do believe that this will be a necessity in order to fulfil the requirements of the RSS and draft PPS 3 regarding housing and the identification of long term housing land In this context we suggest that policy theme 4 should take a more positive approach to the review of green wedge land, particularly in view of the Council's own consultants view on this point The Council's consultants report has identified certain areas of green wedge which need not be protected in the longer term (particularly land to the south of Gartree Road). This objection</p>	Disagree. The Council are not in a position at this time to know positively whether there will be a need to amend the boundaries. It is felt CS7 in its current form allows sufficient flexibility without designating specific boundary changes which would need to be shown on a proposals map. Any proposed changes to the Green wedges will be dealt with through the Allocations DPD.

		would require amendment to policy CS7. It should also be noted that in due course the key diagram may also have to be amended.	
Highways Agency	Theme 4 – Greenfield Land, Natural Environment and Biodiversity	A number of landscape character areas exist in Oadby and Wigston Borough and it is important that the quality and distinctive characteristics of these areas are conserved and enhanced. As such, new development needs to be sympathetic to its surroundings and respect the local character. Where possible new development will be located within or adjacent to existing towns but longer term it will be necessary to locate development outside these sites in more rural locations.	Noted and considered
Andrew Granger	Theme 5 – Built Environment, Culture and Heritage	Where there is a discussion about alternative and reasons for rejections. I am not very convinced that PPS1, PPS7 and RSS8 ensure that the retention of local character and distinctiveness and that there should be some form of wording which ensures new development is of a high quality and takes into account local character and distinctiveness. This would be especially true at Oadby Campus.	Agreed. Policies in relation to design will be revised to strengthen the need for new development to retain and enhance local character and distinctiveness where appropriate.
Highways Agency	Theme 5 – Built Environment, Culture and Heritage	A mix of uses within an area helps to create diverse places and minimises the need to travel, thereby promoting sustainability. Mixed use can be achieved by promoting a mix of uses in large development sites or redeveloping smaller sites in a way that creates diversity. The council hopes to pursue this policy by providing facilities near to urban areas so that people do not need to travel long distances to access recreational opportunities. The HA supports mixed use	Noted. Support for this paragraph.

		development reducing the need to travel and providing opportunities for public transport.	
National Trust	Theme 5 – Built Environment, Culture and Heritage	Other Strategy/Policy Considerations should include PPG16.	Agreed. PPG16 will be added as a source within the Other Strategy/Policy Considerations of the proforma.
Andrew Granger	Theme 6 – Balanced Housing Markets	Reference should be made for sustainability appraisals to be carried out relating to possible housing sites.	Noted. However, no action necessary as Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory process that will be carried out during the preparation of the Allocations DPD.
Highways Agency	Theme 6 – Balanced Housing Markets	<p>For sustainable communities to be achieved, development needs to make the best and most efficient use of existing land, as reflected in national and regional policy. Therefore, policies regarding the location of development, particularly residential, should promote use of previously development land, minimise the need to travel and be accessible to employment, shops and other community facilities.</p> <p>A set of five criteria have been identified which will be used in the allocation of sites for residential development. The proximity to public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes will be assessed as well as the proximity to key services, to ensure that the potential number of car trips and the distances travelled by the private car are minimised.</p> <p>It is anticipated that new residential developments will be provided on previously developed sites which have good access to employment opportunities, shops and community facilities to minimise the need to travel, particularly by the private car. If the five criteria set out in the Core Strategy document are applied, the impact of new development on the highway</p>	Considered and noted.

		network should be minimised.	
Emra	Theme 7 – Employment Provision and Fostering Enterprise	<p>Employment Provision and Fostering Enterprise</p> <p>The reasons for Preferred Option Choice in Section C are noted. Please be aware that the Revised Regional Strategy, due for publication in September 2006, will give a clear indication of employment requirements and corresponding land allocations required over the plan period. Policy 22 in the current RSS8 may provide a policy backdrop to Policy Theme 7 in the interim.</p>	Noted and considered but no action required.
Harris Lamb	Theme 7 – Employment Provision and Fostering Enterprise	<p>On behalf of the cooperative group</p> <p>We note that there is no intention to allocate a strategic employment site. We believe that this suggestion would not lead to the provision of balanced communities within Oadby and Wigston. We consider that the Council's reliance on brownfield sites is likely to mean the loss of further employment sites. We also believe that future employment requirements will require good quality land to be provided. This cannot be done on urban infill sites but, rather, will require the allocation of strategic employment land. This can help to support the Three Cities strategy.</p>	Agreed in part. The Council's current evidence base concludes that there is no requirement to provide a strategic employment site within the Borough. In addition, the draft Regional Plan has not identified the Borough as requiring strategic employment either. Currently mainly of the borough's existing employment sites are under pressure to be developed therefore it is anticipated that new employment provision may be required as part of a greenfield allocation although the site developed is unlikely to be of a strategic size.
Highways Agency	Theme 7 – Employment Provision and Fostering Enterprise	Based on findings from the 2006 Employment Land Study, the council will seek to provide an additional 4.7 hectares of employment land between 2006 and 2016. At least 25% of this requirement will be accounted for by freehold land and premises. The main focus will be on providing smaller employment uses and permitting the expansion of existing employment sites within the borough in accordance with	Noted. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement in the production of DPDs. In order to identify the most sustainable location for employment development in the Borough, an assessment of each site's sustainability will be carried out in line with the Government's SA and other guidance.

		<p>the sustainability approach. Other sustainable sites and premises outside these areas will also be earmarked for employment uses. Only higher density development and employment uses that will not have a detrimental impact on the environment will be permitted near to residential areas. A high standard of design and appropriate landscaping will be required in relation to all employment developments.</p> <p>We recommend that the HA should request that all employment allocations fulfil sustainability criteria set out by the Government. Each site should be accessible by a variety of transport modes and that it is fully integrated into the settlement.</p>	
Barton Willmore	Theme 8 – Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation	<p>We would remind the Council that the provision of developer contributions should only be sought where the tests in Circular 05/2005 would be satisfied.</p> <p>We would ask you could give consideration to our comments and continue to advise us of progress the Core Strategy and other Local Development Documents. We would welcome the opportunity to meet the Council to discuss our Client's interests and the potential directions for growth and would propose to contact you to arrange a convenient date to meet. In the meantime if you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact either Mark Sitch or myself.</p>	Noted. Reference to the tests in Circular 05/2005 is noted.
Harris Lamb	Theme 8 – Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation	The community facilities strategy does support the provision of leisure and recreation uses a variety of locations including green wedges. We believe it would be helpful if the wording clarified the fact that community facilities could	Agreed. The relevant policy and its supporting text will clarify that, in some circumstances, community facilities can be appropriate in Green Wedges.

		also be located in green wedges.	
Sport England	Theme 8 – Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation	<p>In part B, at the regional level it is suggested that Plan4Sport should be referred to. In the evidence base, the Borough Sports and Leisure Strategy is also an important source of information.</p> <p>Following on from our comments in connection with Policies CS16 and CS17, Sport England welcomes, in general terms, the inclusion of Policies CS24 and CS25. However, we do have some reservations about the detail and wording of the policies. These are set out separately.</p>	Noted. Additional strategy sources will be added to the proforma. General support for policies CS24 and CS25 is also noted.

COMMENTS IN RELATION TO PART 2 – DRAFT POLICIES

Respondent	Document Topic	Comment	Officer Response
Barton Willmore	CS1	It is considered that site suitability should also be included in draft Policy CS1 as a basis for assessing the development of land. This should be in accordance with the emphasis of Key Issue 1 and paragraph 13 of draft PPS3 which confirms site suitability as an important factor in the allocation of land.	Noted: Policy CS1 is being re-drafted to focus on the hierarchy of the Borough's settlements. The first sentence and bullet points are to be deleted as it is felt this part of the policy is unnecessary, does not add anything to the objective of the policy and effectively repeats what is contained in RSS8. Site suitability is a consideration within CS2.
Countryside Agency	CS1	Whilst the Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation would not disagree with the proposal for a village envelope for Kilby Bridge we consider that the policy should give greater consideration to the character and distinctive nature of the area. Any development permitted should not detract from the area's character.	Disagree: Although it is agreed that that the character and distinctive nature of Kilby Bridge should be protected from inappropriate development and that any development permitted should not detract from the area's character, Policy CS1 is not the appropriate policy vehicle for this level of depth. The policy designating a village boundary around Kilby Bridge will include criteria that will provide this level of protection. This policy will be created through either the Allocation or Development Control DPD. In the interim, Policies CS17 – Conservation, Heritage and Culture and CS18 – Protecting and Respecting Local Landscape Character will provide guidance for protecting the character and distinctiveness of the area.
Environment Agency	CS1	Spatial strategy for development needs to take account of flood risk. The spatial strategy will need to be informed by a flood risk assessment that will enable a sequential approach to flood risk to be adopted. Appropriate guidance is given in PPG25 and emerging PPS25. Not all Brownfield sites, such as Kilby Bridge, may be appropriate for development once a sequential assessment of flood	Agreed: Brief for a strategic flood risk assessment is being drafted and will be tendered for in due course to enable the development of the Allocations DPD.

		risk is applied.	
Goem	CS1	Policies CS1 and CS2 provide guidelines for a spatial strategy, but do not actually deliver that strategy. Far more could be achieved by simply expressing Key Issues 1 and 10 as policies. A brownfield target will be required.	Agreed: Policies CS1 and CS2 will be re-drafted to better reflect delivery of Key Issues 1 and 10 and/or any generic DC elements will be added to this section of the submission draft. An appropriate brownfield target will be included also.
Harris Lamb	CS1	<p>On behalf of The Cooperative Group</p> <p>Support is given for the policy which would seek to release a large urban fringe site. We believe that this will be necessary to fulfil the RSS requirements.</p> <p>However, we also note that household projections are also likely to mean increased housing provision for the 3 Cities sub region within which Oadby and Wigston is situated and this may require more than one urban fringe site to be allocated. It may also be necessary for further land to be considered as part of a longer term approach to housing land provision if the requirements of Draft PPS3 are to be met in terms of ensuring continuity of housing land supply.</p> <p>In this context we believe that the policy should be amended to refer to the possibility of more than one large urban fringe site being released to meet long term strategic requirements.</p>	<p>Agreed in part: In order to enable the delivery of Key Issue 1, an Urban Extension Policy will be required. However, due to the physical constraints of the Borough it is unlikely that more than one large urban extension would be necessary or could be accommodated. This is backed by evidence to date. In addition, the draft RSS has not required the Borough to provide a large urban extension to meet its housing needs.</p> <p>Although the Borough will only be seeking to allocate one large urban extension site through its Allocations DPD, it is unlikely that the Borough will be able to meet all its housing requirements for the Plan period on brownfield land. Therefore, it is anticipated that further greenfield allocations will be necessary. Furthermore, should further evidence or other regional strategy indicate that the Borough needs to increase its housing development; the relevant policy will be subject to review.</p>
Hbf	CS1	With regards to the detailed objectives of the strategy, the Federation supports the aim to concentrate development on previously developed land at medium to high densities. However account must be taken of the costs associated with such a strategy and excessive requirements for contributions must not	Noted: Implications in terms of necessary community infrastructure requirements and contribution needs will be considered as part of the allocation and application determination process.

		be allowed to stultify development and prevent the housing strategic from being met.	
Indigo Planning	CS1	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (SSL) generally supports the objective of targeting new investment in the main service centres of the Borough, including Wigston where their store represents a key retail anchor for the centre.	Noted: support for the theme of this policy
Indigo Planning	CS1	<p>However, SSL would wish to object to the omission within the policy text of reference to the role of existing "out of centre" retail facilities in meeting the shopping and service needs of local communities.</p> <p>The policy fails to recognise the beneficial role that existing "out of centre" retail facilities can perform in meeting the needs of a growing population in a sustainable manner. For instance, the existing SSL food store at Oadby is located within the urban area of the town, but outside of the town centre. However, the store plays a key role in serving the bulk and day to day convenience shopping needs of a large resident population in the south eastern area of the town. The consolidation and expansion of the existing role that such facilities contribute towards the self containment of the main built up areas will, in turn, contribute to achieving the spatial objectives of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Recommended Changes</p> <p>Policy CS1 should be amended to acknowledge and support the role that existing out of centre retail facilities, such as SSL at Oadby, can perform in</p>	Disagree: Although there is agreement as to the positive contribution existing out of centre retail stores can have on local communities, Policy CS1 broadly sets out where all types of development should be primarily located. DPDs that relate to retailing, town centres and allocations will take into account specific retailing and/or community resource issues.

		contributing to achievement of the Core Strategy objectives.	
Lcc	CS1	The Preferred Options for development are consistent with the sequential approach in the Structure Plan, and are therefore supported.	Noted: support fro the content of this policy.
National Trust	CS1	Other Strategy/Policy Considerations should include PPS1 and the UK Sustainable Development Framework (2005).	Noted: These will be added to the proforma
National Trust	CS1	The inclusion under 'Best Practice Guidance' of The Planning Response to Climate Change is especially important and welcomed, in particular as a new PPS26 on Climate Change is now likely.	Noted: support of the content of this policy
National Trust	CS1	In respect of Section C it is noted that in addition to the expressed reasoning that it is now a statutory requirement for those preparing Development Plan to pursue the achievement of sustainable development (PI and Comp Purchase Act, 2004, Section 39).	Noted: this will be added to the proforma
National Trust	CS1	The wording of CS1 itself is appropriate and supported.	Noted: support for the content of this policy
Pegasus Planning Group	CS1	Part 2 of Core Strategy Objection Achieving Sustainable Development CS1 Spatial Strategy for Development Objection is raised to the first bullet point under Policy CS1 that states that the use and development of land will be determined on the basis of the Borough's assessed accommodation, economic and social needs. This requires amendment to appropriately refer to the development requirements as prescribed by the RRS8 Review, taking account of the Borough's economic and social needs.	Agreed: First sentence and bullet points are to be deleted as it is felt this part of the policy is unnecessary, does not add anything to the objective of the policy and effectively repeats what is contained in RSS8. Disagree: Policy CS1 sets out the hierarchy of the settlements in the Borough and allows for the creation of a village envelope around Kilby Bridge. However, the first sentence and bullet points are to be deleted as it is felt this part of the policy is unnecessary, does not add anything to the objective of the policy and effectively repeats what is contained in RSS8.

Pegasus Planning Group	CS1	Essentially, Potential Policy CS1 is not a policy in itself but sets out the background to a sequential approach policy to the location of development which is set out under Potential Policy CS2. Accordingly, it is proposed to delete reference to CS1 as a potential policy and to rename Potential Policy CS2 Sequential Approach to the Location of Development.	Disagree: Policy CS1 sets out the hierarchy of the settlements in the Borough and allows for the creation of a village envelope around Kilby Bridge. However, the first sentence and bullet points are to be deleted as it is felt this part of the policy is unnecessary, does not add anything to the objective of the policy and effectively repeats what is contained in RSS8.
Pegasus Planning Group	CS1	Accordingly, it is proposed to delete reference to CS1 as a potential policy and to rename Potential Policy CS2 Sequential Approach to the Location of Development.	Agreed: Proposed new title better reflects the aim of the Policy CS2
Pegasus Planning Group	CS1	The Preferred Options approach is also contrary to the sequential approach set out in paragraph 30 of PPG3 and Strategy Policy 2a of the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan (LLRSP).	<p>Disagree: The aim of the preferred approach is to locate the majority of new development on previously developed land and/or buildings. However, it is unlikely that the Borough can accommodate all development needs in this way over the plan period so greenfield development is inevitable. The Borough feels that the most sustainable solution in this instance is to plan for a large urban extension rather than a series of fragmented small fringe developments across the Borough. In this way a sustainable community comprising a mix of compatible uses and any necessary community/environmental infrastructure can be created.</p> <p>In relation to the specific references in the respondents comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ as per PPS12 paragraph 4.22, following commencement of the Act, Local Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans ▪ paragraph 30 of PPG3 is specific to the location of housing, whereas

			draft Policy CS2 relates to the location of all development
Pegasus Planning Group	CS1	As set out under the objections to Part 1 of the Core Strategy, advice in PPS12 is for the Core Strategy to set out the broad locations for delivering the housing and other strategic development needs of the borough over the Plan period. The present Preferred Options fail to accord with this advice.	Disagree: Draft Policies CS1 & 2 set out the broad locations for all new development and the most sustainable hierarchy against which allocations and application will be determined. The policies have been drafted in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 which states "The Core Strategy should contain clear and concise policies for delivering the strategy which will apply to the whole of the local planning authority's area or to locations within it, but should not identify individual sites"
Pegasus Planning Group	CS1	The Borough Council acknowledge that the development needs of the Borough will not be met solely on previously developed land and that land adjacent to the urban area is likely to be needed for development over the Plan period. Such development requirements will include the need for a significant number of new houses together with the outstanding 15 hectare strategic employment site as required by the LLRSP. It is considered that the most sustainable form of provision would be for a large, mixed use urban extension providing both employment and housing development to help meet sustainable development objectives. Such mixed use developments are encouraged through Government advice in PPS1, PPG3, PPG4 and PPG14. The attached plan identifies an appropriate site to meet these requirements in the form of an urban extension to the LLUA, the next most sustainable option following previously adopted land in the urban area. This is a large site, able to accommodate the future development	Noted: Key Issue 1 stipulates the need for a large urban extension. The respondent has supplied information in relation to an expression of interest for this allocation. As stated above, the Core Strategy should not identify individual sites. This should be dealt with under site specific development plan documents or area action plans. The expression of interest will be placed on file and considered as part of the preparation of the Borough's Allocations DPD

		<p>requirements of the Borough that cannot be accommodated on previously developed land in a sustainable location on the edge of South Wigston. The site has vehicular access available to the A5199 Welford Road to the east and to Newton Lane in the north. There is also the possibility of this development facilitating a new passenger rail halt, together with a park and ride facility, on the Leicester to Market Harborough railway line to provide a convenient service into the centre of Leicester. It is proposed that this general location be identified as an area of search to inform the future housing and employment land development plan documents. Proposed change: for land south and east of South Wigston to be identified as an Area of Search under the Achieving Sustainable Development policy theme and to identify this on the key diagram.</p>	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS1	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>The preamble to the policy suggests that whilst development will be concentrated within the three towns on previously developed land it will be difficult to accommodate continued growth without looking at allocating development outside of the current Urban area, and that one large urban fringe site is more suitable than numerous smaller sites. However, the chosen policy does not reflect this and gives no reason for not including a further (presumably) Greenfield site outside of the Urban area. It is considered that additional development will be required within the Borough within the Plan period and to omit it</p>	<p>Agreed: Reference will be made in the policy to the circumstances and criteria that will be used to determine the allocation of large urban extension. This will be done through the Borough's Allocations DPD.</p>

		from the Policy is a fundamental omission.	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS1	On behalf of my clients I would, therefore, advocate supporting the allocation of Brownfield sites with one large urban fringe site, as an option, or perhaps no more than two sites (outside of the Urban area), for instance one might be at Oadby and the other in Wigston. Brownfield development clearly accords with Government objectives but there is unlikely to be sufficient sites within the Borough, without seriously reducing the existing employment base to provide sufficient new dwellings, solely on Brownfield land during the LDF period. However, it is acknowledged that some small scale sites might exist within the Borough which could contribute a small number of dwellings.	Noted: This will be looked at as part of the preparation of the Allocations DPD.
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS1	<p>The option of allocating a single large urban fringe site would provide the economies of scale and allow mixed use development potentially including other facilities as well. This approach is one favoured by Government and whilst there are numerous potential sites situated around the urban edge land to the south of the A6 situated between the golf course and the edge of Oadby is considered to have numerous advantages over the others.</p> <p>These advantages include that: This is the only site that can offer direct access to the A6 and therefore, access to the public transport corridor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is in a sustainable location and is well related to existing residential development and the golf course and open space to the north and south respectively 	Noted: Key Issue 1 stipulates the need for a large urban extension. The respondent has supplied information in relation to an expression of interest for this allocation. As stated above, the Core Strategy should not identify individual sites. This should be dealt with under site specific development plan documents or area action plans. The expression of interest will be placed on file and considered as part of the preparation of the Borough's Allocations DPD.

		<p>enclose the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Transport overview a copy of which is enclosed (see file CSP) illustrates the sustainable nature of the site with close proximity to services such as shops, the town centre and schools; ▪ The site is large enough to incorporate urban space: a range and mix of housing/ including an element of affordable housing, and other facilities to support the development; ▪ The site could be mixed use incorporating an area of employment use which would be entirely compatible with the new development. The site is not covered by any specific policy designation and its development would consolidate this area of Oadby; ▪ A concept plan (enclosed) (see file CSP) has been prepared which illustrates how the site relates to the existing built development and Coombe Park to the north and the golf course to the south. The concept plan illustrates a mix of open spaces the areas are approximately 9.9ha of residential and 0.9ha of business uses; ▪ The site is capable of extension and could be as part of a phased development as suggested within the paper; ▪ The site is capable of early delivery within the LDF period and there are no over-riding constraints to its development, <p>The site in question would represent a sustainable urban extension in</p>	
--	--	--	--

		accordance with PPG3 and as is illustrated in the accompanying report (See file CSP) represents a logical extension to Oadby. As we have indicated earlier in these representations it might be that the Council advocate more than one SUE and if this were the case in conjunction with some Brownfield development, the land at Oadby could fit either of these two options, with a Brownfield/Greenfield mix.	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS1	The Spatial Strategy fails to acknowledge the scale of growth required within the Borough it should take account of the Structure Plan, Regional Guidance and PPS12 to give firm guidance on the issue, it is important to know what is being planned for. Without the requirements and timescale than the DPD just a series of statements with little substance	Disagree: Policy CS1 – Spatial Strategy for Development provides guidance as to the locational hierarchy for all types of new development within the Borough’s settlements. It is not felt therefore that this is the appropriate Policy vehicle for setting out the scale of growth required. It should be noted that within the draft Core Strategy, in relation to particular types of development, policies setting out levels of growth to be planned for have been included. These are for residential development (Policies CS19, 20, and 21) and employment development (Policy CS23). However, it should be noted that at the time of preparing the pre-submission Core Strategy RSS8 was in the process of review. The figures quoted to date have been in accordance with the adopted Structure Plan unless up to date evidence suggests otherwise. It is the intention of the Borough Council to await the release of the review regional housing and employment figures in September so that these can be included in the submission Core Strategy
Smith Stuart	CS1	In conclusion, the Spatial Strategy for	Agreed: It is acknowledged that the

Reynolds		<p>the Borough is incomplete as it does not allow for the development needs of the Borough, the urban capacity and other studies have clearly indicted there would be insufficient land on Brownfield sites to meet the needs of the Borough's housing requirements.</p> <p>Therefore it is essential that one or more large Greenfield urban extensions are Provided for by alterations to the Policy. The requirements and timescale of the DPD should be indicated in the Policy.</p>	<p>Council omitted to include reference within Policy CS2 to a sustainable urban extension and the criteria for allocating such. This will be included in the submission draft.</p>
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS1	<p>The requirements and timescale of the DPD should be indicated in the Policy.</p>	<p>Disagree: Policy CS1 – Spatial Strategy for Development provides guidance as to the locational hierarchy for all types of new development within the Borough's settlements. Due to the size and arrangement of this small Borough, this is likely to remain static for longer than the specified plan period.</p> <p>As discussed above, it is not the appropriate policy vehicle for setting out requirements which would be the preserve of specific DPDs such as that for housing and employments allocations and policy</p>
Andrew Granger	CS2	<p>The sequential approach is one which is now supported but I think the preamble should read 'in priority order, on the understanding all land in one category that is available has been used, the most sustainable location for new development is'</p>	<p>Agreed in part: It is accepted that the policy in its current form does not make clear that there are instances where an undeveloped site may be the more sustainable location for new development as opposed to a brownfield site. The application of a sequential approach and assessment of site suitability against the suitability criteria contained in RSS Policy 2 (2) would allow this to happen. The policy will be re-drafted in line with RSS Policy 2.</p>
Andrew Granger	CS2	<p>This policy should pick up on access to</p>	<p>Agreed: The policy will be re-drafted in</p>

		transport modes and modes in line with national policy	line with RSS Policy 2 (2) which outline accessibility to public transport etc as being important considerations of site suitability
Countryside Agency	CS2	The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation supports the principle of this policy as, by encouraging new building on previously developed land, greater protection is afforded for the open countryside.	Noted: support for the content of this policy.
Countryside Agency	CS2	However we would emphasise that opportunities should be taken to incorporate green infrastructure into urban areas. If areas of green space can be maintained and linked together by footpaths, river corridors etc they can form important links to the open countryside and create many benefits for the quality of life of the residents in terms of recreation potential, increases in biodiversity and improved amenity..	Agreed in part: RSS Policy 3 advocates the need to develop 'green infrastructure' networks as part of approaches to design, layout and construction. This will be emphasised within Policy CS16 Sustainable Construction and Designing for Quality.
Goem	CS2	Policies CS1 and CS2 provide guidelines for a spatial strategy, but do not actually deliver that strategy. Far more could be achieved by simply expressing Key Issues 1 and 10 as policies. A brownfield target will be required.	Agreed: Policies CS1 and CS2 are to be re-drafted to ensure that they will deliver the key issues and an additional policy will provide criteria for the designation of an urban extension should one be required. In addition, a suitable brownfield target for the Borough will be determined.
Hbf	CS2	With regards to the detailed objectives of the strategy, the Federation supports the aim to concentrate development on previously developed land at medium to high densities. However account must be taken of the costs associated with such a strategy and excessive requirements for contributions must not be allowed to stultify development and prevent the housing strategic from being met.	Noted: Policy CS24 relates to developer contributions relevant to new development.
Indigo Planning	CS2	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (SSL) broadly support the focus on regenerating the town centres of the	Disagree: Although there is agreement as to the positive contribution existing out of centre retail stores can have on

		<p>Borough, including Wigston where their store represents a key retail anchor for the centre. However SSL feel that clarification is required within the policy to acknowledge the role that existing “out of centre” retail destinations can perform in achieving the objectives of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Corresponding objections to Policy CS1 outline the positive role of the existing SSL food store at Oadby in meeting the convenience shopping needs of residents of the South Eastern area of the town, for example. The complimentary role of this store to the town centre enhances the ability of the town as a whole to achieve greater self containment. As the residential population grows within the urban area, the consequent expansion of the Sainsbury’s store to meet the additional demands for convenience goods retail floor space would compliment the overarching objectives of the Core Strategy, by retaining trade within the Oadby area in a sustainable manner, thus enhancing the prospects of successfully regenerating the town.</p> <p>Recommended Changes</p> <p>Clarification to be provided within Policy CS2 of the benefits of the expansion and consolidation of existing out of centre retail facilities, such as SSL at Oadby, in conjunction with wider growth and regeneration within the urban area.</p>	<p>local communities, Policy CS2 is a broad policy about all types of development. DPDs that relate to retailing, town centres and allocations will take into account specific retailing and/or community resource issue</p>
Lcc	CS2	<p>The Preferred Options for development are consistent with the sequential approach in the Structure Plan, and are therefore supported</p>	<p>Noted, support for the content of this policy</p>
Lcc	CS2	<p>The policy would be clearer, and more</p>	<p>Agreed in part: Policy CS2 is to be re-</p>

		consistent with the notation of the Key Diagram, if c) and d) referred to 'land and/or buildings within the urban area outside the town centres of	drafted to clarify that criterion a) relates to town centres whereas the other criteria will refer to 'urban areas' rather than specific towns.
Lcc	CS2	The Structure Plan requires that at least 50% of additional dwellings should be previously developed land and buildings. The Preferred Option should set a Borough target for brownfield site developments proposed over the Plan period	Agreed in part: An appropriate brownfield target will be included as part of the re-draft of policies relating to the spatial strategy for the Borough.
Lcc	CS2	Proposed Core Policy Strategy CS2 sets out a sequential approach to development that is inconsistent with Structure Plan Strategy Policy 2A. The following sets out a proposed change to ensure that the sequential approach accords with the Structure Plan version. Recommended changes For the sequential approach under Proposed Policy CS2 to be re-worded as follows:- (a) suitable previously developed land and buildings within the towns of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston (within the LLUA); (b) other suitable land within the towns of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston (LLUA) that is not protected for amenity, infrastructure or other purposes; (c) land adjoining the LLUA, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land; (d) other previously developed land or buildings.	Agreed in part:: It is agreed that the wording of the criteria in Policy CS2 needs re-drafting for the sake of clarity and to accord with RSS Policy 2. However, as per PPS12 paragraph 4.22; following commencement of the Act, Local Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans.
Marrons	CS2	Comments submitted by Marrons on behalf of client J H Hallam & Son Ltd Proposed Core Policy Strategy CS2 sets out a sequential approach to	Agreed in part: It is accepted that the policy in its present form is not clear and will be re-drafted. However, as per PPS12 paragraph 4.22, following commencement of the Act, Local

		<p>development that is inconsistent with Structure Plan Strategy Policy 2A. The following sets out a proposed change to ensure that the sequential approach accords with the Structure Plan version.</p> <p>Recommended changes</p> <p>For the sequential approach under Proposed Policy CS2 to be re-worded as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) suitable previously developed land and buildings within the towns of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston (within the LLUA); (b) other suitable land within the towns of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston (LLUA) that is not protected for amenity, infrastructure or other purposes; (c) land adjoining the LLUA, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land; (d) other previously developed land or buildings 	<p>Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans. Policy CS2 will be re-drafted in accordance with Policy 2 of review RSS8</p>
National Trust	CS2	<p>This Policy is supported as setting out an appropriate form of the sequential approach to development.</p>	<p>Noted, support for the content of this policy</p>
National Trust	CS2	<p>However, notwithstanding the subsequent wording in CS6, consideration could be given to introducing an accessibility dimension to this Policy, i.e. a requirement that all the sites are, or will be, well served by public transport</p>	<p>Agreed: Reference will be made to public transport accessibility in the final draft of this policy.</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	CS2	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Achieving Sustainable Development CS1 Spatial Strategy for Development</p>	<p>Agreed in part: Proposed new title better reflects the aim of the Policy CS2. However, Draft Policies CS1 & 2 set out the broad locations for all new development and the most sustainable hierarchy against which allocations and application will be determined. The</p>

		<p>Objection is raised to the first bullet point under Policy CS1 that states that the use and development of land will be determined on the basis of the Borough's assessed accommodation, economic and social needs. This requires amendment to appropriately refer to the development requirements as prescribed by the RRS8 Review, taking account of the Borough's economic and social needs.</p> <p>Essentially, Potential Policy CS1 is not a policy in itself but sets out the background to a sequential approach policy to the location of development which is set out under Potential Policy CS2. Accordingly, it is proposed to delete reference to CS1 as a potential policy and to rename Potential Policy CS2 Sequential Approach to the Location of Development.</p>	<p>policies have been drafted in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 which states "The Core Strategy should contain clear and concise policies for delivering the strategy which will apply to the whole of the local planning authority's area or to locations within it, but should not identify individual sites"</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	CS2	<p>Further, to delete reference to and/or buildings under category b) as any buildings would already be covered by Category a) pdl</p>	<p>Disagree: Following re-drafting of Policy CS2, criterion a) will now be specific to the Borough's town centres and criterion b) will relate to the urban areas of the three towns</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	CS2	<p>The prioritisation of Categories c) and d) ahead of urban extension is contrary to adopted RSS8 Policy 2 that has as a third tier suitable sites in locations adjoining urban areas, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land.</p>	<p>Disagree: RSS8 sets out a very broad approach to the location of development in Policy 2 which does not take into account local circumstances. Draft Policy CS2 therefore reflects how the Borough interprets RSS8 Policy 2 locally.</p>
Pegasus Planning Group	CS2	<p>The Preferred Options approach is also contrary to the sequential approach set out in paragraph 30 of PPG3 and Strategy Policy 2a of the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan (LLRSP).</p> <p>Proposed change</p>	<p>Disagree: Draft Policies CS1 & 2 set out the broad locations for all new development and the most sustainable hierarchy against which allocations and application will be determined. The policies have been drafted in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 which states "The Core Strategy should contain clear and concise</p>

		<p>To delete Potential Policies CS1 and CS2 and replace with:</p> <p>Potential Policy CS1/2 Sequential Approach to the Location of Development</p> <p>Land for development will be allocated in development plan documents and proposals considered on the basis of the following sequential approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) suitable previously developed land and/or buildings within the towns of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston; (b) other suitable land within the towns of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston that is not protected for amenity, infrastructure or other purposes; (c) suitable land in locations adjoining the Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area, which are or will be well served by public transport, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land. 	<p>policies for delivering the strategy which will apply to the whole of the local planning authority's area or to locations within it, but should not identify individual sites"</p>
Radleigh Homes	CS2	<p>Housing delivery be realistic - both Brownfield and Greenfield land will be needed. It is anticipated that Leicester will need to fulfil a large housing allocation to 2026 as part of the review of the RSS8. Pressure will eventually fall on the boroughs surrounding the city.</p> <p>A sustainable form of development following the sequential approach is necessary and therefore Brownfield land should be developed before Greenfield land but only where it is sustainable to do so.</p>	<p>Agreed in part: Paragraph 13 of draft PPS3 states that site allocation development plan documents should "always include at least five years supply of land for development from the date they are adopted". The Core Strategy will not contain site specific allocations in accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPS12 which states "The Core Strategy should contain clear and concise policies for delivering the strategy which will apply to the whole of the local planning authority's area or to locations within it, but should not identify individual sites".</p>

		Draft PPS3 is changing the way that phasing is being used. Post adoption there needs to be a five year supply of allocations that are developable i.e. previously used sites that are available (now or in the next five years); suitable (a sustainable option for development); and viable (economically).	
Radleigh Homes	CS2	Brownfield sites should not simply be in the first five years because they are Brownfield. A combination of both Greenfield and Brownfield land developed in tandem will be necessary and Greenfield development should only be phased in the unlikely instance that it would threaten Brownfield site delivery.	Agreed in part: In order to meet the Government's sustainability aims there is a presumption in favour of previously developed land in urban areas. However, there are instances where an undeveloped site may be the more sustainable location for new development as opposed to a brownfield site. The application of a sequential approach and assessment of a site's suitability against the suitability criteria contained in RSS Policy 2 (2) would allow this to happen. It is accepted that the policy criteria as they stand do not make this clear. Policy CS2 will be re-drafted to reflect this, although issues related to specific sites and the supply of land will be dealt with through the Allocations DPD.
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS2	On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes Within the sequential test put forward the difference between d) and e) is not clear. It is considered that Greenfield land adjoining the Urban area represents a more sustainable location for new development than d) which is not specific and could include any land within the open countryside. Clearly this sequential approach does not meet that set out within the Structure Plan and needs to be rectified. The policy as drafted suggests	Agreed in part: It is accepted that the policy in its present form is not clear and will be re-drafted. However, as per PPS12 paragraph 4.22; following commencement of the Act, Local Development Documents no longer need to be in general conformity with structure plans. Policy CS2 will be re-drafted in accordance with Policy 2 of review RSS8.

		brownfield outside of the urban area is more sustainable than that adjoining the urban area. This does not accord with Structure Plan Policy 2A. Criterion c) should be relegated to last place in the sequential search sequence.	
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS2	Additionally the title of Policy CS2 is questioned/ as the objective of the Policy seems to be to set out the sequential approach/ the Policy is not entirely concerned with previously developed land and it is, therefore suggested the title is altered accordingly.	Agreed: The title of this policy will be altered to 'Sequential Approach to the Location of Development" to better reflect the aims of the policy.
Andrew Granger	CS3	I think that further description needs to be added to little letter 'd' as to how the assessment is to be undertaken. This is important from the point of view of the Oadby Campus.	Agreed. However, it is intended to revise CS3 and remove the bullet pointed element from this policy.
Goem	CS3	The first two paragraphs of CS3 express Key Issue 5; the rest appears redundant, including CS4. The desire to develop a network of neighbourhood centres would require a separate Key Issue, and would require the broad location of any new neighbourhood centres to be proposed.	Agreed in part. Policies CS3 and CS4 will be revised and streamlined to remove extraneous text and the implication that a new network of neighbourhood centres will be required as part of this policy. However, it is considered necessary to retain policy CS4 as it provides the strategic framework by which future Area Action Plans can be developed.
Indigo Planning	CS3	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (SSL) generally support the proposals to involve stakeholders in the preparation of an Area Action Plan for Oadby and Wigston town centres, and look forward to being involved in this process. SSL also note the opportunity which exists to identify new Neighbourhood Centres which meet the immediate shopping and service needs of local communities, and would wish to take this opportunity to highlight the positive role that their existing store at Oadby	Agree in part. It is agreed that the positive role that existing retail facilities perform in serving the shopping and service needs of local communities should be acknowledged within Policy CS3 and its supporting text. However, designation of the Sainsbury's store at Oadby will not be considered as a Neighbourhood Centre in the Core Strategy. Designation of such retail uses will be determined through an appropriate future Retail Development Plan Document.

		<p>could perform in addressing these needs, along with the associated petrol filling station and doctor's surgery. The store is located within a predominantly residential area to the south east of the town centre, and serves a substantial walk in residential population within this area, representing the focus for the day to day shopping and service requirements of these residents. When considered alongside the key community role performed by the doctor's surgery adjoining the store, it is apparent that this wider site comprises a suitable location for a new Neighbourhood Centre.</p> <p>Recommended Changes</p> <p>Policy CS3 should acknowledge the positive role that existing retail facilities perform in serving the shopping and service needs of local communities, and the SSL site at Oadby should be considered as a Neighbourhood Centre at the appropriate stage within the LDF process.</p>	
Lcc	CS3	<p>The Preferred Options for development are consistent with the sequential approach in the Structure Plan, and are therefore supported. However, there is also a need to ensure that the development does not conflict with the LTP priorities.</p>	<p>Agreed. Support for the preferred options for development are noted. It is further accepted that development must also not conflict with LTP priorities.</p>
Andrew Granger	CS4	<p>These items A-G are relevant provided there is no planning gain supplement, and in this plan, some comment must be made about their alternatives if there is a planning gains supplement.</p> <p>The university welcomes the strategic approach proposed in CS4, requiring areas of major change to have</p>	<p>Noted. Support for the strategic intentions of CS4. In addition, it is intended to revise CS4 and remove the bulleted element of this policy.</p>

		masterplan, area action plans or development briefs.	
Barton Willmore	CS4	The creation of any Area Action Plans or strategies in conjunction with draft policy CS4 for such locations should be grounded by an appropriate evidence base, including urban capacity. They should also be prepared in the context of paragraph 13 of PPS 3, which requires allocated sites to be both available and viable. We consider CS4 should fully assess the urban fringe as a sustainable location for housing.	Noted, a varied evidence base will be used in the preparation of the LDF. The broad location of housing is dealt with in a number of other Core Strategy policies.
Countryside Agency	CS4	<p>The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation suggests that in point (g) that the concept of green infrastructure should be mentioned. Masterplans, Area Action Plans or site development briefs for regeneration schemes would provide a good opportunity to ensure that green infrastructure is designed into new development at an early stage.</p> <p>The phrase green infrastructure is used in the East Midlands Regional Plan. It is taken to mean a network of multi-functional greenspace that contributes to the high quality natural and built environment required for existing and new sustainable communities in the future. The Countryside Agency documents The Countryside in and Around Towns and Planning Sustainable Communities may be particularly useful to refer to on this issue of linking green spaces both within the urban areas themselves and establishing links with the surrounding countryside.</p>	Agree, the concept of 'green infrastructure' will be included in (g)
Goem	CS4	The first two paragraphs of CS3 express Key Issue 5; the rest appears redundant, including CS4. The desire to	Noted, CS4 will become strategic DC Guidance which will be included within the Core Strategy.

		develop a network of neighbourhood centres would require a separate Key Issue, and would require the broad location of any new neighbourhood centres to be proposed.	
Lcc	CS4	The production of masterplans should identify relevant access and transportation issues and solutions and it is supported, however, there will also be a need for this issue to be fully addressed for smaller developments.	Considered and noted; CS4 deals with large scale change, CS6 'Transport and accessibility' includes more detailed guidance on access and transportation issues for any new development.
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS4	On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes It is considered that the reference to the Community Plan should be deleted; this is an unnecessary layer in the process. Clearly any development identified within the LDF would be subject to extensive public consultation and, therefore, to try and link it to another plan, which could cause further delays in delivery of development is inappropriate and unnecessary.	Para 2.10 of PPS12 states that the 'Core Strategy Development Plan Document should draw on any strategies of the Local Authority and other organisations that have implications for the development and use of land e.g. Community Strategy.' The Companion Guide to PPS12 continues that authorities need to consider Community Strategies as they are concerned with well-being and sustainable development principles which are an important element of regeneration schemes, reference to the community strategy will be retained.
British Waterways	CS5	Support	Considered and noted
Lcc	CS5	The policy is broadly consistent with the Structure Plan and is therefore supported.	Considered and noted
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS5	On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes The Policy as drafted is vague, it needs to be explained what the objective is. Is it the intention to designate land for public transport and other transport infrastructure? Clearly any large scale development would necessitate some alternative means of transport other than the car and would be accompanied by such proposals.	Noted, CS5 will be expanded upon in the supporting text to give greater understanding as to the objective of the policy. The designation of land for public transportation is not an issue for the Core Strategy. CS6 goes into further detail about alternative means of transport provision for new development

Barton Willmore	CS6	Policy CS6 is generally supported, but it is considered that the presumption of the policy should be to 'seek' rather than 'should' improve sustainable transport. Rewording of the policy would allow for necessary flexibility in the determination of individual sites on their particular merits.	Agreed. Policy CS6 will be revised to include the amendment as advocated in this response.
British Waterways	CS6	Support	Considered and noted
Goem	CS6	If there are agreed transport corridors that need protecting, e.g. in the Local Transport Plan, they should be protected through Core Policy. Otherwise CS6 is redundant. CS6 is an over-detailed development control policy.	CS5 deals with land which has been identified through other strategies and plans for development. CS6 will be moved to become a generic DC Policy.
Harris Lamb	CS6	On behalf of Cooperative Group. We reiterate our comments made in respect of policy theme 1 in respect of the need to identify, potentially, more than one large urban fringe site. We suggest that any changes to policy theme 6 should reflect those made to policy theme 1 and that the possibility of more than one large urban fringe site should be contemplated.	Noted, consideration will be given to amendments made in policy theme 1 and where relevant amendments will be made to reflect this. This policy does not deal with the allocation of types of sites for development.
Lcc	CS6	The policy is broadly consistent with the Structure Plan and is therefore supported.	Considered and noted.
Nfu	CS6	The policy is not sufficiently supportive of farm and rural diversification. More uses need to be allowed in rural areas than are mentioned in those policies.	Disagree, this policy relates to sustainable transport and accessibility and therefore its purpose is not land use related and should not include farm and rural diversification. This will be considered where appropriate in subsequent Development Plan Documents.
National Trust	CS6	The National Trust is pleased to support this Policy, but considers that it will potentially be considered to set out a hierarchical approach, it is considered that Criterion c) should precede a) and	Noted. The general support for policy CS6. In addition, the criteria in policy CS6 are not intended to be hierarchical. The supporting text that will accompany this policy will clarify this and therefore it

		b).	is not deemed necessary to amend the order of the criteria.
Pegasus Planning Group	CS6	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Transport and Accessibility CS6</p> <p>Criterion c) under Potential Policy CS6 should be amended to replace the word necessitate with facilitate.</p> <p>Criterion e) under Potential Policy CS6 is going to be very difficult to achieve in practice. As such, the issue of delivering a non-adverse impact on the existing transport network should be set out as an objective rather than a requirement. This could be reworded to state should avoid any adverse impacts/effects on the existing transport network.</p>	<p>Disagree. The wording for criterion c will not be amended, PPS1, PPG13 and guidance from Department of Transport advocates that planning authorities should seek to reduce the need for travel and emphasises the need for people being able to travel safely, it is therefore felt that it is important to necessitate easy and safe access for the whole community.</p> <p>Noted, criterion (e) aims to reduce the risk of adverse impacts on the existing transport network and it is important that this occurs. Therefore it is important to retain criterion e to prevent harmful impacts to the transport network and local community. However, wording will be amended to read 'should not have an adverse...'</p>
Sport England	CS6	Sport England supports this policy as an appropriate expression of Objective SO6.	Considered and noted.
Andrew Granger	CS7	Under item (e) it would be helpful to recognise the need for associated infrastructure such as lighting and fencing.	Item (e) of CS7 deals with recreation and access to the countryside. The Core Strategy is the spatial strategy for the Borough, requirements regarding infrastructure such as lighting and fencing will be included in generic development plan documents.
Countryside Agency	CS7	The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation supports this policy and the reasons for the preferred option choice. We are pleased to note that the Oadby & Wigston Landscape Character Assessment has been used to identify the landscape character areas within the Borough and that the importance of conserving the quality and distinctive characteristics of these	Considered and noted.

		areas has been recognised. The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation particularly supports this policy on green wedges because it ensures there is open space available close to urban centres; it preserves the character of the local landscape and provides areas for countryside access and recreation.	
Del Rosa Devlps	CS7	<p>The principles of Green Wedge policy are supported and, in general, the areas of Green Wedge should be safeguarded. However, changes to a Green Wedge boundary should be sanctioned where "Very special circumstances are demonstrated sufficiently to suggest that a change in the boundary of a Green Wedge would be of overall benefit to the Borough".</p> <p>Policy CS7 should be amended therefore to incorporate this exception (The attached note elaborates upon the reason for this objection).</p>	Noted, this policy allows for the review of the green wedge boundaries, the general wording allows for flexibility. More detailed policies and boundary information will be provided within subsequent Development Plan Documents.
English Nature	CS7	Not only would any review of Green Wedge boundaries need to maintain the separate identity of settlements, but also any alterations must take into account the requirements of conserving biodiversity features of interest, and the purpose of the green wedges should take precedence over the development.	Noted. Any review of Green Wedges will be conducted through the Allocations DPD. Issues in relation to biodiversity and settlement coalescence are paramount to any such review.
Goem	CS7	A Core Policy determining the protection and function of Green Wedges would require those policy areas to be deposited on a submission proposals map. As this would invite objections from land owners and developers, this approach and thus the first paragraph of CS7 and the entirety of CS8 are not encouraged. I recognise that the criteria in CS7 are derived from the extant Structure Plan; however this	<p>Noted, the policies aim is to allow flexibility in relation to the management of green wedges, it is felt that the first paragraph should remain in CS7 to allow for this and reflect guidance set out in 'Three Cities SRS Policy 3' of the Draft Regional Plan.</p> <p>Noted, clause b will be reworded to read: 'xxx.'</p>

		does not justify the confusing wording of clause (b).	
Harris Lamb	CS7	<p>On behalf of The Cooperative society</p> <p>It is acknowledged elsewhere in the Core Strategy that some green wedge land may have to be released for longer term development requirements. We believe that it would be helpful for the Core Strategy to confirm this point and to acknowledge that the Council's own work in assessing green wedges has identified the fact that not all green wedge land needs to be protected into the future. It should also be acknowledged that existing land uses within the green wedge will be supported and that further development and changes of use associated with these sites will be permitted, subject to those not having an adverse impact upon the principle of including the land in the wedge.</p>	<p>The Green Wedge Management Strategy examines the landscape character, recreational use, land use and ecology of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge. This establishes a review of the green wedge, the additional supporting text to the policy will include greater detail on the findings of the Green Wedge Strategy.</p> <p>Policy CS8 deals with appropriate green wedge land use.</p>
Lcc	CS7	<p>The policy is generally consistent with the Structure Plan. However, the stated purposes (for recreation and access to the countryside) are different from those set out in the Structure Plan. They are not the strategic purposes for designating Green Wedges, but relate more to the use of land within Green Wedges once they have been designated.</p>	<p>Noted, Chapter starting 'The purpose of green wedges should be:' will be moved and incorporated into the supporting text. CS8 deals specifically with green wedge land use.</p>
National Trust	CS7	<p>Other Strategy/Policy Considerations – at the Regional Level these should include RSS Policies 27 and 28 as they are directly relevant to biodiversity.</p>	<p>Considered and noted, RSS policies 27 and 28 are considered and informed the production of policy theme - Greenfield land, natural environment and biodiversity.</p>
Radleigh Homes	CS7	<p>A review of the boroughs green wedge policy could be needed in order to release development land closer to the city of Leicester.</p>	<p>Considered and noted, the Core Strategy sets out strategic policies required to achieve the spatial vision, subsequent Development Plan Documents will look into detailed</p>

			guidance on the review of Green Wedges.
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS7	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>Any review of his Policy would be contrary to the objectives of the Plan, S011 states that the Green Wedges should be protected and enhanced by limiting development to appropriate uses. Therefore, to initiate a Review at this stage without assessing the alternative sites on the edge of the Urban area is a flawed strategy, clearly there are numerous opportunities for sustainable Urban Extensions to Oadby or Wigston without the need to review the Green Wedge Policy and, therefore, we are requesting that it is only reviewed as a last resort after all other alternative sites on the edge of the urban area have been considered This search for alternative sites would be via detailed sustainability analysis looking at all relevant criteria/constraints, one of which would be the Green Wedges. Only if it is proved that a review of the policy would not provide the most sustainable form of development should it be considered.</p> <p>In conclusion we consider that the suggestion of a Review within Policy CS7 is premature, and that the decision to review the Green wedge should not be made until all other alternative sites on the edge of the Urban area have been considered In previous representations we have put forward land west of the A6 as land suitable for mixed use development and does not conflict with any identified constraints and is close to all services and</p>	Disagree. The Core Strategy is the spatial strategy for the Borough and does not address specific site allocations or identify boundary amendments; the aim of CS7 is to set out the delivery of green wedge management. The location of sites for development will dealt with in the Allocations DPD.

		amenities and has good access to public transport.	
Sport England	CS7	<p>Under Other Strategy Considerations, it is recommended that PPG17 is taken into account, due to the use and potential of Green Wedges and some parts of the countryside for sport recreation, which presumably has led to the references to RSS Policy 32. In principle, these sorts of uses are compatible with the main purpose of Green Wedges, to separate and preserve the identity of urban areas; and with PPS7 dealing with the countryside.</p> <p>Sport England supports the approach outlined in these policies, which seek protection and enhancement of Green Wedges, but recognise the need to accommodate limited built development to support recreational and sporting uses.</p>	CS8 deals with built development for leisure, recreation and sporting facilities it states that significant built development would not be allowed. This allows therefore for small built development to take place. Further guidance will be produced in relation to this in subsequent development plan documents.
Goem	CS8	A Core Policy determining the protection and function of Green Wedges would require those policy areas to be deposited on a submission proposals map. As this would invite objections from land owners and developers, this approach and thus the first paragraph of CS7 and the entirety of CS8 are not encouraged. I recognise that the criteria in CS7 are derived from the extant Structure Plan; however this does not justify the confusing wording of clause (b).	Noted, CS8 is inline with the 'Three Cities SRS Policy 3' set out in Draft East Midlands Regional Plan which states that 'the protection of strategically important areas of open land from built development in order to shape the wider form and direction of urban development.' CS8 will become a generic DC policy.
Harris Lamb	CS8	<p>On behalf of cooperative group</p> <p>Green wedges do contain existing developments. Redevelopment and changes of use in these areas may be desirable and can help to protect and enhance the character of the green</p>	CS8 deals with appropriate uses and does not go into the detail of types of development this will be dealt with in subsequent Development Plan Documents.

		wedge. We believe that the policy should be reworded in order to confirm that the reuse and redevelopment of existing sites in green wedges will be supported.	
Lcc	CS8	<p>The policy is generally consistent with the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Park and ride facilities have not been included as an acceptable use of Green Wedge land. This should be amended in line with the Structure Plan. The County Council will need to be assured that any proposed development in a Green Wedge satisfies all of the Structure Plan requirements.</p> <p>The provision of footpaths, bridleways, cycle ways, road proposals and dedicated public transport routes in Green Wedges provided appropriate mitigation measures are implemented is supported.</p>	<p>Considered and noted policy CS5 deals with the development of the transport system and CS6 deals with sustainable transport which allows for the consideration of transport development and sustainable locations. The issue of park and ride allocations will be considered in the preparation of subsequent DPD documents</p>
Nfu	CS8	<p>The policy is not sufficiently supportive of farm and rural diversification. More uses need to be allowed in rural areas than are mentioned in the policy.</p>	<p>CS8 identifies agriculture, allotments and horticulture development as an acceptable use within the green wedge. Farm and rural diversification is not an issue for this policy, however this issue will be looked into further and where appropriate be included within supporting text or future Development Plan Documents.</p>
National Trust	CS8	<p>Other Strategy/Policy Considerations – at the Regional Level these should include RSS Policies 27 and 28 as they are directly relevant to biodiversity.</p>	<p>Agreed in part, Policy 27 and 28 of the Regional Spatial Strategy discusses issues related to the policy theme 'Greenfield land, Natural Environment and Biodiversity' which CS8 falls within. These policies will be considered and where appropriate feed into the preparation of the above theme for the submission document.</p>
Sport England	CS8	<p>Under Other Strategy Considerations, it is recommended that PPG17 is taken</p>	<p>Considered and noted, PPG17 will be taken into account during the</p>

		<p>into account, due to the use and potential of Green Wedges and some parts of the countryside for sport recreation, which presumably has led to the references to RSS Policy 32. In principle, these sorts of uses are compatible with the main purpose of Green Wedges, to separate and preserve the identity of urban areas; and with PPS7 dealing with the countryside.</p> <p>Sport England supports the approach outlined in these policies, which seek protection and enhancement of Green Wedges, but recognise the need to accommodate limited built development to support recreational and sporting uses.</p>	<p>preparation of the submission Core Strategy policy on appropriate green wedge land uses.</p>
Barton Willmore	CS9	<p>With regard to draft policy CS9 we acknowledge the preference to develop urban areas where they are available. However, we consider that sustainable urban extensions should also be acknowledged as appropriate, to be in accordance with Key Issue 1. We would recommend that the council ensures that supplementary planning guidance and other guidance, including land availability studies, are kept up to date.</p>	<p>Noted. Urban extensions have not been identified with the Core Strategy as it is felt that this would be too site specific. Where appropriate consideration will be given to urban extensions in future Development Plan Documents</p>
Countryside Agency	CS9	<p>The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation supports this policy and believes the rural urban fringe can: be made readily accessible by most people; contribute to the health, wealth and well being of urban and rural communities; underpin more sustainable living; and strengthen biodiversity in both town and country.</p>	<p>Considered and noted.</p>
English Nature	CS9	<p>The sustainable proposals mentioned in the last paragraph of policy CS9 should also ensure that they don't have a negative impact upon biodiversity</p>	<p>Development impacting on biodiversity is addressed in policy CS11 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity and the wider environment' part of the aim of</p>

		features of interest.	this policy is to enable protection and enhancement of the Boroughs Biodiversity.
Goem	CS9	CS9 is superfluous	Agreed in part: It is felt that the rural urban fringe is important to address due to the urban nature of the Borough and its small area of Countryside. However it is recognised that key elements of this policy can be merged into CS10 which would then deal with both the countryside and rural urban fringe.
Lcc	CS9	The additional designation is not consistent with the Structure Plan and is likely to cause confusion. It should therefore be deleted.	Noted, it is felt that the rural urban fringe is important to address due to the urban nature of the Borough and its small area of Countryside. However it is recognised that key elements of this policy can be merged into CS10 which would then deal with both the countryside and rural urban fringe.
Nfu	CS9	The policy is not sufficiently supportive of farm and rural diversification. More uses need to be allowed in rural areas than are mentioned in the policy. In CS9 the siting of new development cannot be left to stakeholders and the local community.	Disagree. CS8 identifies agriculture, allotments and horticulture development as an acceptable use within the green wedge. Farm and rural diversification is not an issue for this policy, however this issue will be looked into further and where appropriate be included within supporting text or future Development Plan Documents. The Core Strategy does not deal with site specific allocations of land, criterion (C) does not enforce developers or the local community to identify sites, its purpose is to ensure that both the local community and stakeholders are consulted in future Development Plan Documents.
National Trust	CS9	Other Strategy/Policy Considerations – at the Regional Level these should include RSS Policies 27 and 28 as they are directly relevant to biodiversity.	Agreed in part, Policy 27 and 28 of the Regional Spatial Strategy discusses issues related to the policy theme 'Greenfield land, Natural Environment and Biodiversity' which CS8 falls within. These policies will be considered and where appropriate feed into the

			preparation of the above theme for the submission document.
Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS9	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>This policy appears to be superfluous as the majority of it is repeated within Policy CS10 as they deal with the same issues, which are land outside of the identified Urban Area. Specifically on CS9 the implication of the Policy seems to suggest that sites will be permitted not adjacent to the Urban area but within the countryside. This would appear to be contrary to the principles of Sustainable Development and the creation of Sustainable Urban Extensions which by their very nature need to be located adjacent to the Urban area</p> <p>The Rural Urban Fringe Landscape is not defined upon any plan and is, therefore a notional area and as highlighted above, is in our opinion, superfluous, clarification is needed on this issue.</p>	It is felt that the rural urban fringe is important to address due to the urban nature of the Borough and its small area of Countryside. However it is recognised that key elements of this policy can be merged into CS10 which would then deal with both the countryside and rural urban fringe.

	Barton Willmore	CS10	Draft policy CS10 confirms the intention to protect the countryside for its own intrinsic value. We acknowledge the flexibility for cases where development may be appropriate (based upon certain criteria) which are contained within the policy. We suggest that the designation of land as 'Countryside' is considered as carefully. In recommending this, we draw attention to paragraphs 24 and 25 of PPS7 which require carefully drafted criteria based policies informed by qualitative tools, as opposed to rigid local designations.	Disagree: The countryside is a general term that refers to all areas that are not urban. Some parts of the countryside are in their natural state while other areas are developed for agricultural or similar uses. A formal definition of countryside is 'land not in towns, cities or industrial areas, which is either used for farming or left in its natural condition' (Cambridge Dictionary). Landscape is a much more abstract term relating to the specific appearance of countryside areas. The Oadby & Wigston Landscape Character Assessment defines landscape as 'not only natural
--	-----------------	------	---	---

				<p>features..... but also man-made constructed features' (David Tyldesley & Assocs, 2005).</p> <p>Therefore, the designation of some areas of the Borough as 'countryside' does not constitute a Local Landscape Designation in accordance with paragraphs 24 and 25 of PPS7.</p>
	Countryside Agency	CS10	The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation supports this policy and agrees with the six criteria listed at the end of the policy wording.	Noted: Support for the content of this policy
	Goem	CS10	<p>CS10 has been worded as an over-detailed development control policy. A Core Policy for the Countryside might consider what development would be appropriate here, including targets for habitat creation etc.</p> <p>CS18 appears to duplicate the intent of CS10.</p>	Agreed: Policy will be re-drafted to streamline guidance
	Harris Lamb	CS10	This policy applies to development in open countryside. We believe that there is no reason why this should not also apply to green wedges and this would provide policy basis for dealing with existing sites in green wedges.	Agreed: Policy will be re-drafted to streamline guidance
	Lcc	CS10	The policy sets out types of development that would be permitted in the countryside that are generally consistent with the Structure Plan and therefore supported.	Noted: Support for the content of this policy
	Nfu	CS10	In CS10 residential use may be allowed where no other re-use is possible. Also, in view of the new PPS7 are safeguards needed for the best and most versatile agricultural land, as this is not protected to the same extent now.	Agreed: In line with paragraph 17 of PPS7, Policy CS10 will be re-drafted to allow for the re-use for residential purposes although economic uses will still be preferable.
	National Trust	CS10	Other Strategy/Policy Considerations – at the Regional Level these should include RSS Policies 27 and 28 as they are directly relevant to biodiversity.	Noted: this will be added to the proforma

	Sport England	CS10	Under Other Strategy Considerations, it is recommended that PPG17 is taken into account, due to the use and potential of Green Wedges and some parts of the countryside for sport recreation, which presumably has led to the references to RSS Policy 32. In principle, these sorts of uses are compatible with the main purpose of Green Wedges, to separate and preserve the identity of urban areas; and with PPS7 dealing with the countryside.	Noted: this will be added to the proforma
	Sport England	CS10	Sport England supports the approach outlined in these policies, which seek protection and enhancement of Green Wedges, but recognise the need to accommodate limited built development to support recreational and sporting uses.	Noted: support for the content of this policy
	Countryside Agency	CS11	The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation supports this policy and is pleased that the term green infrastructure has been included.	Noted: Support for the content of this policy.
	Emra	CS11	<p>Key Issue 1 and Policy Theme 4 Greenfield Land, Natural Environment and Biodiversity</p> <p>It is increasingly our experience that previously developed land, and especially land abandoned more than 20 years ago, is often found to contain previously unrecorded species of national importance, particularly invertebrates. It may be appropriate to arrange for the carrying out of ecological assessments before formal designation/approval of plans for development.</p> <p>Such ecological assessments accord with your Community Plan objective of promoting knowledge and care of the</p>	Noted: As part of our assessment of sites for allocations purposes the Council will undertake a suitable biodiversity survey of all PDL sites as part of the evidence base. This will be in line with PPS9 Companion guide paragraph 4.42.

			environment, and may also help inform/prioritise the revisions to the Green Wedges policy area.	
	Emra	CS11	Under proposed policy CS11 it may be felt appropriate to require new development to have minimum disturbance to and incorporate provision for enhancing biodiversity.	Agree in part: Criteria a) requires enhancement of biodiversity for brownfield sites. However, it is felt that both criteria a) and b) should be re-drafted to include both new development and re-develop in both considerations.
	English Nature	CS11	English nature very strongly supports this policy, and particularly welcomes the need for creation of new habitats as well as the conservation and enhancement of existing resources.	Noted, support for the content of this policy.
	English Nature	CS11	In addition this policy should include a requirement that developments take account of the conservation of designated SSSI, local wildlife sites and regionally important geological sites.	Disagree: The latter part of the policy relates to sites of national, regional and locally designated sites. Criteria b) relates to the conservation of such sites where new development may affect them. However, criteria b) will be amended to make reference to geological interest also. In addition, the supporting text to accompany this policy will include broad guidance in relation to the conservation of such sites.
	National Trust	CS11	Other Strategy/Policy Considerations – at the Regional Level these should include RSS Policies 27 and 28 as they are directly relevant to biodiversity	Noted: this will be added to the proforma
	Goem	CS12	Can you indicate what geological site in the Borough requires protection under CS12? If there is none, why is this policy needed?	Noted: The Borough has a SSSI and a RIG at in an area around the Grand Union Canal at Kilby Bridge. The exact location can be found on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map.
	Barton Willmore	CS13	CS13 should acknowledge that development in areas at risk of flooding would be acceptable where suitable mitigation methods can be demonstrated.	Disagree: development accompanied by suitable flood defence and mitigation works will only be acceptable in areas at risk of flooding only where it can be demonstrated that the wider aims of sustainable development may be met. This is as per PPG25 and draft PPS25

	Environment Agency	CS13	The criteria included in policy theme 4 - CS13, Flood risk and the protection of the water environment are welcome.	Noted. support for the content of this policy
	Environment Agency	CS13	Provision should also be made (possibly in criteria f) to require the retention, and where possible the provision, of access to watercourses for the purpose of maintenance. The inability to maintain a watercourse may contribute to flood risk	Agreed: Amend policy to include reference to the need to ensure access to watercourses for maintenance is provided or retained
	Goem	CS13	Flood risk may be a topic suitable for Core Policy, but does not relate to any of the Key Issues identified.	Disagree: The area most at risk of flooding in the Borough falls within the countryside to the south of South Wigston. It was for this reason that this policy was related to Key Issue 9 – Development in the Countryside. However, a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment has not yet been carried out and it may be found that some urban areas may be at risk. Therefore, it is intended that a policy on flood risk should be included in the strategic Development Control policy section.
	Goem	CS13	The first paragraph of CS13 contradicts clause (a) of the same policy. Clauses (b), (c) and (h) further duplicate clause (a). Clause (d) is a generic development control matter, whilst clause (e) may sit more comfortably under Key Issue 7 Sustainable Development. Clauses (f) and (g) appear to be matters that should be addressed through the RSS, and are unlikely to arise in the Borough. CS16 might be usefully merged with elements of CS13 &14 as indicated above to form a strategic policy for sustainable construction	Agreed: Policy to be amended to remove first paragraph apart from the last sentence: "Development will only be acceptable where:" Furthermore, the remaining criteria will be rationalised to remove issues of duplication and contradiction. With regard to criteria (e), this will be incorporated into CS16
	Lcc	CS13	Flood risk and the Protection of the Water Environment requires developments to minimize surface water run-off by the use of permeable surface treatments, sustainable	Noted: Provision of commuted sums are dealt with under policy

			<p>drainage systems or retention systems. These features are permissible in Htd however the maintenance implications are not fully understood and there is a need to ensure that additional maintenance costs for the highway authority are covered by the payment of commuted sums.</p>	
	Leics. Constabulary	CS13	<p>In considering the overall effect of the Core Strategy on SO4 CS13 is listed as a 'beneficial effect' I fail to see how flood risk and protection of the water environment can improve community safety, reduce anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime'</p>	<p>Noted: However, comments relate to SA.</p>
	National Trust	CS13	<p>The bulleted points at a) to h) all need to be satisfied; at the end of a) to g) the word 'or' should be replaced with 'and'.</p>	<p>Agreed: The criteria by which a development affecting areas likely to flood should not be optional. The inclusion of 'and' rather than 'or' will be used in the re-draft of this policy</p>
	Andrew Granger	CS14	<p>Renewable energy sets targets for CO2 reductions through the use of renewable energy generation. Whilst the strategy is to be commended it is proposed to apply this to refurbishment schemes. The University does not support this element of the proposal since it will be unworkable in practice.</p> <p>The incorporation of carbon reducing measures into major developments including refurbishments is welcomed and we suggest that the use of biomass heating and draft-proofing should be added to the list of examples.</p> <p>Additional comment received 6 June 2006 The policy needs clarifying as to what baseline is to be used in order to calculate the reduction.</p>	<p>Agree in part: Policy in its current form is too restrictive. The policy should clarify that generation of energy from on-site renewable sources will only be expected where the installation of renewable energy equipment would be viable in terms of type of development, its location and design. This could then apply to some refurbishment schemes. This is also in line with paragraph 8 of PPS22.</p>
	Barton Willmore	CS14	<p>CS14 proposes to require all major developments to incorporate renewable energy generation. The policy should</p>	<p>Agreed: As endorsed by paragraph 8 of PPS22 on Renewable Energy, the Council have chosen to include the</p>

			seek to incorporate renewable energy generation, to allow for the assessment of different types of development and their likely energy requirements, consumption of resources and outputs.	requirement for a percentage of the energy to be use in new residential, commercial or industrial development to come from on-site renewable sources. However, the policy should clarify that this will only be expected where the installation of renewable energy equipment would be viable in terms of type of development, its location and design. This is also in line with paragraph 8 of PPS22.
	Bwea	CS14	BWEA fully supports CS14and the requirement that all major developments incorporate onsite renewables.	Noted: Support for the content of this policy.
	Bwea	CS14	BWEA urge the Council to set a target for energy efficiency measures in addition to this. For example all major development will be required to demonstrate how energy efficiency measures will be used to reduce CO2 emissions by 10%.	Agreed in part: It is intended to develop further policy on sustainable construction and energy efficiency and is felt that specific measures and targets for achieving these could be developed through specific DPDs and SPDs
	Goem	CS14	Renewable energy is an issue suitable for Core Policy, and might relate better to Key Issue (7) Sustainable Development.	Agreed: The use of renewable energy and reducing energy wastage is a key to reducing climate change and the negative effects it generates
	Goem	CS14	The first paragraph of the CS14 appears to be in keeping with PPS22. However, the rest of CS14 appears to be guidance, not policy.	Agreed: The remainder of the content of CS13 after the first paragraph will be removed and encompassed within the supporting text for this policy.
	Goem	CS14	CS16 might be usefully merged with elements of CS13 &14 as indicated above to form a strategic policy for sustainable construction.	Disagree: Flood risk, renewable energy and energy efficiency are important strategic issues. It is felt that individual policies are still required and these will contained within a raft of Strategic DC policies to accompany the Core policies. However, some re-drafting will need to be carried out to remove those elements that should be supporting text and also strengthen their links to climate change
	Harris Lamb	CS14	On behalf of The Cooperative Group	Agreed in part. It is accepted that reference to importance of the

			<p>The Co Op does support the principle of renewable energy. We note the Council's aspirations to achieve reductions in CO2 emissions by renewable energy sources. It is not clear that the technology is in place to achieve the reductions being sought by the Council and this could have implications for bringing forward strategic development land. We believe that such matters are properly dealt with through the building regulations system.</p> <p>In this context we believe that the land use proposals of policy CS14 should be reworded and the specific targets removed. Reference could be made to the use of building regulations to achieve reductions in CO2 emissions.</p>	<p>Building Regulations in ensuring development is sustainable will be included. However, any targets contained in policies related to renewable energy have been essentially derived from national and regional sources and therefore to maintain conformity and soundness targets will continue to be included.</p>
	National Trust	CS14	<p>This is an especially important Policy in relation to dealing with the causes of Climate Change and is supported.</p>	<p>Noted: Support for the content of this policy.</p>
	Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS14	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>The policy as drafted whilst laudable does not take account the viability of development proposals and it is only above a certain threshold that such renewable energy measures are feasible. Therefore, without very detailed proposals or plans of a certain scale the policy is likely to be unduly restrictive and prevent delivery of development. For instance it might be that other objectives of the Council need to be reduced in order that these measures are implementable, one example might be a reduction in Affordable Housing to compensate.</p>	<p>Agreed: As endorsed by paragraph 8 of PPS22 on Renewable Energy, the Council have chosen to include the requirement for a percentage of the energy to be use in new residential, commercial or industrial development to come from on-site renewable sources. However, the policy should clarify that this will only be expected where the installation of renewable energy equipment would be viable in terms of type of development, its location and design. This is also in line with paragraph 8 of PPS22.</p>
	William Davis	CS14	<p>It is accepted that government policy set out in PPS22 seeks to encourage use of renewable energy principles in</p>	<p>Disagree: Although it is accepted that the policy in its current form is too restrictive, as endorsed by paragraph</p>

			<p>new development and suggests that local planning authorities should do likewise in their LDF policies. the policy guidance, together with accompanying advice within the associated Companion guide places a number of caveats on how this should be done. It advises that policy should encourage consideration of a range of technology, should be flexible in approach and should not place an undue burden on developers.</p> <p>Policy CS14 conflicts with this government advice. It should not "require" but should only "encourage" development proposals to incorporate on site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Because of the wide range of potential options available (many of which still have to be verified for their cost effectiveness) the policy should also provide for maximum flexibility for choice of renewable energy sources and means of reducing energy consumption. The policy should not therefore make specific mention of particular examples. This could perhaps be a matter, which is more appropriately dealt with by preparation of SPD at a later stage.</p>	<p>8 of PPS22 on Renewable Energy, the Council have chosen to include the requirement for a percentage of the energy to be used in new residential, commercial or industrial development to come from on-site renewable sources. However, the policy should clarify that this will only be expected where the installation of renewable energy equipment would be viable in terms of type of development, its location and design. This is also in line with paragraph 8 of PPS22. However, it is agreed that policy CS14 should be revised to remove the list of examples which are better suited to the supporting text.</p>
	Bwea	CS15	<p>With regard to 'the wider environmental, economic and social benefits of the scheme outweigh any unacceptable effects' the Council should refer to 'unacceptable effects as opposed to adverse impacts'.</p>	<p>Agreed: This wording will be substituted in the final policy if it is retained</p>
	Bwea	CS15	<p>Similarly for the second bullet point state 'there are no unacceptable effects upon designated environmental assets, important landscape features and significant local biodiversity'</p>	<p>Agreed: This wording will be substituted in the final policy if it is retained</p>

	Bwea	CS15	With regard to the third bullet point: 'the chosen method of energy generation is viable in the proposed location', this is not a material planning consideration and therefore BWEA recommend it is deleted. It is up to the developer to ensure that the chosen location is viable for the method of energy generation.	Agreed: This criteria will be deleted from the final policy if it is retained
	Bwea	CS15	With regard to the fifth bullet point amend to 'there are no unacceptable effects upon the amenity of neighbouring residents and land uses'	Agreed: This wording will be substituted in the final policy if it is retained
	Bwea	CS15	With regard to the sixth bullet point 'they are capable and can demonstrate that they meet energy requirements' it is unclear what this criterion is referring to, in any case it is not a planning consideration and therefore should be deleted.	Agreed: This criteria will be deleted from the final policy if it is retained
	Bwea	CS15	With regard to the seventh bullet point 'they are, as far as practicable, well located in relation to the existing electricity transmission network' this is not a material planning consideration and therefore BWEA recommend it is deleted. It is the developer's responsibility to deal with matters relating to infrastructure.	Agreed: This criteria will be deleted from the final policy if it is retained
	Bwea	CS15	With regard to the eight bullet point 'they offer, where possible scope for heat recovery for example by the use of Combined Heat and Power Technology', PPS22 encourages ALL forms of renewable energy. Whilst BWEA do not wish to discourage scope for heat recovery, it is considered inappropriate to include this as a criterion; it may be advisable to include this detail in the supporting paragraphs.	Agreed: This wording will be deleted from the final policy if it is retained but included in the supporting text
	Goem	CS15	Most of the criteria of CS15 do not appear appropriate, relating either to matters subject to generic development control (e.g. amenity) or pre-judging the	Agreed in part: Should this policy be retained it will be re-drafted and included in the raft of strategic DC policies. Otherwise, elements of it will

			viability of schemes, which is a matter better left to the judgement of developers. The second criteria could be retained if it clarified that only significant damage to other assets would justify refusal of renewable energy schemes e.g. the benefits of renewable energy will outweigh minor impacts on other assets.	be included within a comprehensive sustainability policy.
	National Trust	CS15	It is requested that the second bullet point is amended to read 'They do not adversely affect designated environmental assets or their settings, important...' It is considered that this alteration would bring the Policy into conformity with the advice in PPS22 in the second sentence of paragraph 14 which states that the impacts upon 'buffer areas' are material considerations.	Disagree: The inclusion of the wording "or their settings" in relation to designated environmental assets is not considered necessary as para. 14 of PPS22 makes it clear that the proximity of proposals to these areas is a 'material consideration' in the determination of planning applications. Furthermore, it is felt to specify the settings of designated assets in the policy wording would in effect produce an informal buffer zone which is contrary to the guidance contained in para. 14.
	British Waterways	CS16	Support	Considered and noted
	Countryside Agency	CS16	The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation supports this policy as it meets the aims of one of our key principles, which is to encourage high quality applications and assess them on the basis of are they good enough to approve? - rather than are they bad enough to refuse. Good enough includes the idea of high quality, where quality moves beyond it traditional architectural associations to include a range of other factors that, combined, will lead to good development. We particularly support the inclusion of the following criteria: f) maximising the scope for the use of renewable energy; h) encouraging the use of sustainable and locally sourced materials to reduce	Noted: Support for the content of this policy.

			the impact of consumption on resources and energy waste; k) respecting and enhancing local character and distinctiveness.	
	Emra	CS16	CS16 Sustainable Construction Within the criteria a) to l), it may be appropriate to include the re-use and recycling of on-site buildings and materials, for example the re-use of bricks from demolished buildings and the recycling of site concrete for aggregates, in the requirements for new developments.	Agreed: this can significantly reduce the carbon load of a new/re-development.
	Goem	CS16	Policies CS16-18 does not implement Key Issue 7, and are worded as development control policies. CS16 might be usefully merged with elements of CS13 &14 as indicated above to form a strategic policy for sustainable construction.	Agreed: Following discussion with GOEM Policy CS16 will either form a raft of strategic DC policies or will be merged with CS13 & 14 to form a comprehensive sustainable development policy.
	Leics. Constabulary	CS16	CS16 could have the last line amended and included as a criterion of PPS1 includes safe environments as a requirement for sustainable development. (m) Incorporating principles that design out crime and design in community safety With the SO link amended as appropriate	Agreed: amend policy to include new criteria and amend SO3 to include crime reduction and community safety.
	Lcc	CS16	The criteria for housing design are generally consistent with the Structure Plan and are therefore supported.	Noted: There is support for the design criteria in relation to housing as they are compliant with those of the adopted Structure Plan.
	Lcc	CS16	However, minimum densities should be set out that are consistent with those outlined in the Structure Plan.	Disagree: Although there is a need to set out densities in relation to housing, Policy CS16 is a general sustainable design policy that covers all types of development. Guidance in relation to housing densities will be include within

				policies related to housing development solely
	Lcc	CS16	The Policy is generally consistent with the approach taken in Htd and should be supported. However additional maintenance costs need to be covered by the payment of commuted sums.	Noted: There is support for this policy as it is generally consistent with the approach taken in the LCC document Highways, Transportation and Development. Issues in relation to commuted sums will be dealt with within Policy CS24 Developer Contributions to meet community needs
	National Trust	CS16	Generally this is a well considered Policy that the National Trust is pleased to support.	Noted, support for the content of this policy
	National Trust	CS16	However, it would wish to query bullets k) and l). There is no separate point relating to heritage, unless one is provided then heritage aspects will need to be assessed against k); in this regard the use of the word 'respect' is inappropriate and 'protect' or 'safeguard' should be used instead.	Agree in part: Criteria k) of CS16 will be amended to include reference to heritage if the policy is retained in its current format
	National Trust	CS16	Bullet l) needs to incorporate considerations that go wider than just new landscaping, the impact upon existing landscape character also needs to be addressed.	Agree in part: Consideration of landscape character is dealt with under Policy CS18. However, criteria l) of CS16 will be amended to include reference to existing landscaping if the policy is retained in its current format
	Pegasus Planning Group	CS16	Part 2 of Core Strategy Objection Balanced Housing Markets It is helpful that the Core Strategy acknowledges that the Borough will be unable to meet all of its development needs on previously developed land over time and that land adjacent to the urban area is the next most sustainable option to maximise access to existing facilities and infrastructure. However, this obvious implication for the Spatial Strategy of the Borough fails to be	Agreed: The criteria based part of Policy CS19 will form a raft of strategic Development Control policies Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing figures. As part of the determination of any proposal any relevant strategic Development Control policies will be expected to be applied alongside the Core Policies

			<p>articulated in the Core Strategy Preferred Options 2 particularly in terms of where the Borough will seek to identify such sites and how much is likely to be required.</p> <p>CS19 Meeting the Housing Needs of the Borough</p> <p>Objection is raised to the reference in Potential Policy CS19 to the LLRSP Housing Requirement 1996-2016 as this has now been superseded by the RSS requirement 2001-2021.</p> <p>The Government Office for the East Midlands has confirmed that LPAs should plan in accordance with the housing requirements set out in Policy 17 of RSS8 using existing Structure Plan proportions 2001-2021. Accordingly, the RSS8 requirement 2001-2021 is 1700 dwellings and it is recommended that the Core Strategy should set out under Policy CS19 a requirement to at least meet this figure. However, RSS8 is presently being reviewed and will result in an increase in the housing requirements for the Borough to 2026; this new RSS8 is expected to be adopted in early 2008. Accordingly, it is important for the Core Strategy to plan for the likely housing requirements emanating from the RSS8. Review that is likely to be at least 110 new dwellings per annum compared the present requirement of 85 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>Further, the Criteria a) to i) listed under Policy CS19 should appropriately be</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			considered together with the proposed sequential approach policy as they are both requirements allocating and permitting proposals for residential development.	
	Sport England	CS16	<p>In many respects, Sport England would wish to support the approach of the Council towards the built environment, culture and heritage of the borough. For instance, Sport England welcomes strong policies to protect and enhance the historic and cultural environment, including landscape character; and to promote high quality, sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>However, within that, Sport England recommends that the policies are amended to include reference to good design incorporating the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protect and enhance existing open space and recreational facilities ▪ Make provision for accessible open space and the recreational needs of communities, including those needs arising from new development. <p>These are key requirements to create healthy and sustainable communities. We would refer the Council to RSS8 Policy 32, and our comments in connection with Objectives SO8 and SO11.</p>	Agreed in part: Although there is agreement with the points made in this response it is felt that they would be better included within those policies related to leisure and recreation. However, Policy CS16 will be strengthened to make reference to the importance of open space in the design of new development
	Andrew Granger	CS17	<p>CS17 (d) The listing of buildings normally does not take into account the inside of the building and any listing should be undertaken in consultation with the owner</p>	Disagree: Buildings are listed in their entirety, both inside and out. Paragraph 3.2 of PPG15 states “controls apply to all works, both external and internal, that would affect a building’s special interest, whether or not the particular feature concerned is specifically mentioned in the list description”. In addition, English Heritage has

				responsibility for the administration of the listing system. As part of this system, the owner and Local Authority are informed that listing is being considered and will be asked for comments.
	Goem	CS17	Policies CS16-18 do not implement Key Issue 7, and are worded as development control policies. CS17 contains no proposals to preserve or enhance cultural assets.	Agreed: Following discussion with GOEM Policy CS17 and 18 will form a raft of strategic DC policies. However, CS17 may be re-drafted to include proposals to enhance/preserve cultural assets depending on other respondent comments.
	Lcc	CS17	This Policy does not mention Planning and Policy Guidance Note 16 (Archaeology and Planning). An omission rather than a criticism as it clearly show its influence and address its main concerns.	Agreed: A reference to PPG16 will be added to section B of the proforma
	Nfu	CS17	In CS17 will the publication of the local list of buildings result in listing by the back door? There must be reasonable and lesser controls applied to these 'locally listed' buildings	Disagree: A list of significant local buildings and associated Conservation Proposal 22 is already contained in the adopted Local Plan. Locally listed buildings are chosen on the same criteria as statutory listed buildings but with a focus on their local rather than national importance. Inclusion in the list does not give a building any statutory protection but it would be a material consideration when determining planning applications. However, when they are located within a conservation area, they are afforded some degree of statutory protection. Any controls subsequently attributed to locally listed buildings will be determined through the relevant development plan document (DPD) e.g. Development Control DPD.
	National Trust	CS17	This Policy in many areas is good in ensuring that the wider historic environment is properly considered, protected and enhanced – especially in the references to settings in bullets b)	Agreed: Criteria c) of Policy CS17 will be amended to include reference to the settings of Conservation Areas.

			and d). However, in accordance with PPG15 and RSS Policies 27 and 31 the question of setting is also relevant to Conservation Areas (PPG15 para 4.14: 'The desirability of preserving or enhancing the area should also, in the Secretary of State's view, be a material consideration in the planning authority's handling of development proposals which are outside the conservation area but would affect its setting, or views into or out of the area'). Bullet c) should be revised accordingly.	
	Sport England	CS17	<p>In many respects, Sport England would wish to support the approach of the Council towards the built environment, culture and heritage of the borough. For instance, Sport England welcomes strong policies to protect and enhance the historic and cultural environment, including landscape character; and to promote high quality, sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>However, within that, Sport England recommends that the policies are amended to include reference to good design incorporating the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protect and enhance existing open space and recreational facilities ▪ Make provision for accessible open space and the recreational needs of communities, including those needs arising from new development. <p>These are key requirements to create healthy and sustainable communities. We would refer the Council to RSS8 Policy 32, and our comments in connection with Objectives SO8 and SO11.</p>	Noted: Support for the content of this policy.
	Countryside	CS18	The Countryside Agency; Landscape,	Noted: Support for the content of this

	Agency		Access and Recreation very much supports this policy. Protecting landscapes from inappropriate development is one of the key principles that The Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation promotes. This principle urges planning authorities to use an understanding of the landscape character everywhere to underpin their plans and decisions.	policy.
	Lcc	CS18	<p>This Policy does not mention Planning and Policy Guidance Note 16 (Archaeology and Planning). An omission rather than a criticism as it clearly show its influence and address its main concerns.</p> <p>The on-going Historic Landscape Characterisation programme will contribute to our appreciation of local form and distinctiveness. This aims to provide a coherent assessment of the District's landscapes identifying and describing its predominant historic character and origins. The results of this work will provide a valuable tool for assessing the impact of development schemes and the capacity of landscape to accommodate change.</p>	Agreed and Noted: A reference to PPG16 will be added to section B of the proforma. The ongoing Historic Landscape Characterisation programme will be utilised to inform future policy development and proposals in this and subsequent DPDs
	National Trust	CS18	This Policy is welcomed as an important dimension in the assessment of development proposals, but it is requested that specific reference is included to the historic dimension to Landscape Character Assessment (for example, as referred to in 'Using Historic Landscape Characterisation' – English Heritage/Lancashire County Council, 2004).	Agreed: Policy CS18 will be amended to include reference to historic character. Reference will also be made within the supporting text to the importance of Historic Landscape Characterisation.
	Andrew Granger	CS19	In the document there is some confusion as to whether or not the housing numbers are to 2021 to 2026, which is the new date for the regional	Noted. The Council have concerns that the evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from

			planning guidance.	2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time.
	Barton Willmore	CS19	<p>The emphasis of Policy CS19 to ensure a five year provision of land is supported. However, attention is drawn to paragraph 12 (d) of draft PPS3, which advises that Local Planning Authorities,</p> <p>“for the following 10 years of the housing trajectory, allocate land wherever possible. Where it is not possible to allocate specific land, broad areas of land for future growth should be indicated in the core strategy”</p> <p>We consider that the key diagram should indicate the broad locations for growth, and that the policies of the Core Strategy should also consider sustainable urban extensions.</p>	<p>Agreed in part: We consider that the key diagram does illustrate broad locations of growth. The physical size of Oadby and Wigston Borough and its topographic constraints mean that development must be contained either within the urban borders of the three towns or through expansion into the greenfields/wedges surrounding these towns and separating the Borough from its neighbours to the south. However, as extension into greenfield areas is likely to deliver our development needs it is agreed that an appropriate urban extension policy will be required. This will complement Policies CS1 and 2.</p>
	Barton Willmore	CS19	<p>Policy CS19 considers housing needs based upon the RSS requirement to 2016, confirming that the need to 2021 would be considered in light of the RSS review. However, the review of the RSS extends the plan period to 2026 and we believe that the Council should make necessary provisions to consider the likely housing needs of the Borough to 2026</p>	<p>Agreed in part: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing figures. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 (“... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...”) and paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”).</p>
	Goem	CS19	<p>The housing target in the first paragraph of CS19 may have to be revised subject to the emerging content of the RSS Review. Given that the broad locations suitable for development will be defined</p>	<p>Agreed in part: The Core Strategy will be submitted containing the most up to date guidance in respect of the Regional Plan. In addition, following discussion with the Government Office</p>

			under Key Issue 1, I can not see what value is added by the rest of the content of CS19.	it was agreed that elements of housing policy could form part of a raft of strategic DC policies.
	Harris Lamb	CS19	<p>On behalf of The Cooperative Group</p> <p>We believe that the phasing of development needs to be considered more carefully Although the need to bring forward previously developed land is acknowledged, it is also important to ensure that there is a continuous supply of land in order to meet national policy set out in draft PPS3 as well as RSS housing objectives including the provision of affordable housing. In this context we believe that policy CS19 needs to be reviewed and the Possibility of a phased approach to the release of both brownfield and greenfield housing land should be made This could still ensure that brownfield land is brought forward and the necessity of releasing greenfield land together with their associated infrastructure requirements should be acknowledged; such land should not be held back because brownfield sites are not released. A properly considered strategy will ensure a balance in the timing of release.</p>	<p>Disagree: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing figures. In addition, Policy CS2 will be re-drafted and renamed the Sequential Approach to the Location of Development. Re-drafted CS2 will provide the mechanism for delivering the release of housing sites. Although the release of brownfield sites before greenfield is the preferred approach this will not preclude the development of a greenfield site if a brownfield option is not available.</p> <p>Further detailed policy in relation to the delivery of particular development on specific sites will be contained in the subsequent Allocations Development Plan Document.</p>
	Hbf	CS19	The strategy should detail the basis of the housing figures and must take into account the requirements of the RSS from the first possible date.	Agreed: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing and employment figures. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time.
	Lcc	CS19	The Preferred Option is generally consistent with the Structure Plan and is therefore supported. The County	Disagree: Polices within the Core Strategy no longer need to be in general conformity with Structure Plans

			council will need to be assured that any proposed greenfield development satisfies all of the Structure Plan requirements when further information is published in March 2007. The Structure Plan requirement is for no more than 15 hectares of new greenfield housing land in Oadby & Wigston. If any such land is required to meet the overall requirement in Oadby & Wigston, the County Council will need to be assured that Structure Plan obligations are satisfied	although Structure Plan policies remain material considerations whilst they still form part of the development plan.
	Lcc	CS19	The Policy includes the proximity to public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes, but does not make reference to the available capacity of the highway network or the need to provide appropriate and safe access to the highway	Agreed: Should Policy CS19 be re-drafted and retained it will form part of a raft of strategic Development Control policies. Reference will be included in relation to these highway considerations
	Lcc	CS19	This Policy seeks to accord with the present structure plan requirements to 2016. This requirement has now been superseded by RSS8 with the need to plan between 2001 and 2021. Accordingly, Policy CS19 requires amending to reflect the current requirements in RSS8 noting that this is being reviewed and will be updated following publication of the review to provide a requirement to 2026. Recommended change For Policy CS19 to delete reference to providing new housing development for the period 1996 - 2016 and to replace this by reference to the RSS8 requirement 2001 - 2021 based on structure plan proportions.	Agreed: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing figures. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 (“... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...”) and paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”).
	Marrons	CS19	Standard objection	Agreed: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing and employment figures.

				However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time.
	Miller Homes	CS19	<p>Miller Homes acknowledges the Council's preferred approach to new development on previously developed sites. It is noted, however, that there is a lack of brownfield land within the Borough, and therefore the Borough will need to look to undeveloped land, such as the open countryside in order to meet its housing requirements. In this regard, and in line with both Regional Plan and Structure Plan requirements, it is necessary to identify sufficient housing land on greenfield sites up to 2021, in addition to brownfield sites.</p> <p>Whilst, much of this requirement can be accommodated on urban fringe sites, it is considered that greenfield land beyond the urban fringe would also be required. This strategy would be consistent with the Structure Plan requirement for allocating 15ha of Strategic Greenfield Housing Sites (Housing Policy 2), and the Regional Plan's Draft Preferred Option of the delivery of 3,790 dwellings per annum within Leicester and Leicestershire.</p>	Disagree: The Core Strategy should only be concerned with setting out the "...broad locations for delivering the housing and other strategic development needs..." (PPS12, para. 2.10) but it "... should not identify individual sites." (PPS12, para. 2.12). The subsequent Allocations DPD will identify sufficient land for all development which is likely to be a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites.
	Miller Homes	CS19	It is considered that the most suitable option for accommodating new residential development would be land to the south east of the Borough, which provides a highly sustainable location for development and has little constraints that would prevent the site from being developed. In this regard, Miller Homes have identified a suitable	It is considered that the most suitable option for accommodating new residential development would be land to the south east of the Borough, which provides a highly sustainable location for development and has little constraints that would prevent the site from being developed. In this regard, Miller Homes have identified a suitable

			site on Newton Lane, Wigston. This site has the potential to be promoted as a comprehensive site.	site on Newton Lane, Wigston. This site has the potential to be promoted as a comprehensive site.
	Pegasus Planning Group	CS19	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Balanced Housing Markets</p> <p>It is helpful that the Core Strategy acknowledges that the Borough will be unable to meet all of its development needs on previously developed land over time and that land adjacent to the urban area is the next most sustainable option to maximise access to existing facilities and infrastructure. However, this obvious implication for the Spatial Strategy of the Borough fails to be articulated in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, particularly in terms of where the Borough will seek to identify such sites and how much is likely to be required.</p> <p>CS19 Meeting the Housing Needs of the Borough</p> <p>Objection is raised to the reference in Potential Policy CS19 to the LLRSP Housing Requirement 1996-2016 as this has now been superseded by the RSS requirement 2001-2021.</p> <p>The Government Office for the East Midlands has confirmed that LPAs should plan in accordance with the housing requirements set out in Policy 17 of RSS8 using existing Structure Plan proportions 2001-2021. Accordingly, the RSS8 requirement 2001-2021 is 1700 dwellings and it is recommended that the Core Strategy</p>	<p>Agreed in part: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing figures. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 (“... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...”) and paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”).</p>

			<p>should set out under Policy CS19 a requirement to at least meet this figure. However, RSS8 is presently being reviewed and will result in an increase in the housing requirements for the Borough to 2026; this new RSS8 is expected to be adopted in early 2008. Accordingly, it is important for the Core Strategy to plan for the likely housing requirements emanating from the RSS8. Review that is likely to be at least 110 new dwellings per annum compared the present requirement of 85 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>For Potential Policy CS19 to be reworded to reflect the most up to date information on housing land requirements as set out in RSS8 and the RSS8 Review.</p>	
	Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS19	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>The policy fails to make it clear what the start and end date of the Plan is, it is our suggestion that it coincides with the end date of RSS8. This would seem to be logical so that the LDF coincides with the RSS and that it would cover more than a ten year time period and according to guidance within paragraph 2.14 of PPS12. At present by the time the plan is adopted in 2007/2008 it would not cover a ten year period.</p> <p>Further, as the emerging RSS8 covers the time period from 2006 to 2026, there is logic in following this guidance, such that the LDF will be in conformity with it. Otherwise as outlined the period would be insufficient and will not</p>	<p>Agreed in part: Policy CS19 will be reviewed to reflect the review Regional Plan housing and employment figures. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 (“... the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years...”) and paragraph 4.19 (“...must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy”).</p>

			<p>coincide with the higher guidance. Clearly there is little point in adopting a Plan which already has more than half of its life (from 1996) expired and, therefore, we are requesting that as a minimum the end date be altered to 2021 but preferably to 2026 which would then coincide with emerging RSS8.</p> <p>Updated housing and employment requirements then need to be given for the Plan period. Clearly a fundamental part of the Core Strategy is the level of development proposed which is not clearly outlined in the DPD.</p> <p>In conclusion we are requesting that the end date of the Plan is altered to 2021 as a minimum but preferably 2026 and that revised housing and employment requirements are put forward as to coincide with the time periods.</p>	
	William Davis	CS19	<p>We consider that the final policy of the Core Strategy should look to make provision for housing requirements over an extended period to 2026, rather than 2016 or 2021. Emerging guidance in PPS3 requires local authorities to make provision for housing over a 15 year period from the likely date of adoption. Even assuming that the Core Strategy were to be adopted in late 2007 (which we consider to be very ambitious) an end date of 2021 would not provide for a full 15 years of housing supply. An end date of 2026 should therefore be followed for the Core Strategy in line with the emerging Regional Plan.</p>	<p>Disagree. The submission Core Strategy will reflect the review Regional Plan. However, we have concerns that our evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time. This approach meets with the requirements of PPS12 paragraph 2.14 "the time horizon of the core strategy should be for a period of at least 10 years" and paragraph 4.19 "must be in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy".</p>
	Goem	CS20	<p>The housing target in the first paragraph of CS19 may have to be revised subject to the emerging content of the RSS Review. Given that the broad locations</p>	<p>Criterion (g) of CS20 is not in existence; comment will be discussed with respondent.</p>

			suitable for development will be defined under Key Issue 1, I can not see what value is added by the rest of the content of CS19. Likewise, criterion (g) of CS20 is superfluous.	
	Harris Lamb	CS20	On behalf of the Cooperative Group We would support the provision of affordable housing as suggested	Noted. Support for the content of this policy
	Hbf	CS20	The requirement for the provision of a set mix of affordable housing for rent and intermediate purchase must be justified and may vary in different areas of the plan and throughout its lifespan. The level of affordable housing sought should not be such as to prevent the development of a housing site and thus call into question the ability of the strategy to meet the overall housing targets. There will be some sites which are not suitable for the provision of affordable housing and in these instances there should be no requirement for them to contribute towards such provision.	A Housing Needs Assessment was carried out by the Local Authority in 2005; this document has been used to inform and justify the proposed target of 30%. PPS12 advocates the monitoring of LDFs; Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide states that DPDs or parts of DPDs (including the Core Strategy) can be reviewed independently allowing flexibility to amend elements of the document where necessary; this would allow for an amendment to the affordable housing target if required. No change proposed.
	Lcc	CS20	The approach to affordable housing provision is consistent with the Structure Plan and is supported.	Considered and noted.
	Owbc Officer	CS20	Does a statement need to be added to highlight that affordable housing will be sought on sites of 15 units or 0.5 hectares or more? It may be worthwhile clarifying that both the 30% requirement and the tenure mix may vary on a site by site basis, depending upon the requirements and constraints of individual sites. I would suggest relaxing the wording in relation to the 20/10 split for affordable housing. To allow for some flexibility	Agreed. Policy CS20 will be revised to include reference to a site size threshold of 10+ dwellings and/or 1 hectare. Further clarity will be included within the policy and supporting text that the 30% requirement and tenure mix may vary on a site by site basis, depending upon the requirements and constraints of individual sites. In relation to the further division of the 30% target the policy will be revised and the supporting text will state that the tenure mix will be determined by reference to local housing needs. In addition, criteria

			<p>and requirements relating to specific sites, it may be better to state that:</p> <p>'It is envisaged that typically the 30% affordable housing requirement will comprise 20% rented social housing and 10% low cost housing for sale. However, this mix will depend upon the housing needs within the locality and therefore may differ significantly from site to site.'</p> <p>Alternatively, the reference to the 20/10 split could be removed from the policy, and be replaced with a simple statement that the tenure mix will be determined by reference to local housing needs.</p> <p>I have some concerns about the term 'equal quality' in point (d), as social housing (as provided by registered social landlords) can sometimes be of a higher standard (particularly in terms of floor area). To overcome this, I would suggest rephrasing this to 'equal or higher quality'.</p> <p>I'm seeking some guidance on policy CS21 from a colleague in Social Services and will come back to you again once I've had a chance to formulate my thoughts.</p>	<p>d) will be revised to read of an 'equal or higher quality'.</p>
	Pegasus Planning Group	CS20	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Balance Housing Requirements CS20 Housing Affordability</p> <p>The potential policy identifies within it a requirement for a specific 30% of affordable housing to be provided on</p>	<p>Disagree: Indicative targets for specific suitable sites and negotiation with developers for the inclusion of an element of affordable housing on qualifying sites is not a matter to be included within the Core Strategy. PPS12 states that a Core Strategy should 'set out the long term spatial vision for the authority's area.' The Companion Guide to PPS12 continues</p>

			<p>qualifying sites.</p> <p>Whilst the principle of an affordable housing policy is acceptable, It is considered that the proposed wording of the policy is inconsistent with the advice in Circular No. 06/98: Planning and Affordable Housing. Paragraph 9 of this Circular advises that a planning policy should specify seeking an element of affordable housing on suitable sites and to also indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area, together with setting indicative targets for specific suitable sites. This goes on to note that the policy should set out a statement that it is the intention of the local planning authority to negotiate with developers for the inclusion of an element of affordable housing on qualifying sites.</p> <p>It is considered inappropriate within the policy itself to set out a specific requirement for the percentage of housing to be provided on qualifying sites as what is necessary is for the policy to seek to meet the affordable housing needs of the district over the plan period. In this context, it is completely inappropriate to prescribe a percentage requirement when the Core Strategy fails to identify the overall quantum of housing that is to be provided over the plan period. It is also important to note that the affordable housing needs of the Borough will change over the plan period and it will be necessary for the Policy to respond to such changes.</p> <p>Proposed change</p>	<p>that 'specific land allocations should not be set out in the Core Strategy,' it unjustified to include the suggestions above within the document as it would be contrary to PPS 12.</p> <p>A Housing Needs Assessment was carried out by the Local Authority in 2005; this document has been used to inform and justify the proposed target of 30%. PPS12 advocates the monitoring of LDFs; Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide states that DPDs or parts of DPDs (including the Core Strategy) can be reviewed independently allowing flexibility to amend elements of the document where necessary; this would allow for an amendment to the affordable housing target if required. No change proposed.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			To delete reference to a specified 30% provision of affordable housing on qualifying sites under Policy CS19.	
	William Davis	CS20	<p>We query the adequacy of the 2003 Housing Needs Assessment as a robust evidence base for the Core Strategy over an extended period to 2026. The review of the Regional Plan will be providing strategic guidance on affordable housing needs related to the revised housing requirements for this period for the Region as a whole and for individual housing market areas. This approach is wholly consistent with emerging PPS3 which indeed has directed that these regional based Housing Market Assessments will replace local need assessment as a basis for planning for affordable housing. It is the review of RSS8 therefore which will be more appropriate for the Council's long term Core Strategy approach towards affordable housing rather than the more short term Housing Needs survey which examined needs for the period 2003-2008.</p> <p>The policy is also too detailed for a Core Strategy and would be better pursued in the future Housing DPD.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above objection in principle to the nature of the policy William Davis Ltd further objects to the detail of the policy as follows:</p> <p>The policy should not express a preference for a split of tenure between rent and intermediate housing. Current government advice in Circular 6/98</p>	<p>Agreed. It is accepted that the existing Housing Needs Study will not be appropriate for supporting the policy direction on Affordable Housing post 2008. The Council alongside other Leicestershire authorities is looking to commission consultants to prepare a Joint Housing Market Assessment for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA. In addition, it is agreed that the policy in its current form is too rigid in relation to tenure split and it is intended to revise draft policy CS20 to remove such inflexibility.</p>

			<p>confirms that planning policy should not be expressed in preference for any particular tenure and includes low cost market housing within the definition of affordable housing. It says:</p> <p>"Planning policy should not be expressed in favour of any particular form of tenure. Therefore, the terms "affordable housing" or "affordable homes" are used in this Circular to encompass both low-cost market and subsidised housing (irrespective of tenure, ownership - whether exclusive or shared - or financial arrangements) that will be available to people who cannot afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market. (Paragraph 4)</p> <p>Although draft PPS3 suggested a redefinition to exclude low cost housing we cannot be sure at this stage that this will not be changed in the final confirmed draft.</p> <p>Flexibility will also be required regarding the precise quantum and mix of affordable housing delivered on individual sites depending on the availability of Housing Corporation funding and the overall viability of the development. The lack of Housing Corporation funding is clearly acknowledged by the ODPM as a material consideration. It is noted in the draft PPS3 that local planning authorities "should make informed assumptions about the levels of finance available for affordable housing" (Paragraph 27 refers). PPS3 promises further guidance in future companion guide on innovative approaches to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>securing affordable housing where levels of funding previously assumed are not forthcoming. Unfortunately, this further guidance has not yet been released. However, the earlier consultation paper on 'Planning for Mixed Communities' in January 2005, noted that:</p> <p>"where necessary planning obligations should include an appropriate cascade or fallback mechanism to ensure delivery of affordable housing... through an alternative arrangements (for example a different split between social rented and intermediate housing or a different proportion of affordable housing)"</p>	
	Andrew Granger	CS21	The specialist housing should include student accommodation.	Agreed, a reference to student accommodation will be included within this policy as students are identified as a specific group to meet the housing needs of within PPG3.
	Goem	CS21	For CS21 to be effective, it needs to contain targets for delivery.	Agree, a target for delivery will be sought and included within CS21
	Goem	CS22	The inclusion of a criteria based policy for gypsy and traveller sites is necessary. However, criteria (c), (d), (e) and (g) appear to duplicate generic development control issues. Furthermore, criterion (a) requiring occupants to have existing links with the area seems to be unduly onerous.	Agreed, a generic development control policy will be included within the Core Strategy to include criteria (C), (D), (E) and (G). The wording included in criteria (A) will be relaxed to enable more flexibility.
	Goem	CS23	The employment land target in the first paragraph of CS23 may have to be revised subject to the emerging content of the RSS Review. The third paragraph of CS23 should be informed by an employment land review commensurate with the 2004 ODPM Guidance Note. Existing employment sites that are suitable for continued employment use could be identified spatially. The fourth	Agreed, consideration will be given to the emerging content of the RSS review when available. Furthermore, Oadby & Wigston Borough Council commissioned an Employment Land and Premises Study completed in March 2006. The document followed the three-stage process set out in the ODPM document Employment Land Review: Guidance Note (2004). Finally,

			and fifth paragraphs concern generic development control matters and are superfluous.	The fourth and fifth paragraphs will be included within a generic development control policy in the Core Strategy.
	Lcc	CS23	<p>The Structure Plan requires that 24 ha (1.2 ha per year) of employment land to be allocated between 1996 and 2016. The figures set out in the Core Strategy are not consistent with those laid out in the Structure Plan. However, the recent Employment Land and Premises Study (commissioned by the County Council on behalf of the Borough and the LSEP) recommends that approximately half of the Structure Plan provision is required. Although it has not yet been decided how to take this report forward, these recommendations need to be borne in mind at this time.</p> <p>The Preferred Options should contain a specific reference to the role of office development within the town centres and clear criteria to direct office development to the town centres in line with the sequential approach.</p> <p>The criteria should be extended to include the proximity to public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes, the available capacity of the highway network, and the need to provide appropriate and safe access to the highway.</p>	Agreed, the Core Strategy takes into consideration the results of the recent Employment Land and Premises Study which gives guidance to the Borough Council in allocating employment land. Furthermore, CS2 sets out the sequential approach to development in general. Reference will be given to the role of office development within town centre in either Policy Theme 2 or Policy Theme 7. CS6 gives guidance for new development in relation to sustainable transport and accessibility, which includes consideration to proximity of public transport, cycling etc.
	Pegasus Planning Group	CS23	<p>Part 2 of Core Strategy</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>Employment Provision and Fostering Enterprise CS23</p> <p>The premise of employment land provision is that there is no need to</p>	Disagree. In considering the historic take up of employment sites, it is extremely important to consider the nature and physical constraints of the Borough, the Employment Land and Premises Study shows that it would almost be impossible to find the amount of employment land identified, the additional 4.77 ha is a more achievable target for the Borough.

			<p>allocate land for strategic employment site. This is in conflict with LLSRP Employment Policy 2 that requires the development of a strategic employment site of 15 hectares before 2011. The basis of rejecting the Structure Plan requirement is the findings of a recently complete Employment Land Study by consultants appointed by the Borough Council. Having considered the basis of the recent employment land study findings it is contended that the Council's response in rejecting the need for a strategic employment site is flawed for the following reasons:</p> <p>* The Employment Land Study identifies that there is a lack of sites and premises in the Borough and that there is pent up demand throughout the Borough and the rest of the LLUA.</p> <p>* The study recognises that the Borough Council could indeed allocate the Structure Plan Strategic Employment Site and that if it did, the site would find occupiers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study fails to recognise that the historic take up of 0.67 hectares per year (when the Structure Plan forecast 1.2 hectares per year) is directly as a result of constrained supply and though a lack of employment land coming forward (the strategic employment site) as required by the Structure Plan. • The study in focusing on the tight boundaries of Oadby & Wigston Borough area fails to fully consider the relationship with the rest of the LLUA; the Structure Plan clearly makes this connection together with the relationship to the rest of Leicestershire in looking at the 	<p>The Employment Land and Premises Study states that the Borough could allocate land as guided by the Structure Plan and would find occupiers, however, the sentence continues to state that this would be an unrealistic scenario. The study suggests that it would be more prudent to allocate an additional 4.67 to 6.02 ha which would be a more sustainable option.</p> <p>Although there is demand for employment within the LLUA, regional guidance does not facilitate strategic cross border co-operation, therefore the study focuses on the Borough.</p> <p>In conclusion, the recommended change has been discounted as the findings of the Employment Land and Premises Study shows that it is highly unrealistic for the Borough to find 15 hectares to allocate for employment and these findings need to be considered; 4.7 hectares is a much more achievable target to attain.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>employment land needs of the wider urban area and not Oadby & Wigston in requiring the provision of a strategic employment site of 15 hectares.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study identifies that there is a lack of potential development sites for the 15 hectare strategic employment site but this fails to consider the availability of a potential mixed use urban extension to fulfil this requirement in addition to meeting the Council's future housing needs (as set out in more detail below). <p>Recommended change</p> <p>For Potential Policy CS23 to reflect the LLRSP Employment Policy 2 requirement for a 15 hectare strategic employment site to be delivered by 2011.</p>	
	Andrew Granger	CS24	I would make the same comment as above (para 7 of response: 'In the document there is some confusion as to whether or not the housing numbers are to 2021 to 2026, which is the new date for the RPG') especially if the planning gain supplement is implemented	Noted. The Council have concerns that the evidence base would not be robust enough to stand until 2026. Therefore, we intend to run the Core Strategy from 2006 to 2021 (a period of 15 years) in the interim and will review at the appropriate time.
	English Nature	CS24	English Nature strongly supports the opportunities laid out in this policy to create or improve existing environmental works including benefits to local biodiversity, cultural and historical environment. This policy may also link to SO10.	Agreed, CS24 takes into consideration environmental works, including benefits to local biodiversity relating to the effective management and enhancement of the Borough wildlife and natural habitats set out in SO10
	Goem	CS24	I note that you have identified the types of community needs to which you would seek a financial contribution under CS24. The list is quite exhaustive, and clearly not all elements would be	Noted. Policy CS25 will be revised to remove extraneous information better suited to the supporting text. In addition, some indication of where Borough priorities lie spatially will be included.

			required in any particular case. Some indication of where priorities would lie, e.g. on a spatial basis, would be very helpful. In all cases any planning obligation will have to conform to Circular 5/05. In this regard, evidence of the need for each element you have listed will be sought and if necessary challenged at examination.	
	Hbf	CS24	The requirement for development contributions to meet community needs must relate to the needs of the community served by the development and not the existing community. The provision of community infrastructure should be as a result of a discussion process with both the developer and the community and not at the sole discretion of the Borough Council as detailed in CS224.	Agreed in part. Development contributions will always be sought to meet the community needs of an existing community where the new development has resulted in an adverse impact on that existing community in terms of its needs. However, it is agreed that it should not be at the sole discretion of the Council to determine what community infrastructure requirements will be necessitated by the development. Policy CSP24 will be revised to reflect that the Council will work with developers and communities to determine the required needs and the appropriate sum to meet these.
	Hbf	CS24	The production of development briefs for major sites is supported with the proviso that there should be significant industry involvement in the overriding principles of the development to ensure the brief is realistic and capable of being met in an efficient and economic manner.	Noted, during the production of a development brief consultation will take place in line with the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement to ensure active and meaningful engagement.
	Lcc	CS24	Support	Noted. Support for this element of the Core Strategy.
	Pegasus Planning Group	CS24	Part 2 of Core Strategy Objection Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation CS24 Developer Contributions to meet community needs	Agreed in part. It is accepted that Policy CS24 in its current form should not be retained. It is intended to revise CS24 to remove extraneous detail and clarify that the Council will work in partnership with developers, communities and other interested parties to negotiate contributions towards appropriate

			<p>Whilst there is no objection in principle to Potential Policy CS24, it is necessary to ensure the Policy is carefully worded to comply with the advice in Circular No. 05/2005: Planning Obligations. this is the mechanism by which developer contributions will ultimately be made and, as such, developer contributions/obligations should only be required "to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms". Circular No. 05/2005 requires planning obligations to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Relevant to planning; ii) Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; iii) Directly related to the proposed development; iv) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and v) Reasonable in all other aspects <p>In this context, it is considered unacceptable for Policy CS24 to simply say that the Borough Council will seek to secure provision of the consequential on and off site community infrastructure costs of new development.</p> <p>Proposed change</p> <p>For the introductory paragraphs to Potential Policy CS24 to be reworded as follows:</p> <p>"The Borough Council will seek to mitigate and/or compensate the direct impacts of new development where</p>	<p>community infrastructure in relation to new development.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>necessary, relevant and reasonable. In such circumstances the Council will enter into a legal agreement with the owners/applicants and/or developers and to negotiate appropriate levels of provision related to the development proposed. In undertaking such negotiations, regard will be had to the economic viability of the proposed development.</p> <p>The potential community infrastructure requirements of new development, where provision or contribution may be sought, are as follows:</p>	
	Smith Stuart Reynolds	CS24	<p>On behalf of Wheatcroft and Son/Bloor Homes</p> <p>We have no objection in principle to this policy but any provision of community infrastructure requested by the Council must be subject to a rigorous needs assessment. The assessment must relate to the needs of the proposed development and not be an excuse to make up deficiencies elsewhere within the Borough.</p>	Agreed. Any community infrastructure needs would be backed by evidence that they were required in relation to the new development proposed.
	Sport England	CS24	<p>Sport England supports the general thrust of this policy. Presumably a much greater level of detail will be provided in the later Developer Contributions DPD.</p> <p>There is some concern that the last sentence is at best unnecessary, and at worst unhelpfully ambiguous. It could be interpreted as saying that where contributions are needed towards, for instance, open space, then the Borough will decide (with reference to evidence of identified need) which open spaces is</p>	Agreed. Policy CS24 will be revised to clarify that the Council will liaise with the developer, the community and any other interested party to negotiate contributions towards the necessary community infrastructure.

			<p>the greatest priority for enhancement. That would be an acceptable approach.</p> <p>Alternatively, the sentence could be interpreted as indicating that, where a limited resource is available from a developer, the Borough Council might choose, for instance, to prioritise waste recycling above (and to the detriment of) sport and leisure facilities. That would not be an acceptable approach, as Sport England's view is that different types of requirements should not be in competition in that way – and indeed it is probably not the intention of the Council. It is suggested that consideration be given to clarifying this point.</p>	
	Andrew Granger	CS25	The policy needs to stick more closely to PPG17, meaning at point (iii) that issues of quality should come into play and can justify a reduction in pure area terms.	Point (iii) has been amended and a new paragraph inserted which reads: '(a) suitable alternative provision of appropriate quantity, quality and accessibility is already available or will be provided and maintained to meet the needs of the community'
	Countryside Agency	CS25	Whilst the Countryside Agency; Landscape, Access and Recreation generally supports this policy we would suggest that specific reference is made to the contribution that Public Rights of Way can make to countryside recreation provision	Agree; PPG17 identifies right of way as an important recreational facility, which local authorities should protect and enhance. A reference will be made to CSP25 to give regard to rights of way inserted in paragraph 2 to read 'The enhancement and protection of recreational rights of way will be sought.'
	English Nature	CS25	English Nature strongly supports this policies aim to work towards the English Nature standards for accessible green space and the woodlands trusts woodland access standards.	Considered and noted
	Goem	CS25	CS25 suffers from the same duality as Key Issue 8 (Recreation). The first paragraph appears to duplicate CS3. The second, fifth, sixth and seventh	Agreed. Text within the first paragraph will be amended to read: 'The Borough Council will seek the provision of adequate and well located leisure and

			<p>paragraphs relating to the safeguarding of open space may be a development control issue, and could in any case be expressed far more succinctly. The standards alluded to in the third paragraph may provide the basis for proposals for new open space facilities, but no such proposals are made.</p>	<p>recreation facilities to meet the needs of the Borough's residents. The sequential approach will be used to identify development of facilities so that they are close to their intended population catchment areas and are accessible by a choice of transport modes other than the car and be of an appropriate scale and design.'</p> <p>Paragraphs 2, 5, 6 and 7 will form part of a Generic Development Control policy and wording will be amended as a result of representations received: 'In relation to formal and informal play and open space, the policy will seek to protect existing sites from development where there is a demand to retain and the equivalent cannot be provided elsewhere. New development will be expected to contribute either physically or financially to the provision/improvement of recreational facilities.</p> <p>The Borough Council will not grant planning permission for development involving the loss of open space , leisure, recreation facilities unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) suitable alternative provision of appropriate quantity, quality and accessibility is already available or will be provided and maintained to meet the needs of the community; and (b) in the case of development involving the loss of open space it can be clearly demonstrated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the facilities are not required for use by any alternative leisure or community use; or
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>ii) the proposal is directly related to the function of the open space.</p> <p>It will be for the developer to demonstrate that facilities are not required for use by any alternative leisure or community use.</p> <p>Development involving the loss of open space to which the general public do not have a right of access, for example school playing fields or allotments, will only be permitted if the development meets the tests contained in PPG17.'</p> <p>The text will be amended and reference will be made to the achievement of working towards these proposals.</p>
	Goem	CS25	CS25 suffers from the same duality as Key Issue 8 (Recreation). The first paragraph appears to duplicate CS3.	Agreed. Policy CS25 will be revised in particular to remove the duplication of CS3.
	Sport England	CS25	<p>Sport England does not object to the inclusion of a policy such as this one. However, it is suggested that in the Core Strategy, it may be sufficient to have a relatively shorter policy setting out the key principles for leisure and recreation. More detailed policies in accordance with the Core Strategy could be included in later DPDs and SPDs, such as the forthcoming Development Control DPD. Indeed, the Local Development Scheme identifies Local Plan recreation policies as being superseded by the Development Control DPD in the future.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy begins with the elements that seek to protect existing sport and recreation facilities, currently forming the last two</p>	<p>Agree, a shorter policy will be achieved which sets out the key spatial principles for leisure and recreation. Some of the more detailed paragraphs will form part of a Generic Development Control (DC) Policy to be included within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The last two paragraphs will be moved to the Generic DC Guidance section as they lack spatial reference.</p> <p>Paragraph 5 which sets out the guidance on development involving the loss of open space will be moved to the Generic DC Guidance. This paragraph will be amended to read: 'The Borough Council will not grant planning permission for development involving the loss of open space , leisure,</p>

			<p>paragraphs. This would make it clear that the starting point for the consideration of proposals involving the loss of such facilities will be a presumption against them, unless the criteria are met. Such a strategic policy might be worded as follows:</p> <p>“The Borough Council will not grant planning permission for development involving the loss of open space, leisure, recreation or community facilities unless:</p> <p>a) suitable alternative provision of appropriate quantity, quality and accessibility is already available or will be provided and maintained to meet the needs of the community; and</p> <p>b) in the case of development involving the loss of open space it can be clearly demonstrated that:</p> <p>i) the facilities are not required for use by any alternative leisure or community use; or</p> <p>ii) the proposal is directly related to the function of the open space.</p> <p>In addition, new development will be expected to provide or make an appropriate contribution towards meeting the need for open space, leisure, recreation and community facilities arising from the proposal, including provision for their maintenance where relevant.</p> <p>Development of leisure and recreation facilities attracting large numbers of visitors should be located within or</p>	<p>recreation facilities unless:</p> <p>(a) suitable alternative provision of appropriate quantity, quality and accessibility is already available or will be provided and maintained to meet the needs of the community; and</p> <p>(b) in the case of development involving the loss of open space it can be clearly demonstrated that:</p> <p>i) the facilities are not required for use by any alternative leisure or community use; or</p> <p>ii) the proposal is directly related to the function of the open space.</p> <p>A reference to contributions will not be included within this policy as this is dealt with in CSP24.</p> <p>A specific reference to the CPA will not be made within the policy although contents of this guidance will be taken into consideration in formulating policy. Reference will be made to the Comprehensive Performance Assessment Inspectors Report for Oadby & Wigston Borough Council in the supporting text of CSP25.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>close to Oadby, Wigston or South Wigston Town Centres and close and accessible to their intended population catchment areas. Within the Rural Urban Fringe and Green Wedges, facilities for outdoor sport and recreation can be appropriate providing they conform with the Core Strategy policies related to these areas.</p> <p>In all cases, facilities should be accessible by a choice of transport modes other than the car and be of an appropriate scale and design.”</p> <p>If it is considered appropriate to retain references to standards in the draft Core Strategy, then in addition to working towards English Nature’s standards for Accessible Natural Green Space and the Woodland Trust’s Woodland Access Standards, it is suggested that the Council have regard to the Government’s emerging Comprehensive Performance Assessment for sport and recreation. The possible Performance Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the percentage of the population that are within 20 minutes travel time (urban areas by walking; rural areas by car) of a range of three different sports facility types, of which one has achieved a quality assured standard. <p>When such indicators are confirmed for district authorities, they could assist in evaluating current provision, in setting relevant targets, and in targeting both</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			public resources, and also on-site, off-site or financial contributions from developers.	
	English Nature	CS26	English Nature welcomes the inclusion of taking into account of the wider countryside and SSSI issues relating to the Grand Union Canal, and would also welcome this around other designated wildlife sites.	Considered and noted; the Core Strategy sets out the broad spatial strategy for the Borough. CS10, CS11 and CS 12 deals with geological conservation, biodiversity, geodiversity and development in the countryside which deals with wildlife sites in general.
	Goem	CS26	The proposals in the second paragraph of CS26 are welcome. It is unclear what the first paragraph is intended to achieve.	Considered and noted. After the preparation of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper new guidance on Planning for tourism was published (DCLG (2006) Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism) this will be considered in formulating amended, DC Generic policies and supporting text.
	National Trust	CS26	The Trust is pleased to see the matter of tourism being dealt with in the Core Strategy – it will normally have implications for all three aspects of sustainable development, not just environmental matters. The Policy wording is appropriate and supported.	Considered and noted.