

TABLE H – ENVIRONMENT

Policy En1 – Nature Conservation

Question 41 Do you agree with our suggested approach to Nature Conservation issues? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any change required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted	No change.	Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted	No change.	Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted	No change.	Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
The local plan should designate local Green Spaces to continue to protect sites previously designated as sensitive sites or recognised as important in documents such as the Appleby Village Design Statement.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Lisa Holloway	N/a
The policies are general and supported. Elsewhere the idea of the green area in the heart of the National Forest is promoted, and it is suggested that this should be one of the areas protected under para (2). This will require the area to be better defined.	Policy En3 supports the growth of the National Forest. Part 5 of Policy En3 refers to 'The Heart of the National Forest' as being between Ashby, Measham and Swadlincote and it sets out development that would be appropriate in that location to support the National Forest.	No change.	Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
Yes	Noted	No change.	Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted	No change.	Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted	No change.	Sue McGlynn - Clerk to Coleorton Parish Council	Coleorton Parish Council

<p>Within the National Forest there are the developing areas of new plantings, and housing people near these is obviously an attractive prospect; it is important to ensure that everyone has access to green space. There are also well established areas of considerable wildlife importance and development should not encroach on, or even approach closely to these areas as they maintain the gene bank from which species will migrate into the newly created areas. The National Nature Reserve at Charnwood Lodge etc is a classic example and development should be kept back from that area.</p> <p>All developments should be sympathetic to the needs of wildlife, allowing them to migrate and green corridors should be left linking open areas. These can be dual purpose if wide enough; also providing footpath links for residents as well. Opportunities to improve access between sites and other green spaces in the vicinity must be considered wherever possible, especially taking advantage of planning gain from larger developments.</p> <p>It is absolutely essential to protect the District's natural environment (species and habitats), landscape and geology and to monitor, protect and enhance biodiversity, when agreeing the design of new developments. The river Mease is an extremely important wildlife corridor and any development should not disturb this in any way. Numerous species thrive along it including otters.</p>	<p>Noted. The issues raised are covered in Policies, En3: National Forest, IF1: Development and Infrastructure, S5: Design of new development and Policy En2: River Mease Special Area of Conservation.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Terry Kirby</p>	<p>Chairman local access forum</p>
<p>This contradicts with the plans for the SRFI which NWLDC has said it fully supports and agrees with.</p>	<p>Policy EN1 is not site specific and covers the whole the district, proposals for development will be supported which conserve, restore or enhance the biodiversity of the district.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Samantha Lockwood</p>	<p>Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council. 	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Paul Hemmerdinger</p>	<p>Parish Council</p>

<p>This question does not cover paragraphs 9.1-9.6 (Introduction and Green Infrastructure). With regard to these 'Local Green Spaces', we believe these should be designated within the Local Plan as well as in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>We believe that the area of open countryside in the Willesley area, in the Heart of the National Forest, between the built-up edge of the town and the Hicks Lodge National Forest Cycle Centre and open access areas and trails for walking and cycling should be designated as Local Green Space, a recent Appeal Decision against development here having been dismissed, including on the grounds of the harm that would be caused to its character and appearance. This is an area of High Quality Landscape value. In evidence documents to the presently withdrawn Core Strategy, the location was given the 'landscape quality value' of 9, the highest value of all the sites assessed within Ashby (followed by the Lower Packington Road site assessed as 8) and only equalled by one other site in the whole District. The extent of this area, between Willesley Lane and the Ivanhoe Railway Line, is approximately 16 hectares of open fields and 4 hectares of woodland (Willesley Wood), a total of 20 hectares. Areas of this nature and extent have been accepted elsewhere as meeting the criteria as set out in Paragraph 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Considerable numbers of members of the public, up to 100 a day, walk or cycle through this area from Willesley Road/Wells Road to the Hicks Lodge Cycle Centre and trails to gain access to the trails. This provides a safe alternative route to using Willesley Lane and Willesley Woodside. An application has been submitted to the County Council to get the route added to the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way. This application also has the support of the National Forest Company. This area of open countryside is of the highest value in terms of environmental value and tranquillity, prized for its recreational and amenity value and meeting the needs of local people and visitors, in terms of their enjoyment, health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The Local Plan should also identify and protect within a Policy those areas which are not classified as 'Local Green Spaces', but are nevertheless areas of open countryside of the highest value in terms of environmental value and tranquillity, prized for their recreational and amenity value and meeting the needs of local people and visitors, in terms of their enjoyment, health and wellbeing. The Willesley area to the south east of Willesley Lane is considered such an area, forming an important and integral part of the Heart of the National Forest area.</p>	<p>The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. It can be dealt with through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Frank Bedford, MBE</p>	<p>Willesley Environment Protection Association</p>
--	---	-------------------	---------------------------	---

<p>9.7-9.13 Under (2) in Policy En1, we believe the areas defined as 'Heart of the National Forest' and 'Ivanhoe Railway' in Background Paper 11 should be included in this list. We also believe 'River corridors' in this list should be changed to read 'Rivers and their Tributaries'.</p> <p>Under (3) in Policy En1, we believe that the importance and retention of existing water courses, hedgerows and tree lines is not emphasized strongly enough in planning applications in connection with arboricultural, ecological and amenity value, as it is often agreed that these can be removed if commitments are made to plant new ones. These, however, will not generate the biodiversity of the original ones for many years and may completely destroy a wildlife corridor. With the diseases recently associated with elm, ash and horse chestnut trees, more regard should be given to preserving existing mature trees and Tree Preservation Orders made, where appropriate. Further, these TPOs should have a more binding effect and not be overruled when it suits planning requirements. Appropriate legislation with regard to the retention of hedgerows should also be more rigorously enforced.</p> <p>In my previous response to Question 41 (further comments), the penultimate sentence refers toapproximately 16 hectares of open fields and 4 hectares of woodland (Willesley Wood), a total of 20 hectares. This should have referred to Shellbrook Wood (the mature wood located alongside and to the south of the Ivanhoe Railway Line) and not to Willesley Wood. I shall be obliged if you will make this correction.</p>				
<p>The County Council defers to colleagues in Leicestershire to comment on the draft Plan from a natural environment perspective.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Eilidh McCallum</p>	<p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>
<p>The Local Plan should itself designate local green spaces as a way of protecting sites previously described as sensitive or recognized as important in local design statements such as the one for Appleby Village.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Michael Foote</p>	<p>Appleby Environment</p>
<p>Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Paul Cooper</p>	<p>Resident</p>

Relating to Appleby Magna (2 & 3 on the map): Extensive and compelling work was presented concerning the areas which were previously considered 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna last year are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Alison Draper	None
Yes	Noted	No change.	david harris	Pyrotect Ltd
The Plan should make provision for the allocation of Local Green Space. There is none identified in the plan as it stands. The Bath Grounds Green Corridor between the Royal Hotel and Ashby Castle should be protected and designated as Local Green Space.	Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter. Local Green Space can be designated through the Neighbourhood Plan process.	No change.	Colin Eaton	Colin Eaton
No	Noted	No change.	Robert Yates	Cliftonthorpe Residents Management Company
Areas which were previously sensitive areas (behind church hall etc) are important to the village setting and on-going preservation of the village and should be designated local green spaces.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Nicky and David Keer	NA
No because it does not take into account areas that were designated as being sensitive, these areas are particularly important to the village where the rural setting is highly prized and forms an integral part of what villager life is about. The strategy does for the V.D.S highlighted this aspect and should be respected.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Duncan Saunders	NA
For Appleby Magna, Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Peter Selby	None
Yes	Noted	No change.	Andrew Stone	NA

Any provision of walking and cycling routes and access to the countryside should include horse riding. Frequently horses are overlooked when new schemes are introduced when they can quite easily be included without any problems: generally all that is needed is suitable gateways, and perhaps discussion with the Bridleways association.	Noted.	No change.	Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Trevor Davis	None
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
<p>We welcome the updated version of the plan. We particularly welcome the changes to the original draft in response to our previous suggestions. In that respect, we strongly support the references to policy En2 in relation to development in the River Mease catchment.</p> <p>We have nothing to add at this stage which hasn't been covered in previous correspondence except to acknowledge and welcome the recognition in paragraph 1.8 of the need to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment and a Habitats Regulations Assessment to consider the impact of the policies and proposals contained within the new local plan on the River Mease SAC. The same applies to the requirement to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal as indicated in paragraph 1.9.</p>	Noted.	No change.	Natural England	Natural England
Areas that have lost their designation as sensitive areas since the previous local plan are of great relevance to Appleby. The village design statement demonstrates the importance of open green countryside in the context of this ancient village. In particular church hall field and the field between top street and Botts lane should be clearly designated as local green spaces under the new local plan.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Mr T J Marsh	Appleby Resident
I refer to Appleby Magna, and the categorisation of certain areas within the village. Previously, there were a number of areas within the village which were considered "sensitive" (behind the church hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane. I am aware that these areas are of historical importance to the village and its residents, and I believe that they should remain as such for the time to come. Once this status changes, and there is the possibility to build on this land, the changes can never be reversed and I fear that the history and character of the village could be compromised. The areas should be designated as Local Green Spaces by the council.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Rachel Darby	resident of the village

<p>Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mr Richard Hine</p>	<p>Resident of Appleby Magna</p>
<p>Areas which have previously been designated as 'sensitive areas' eg . behind the church hall and between Top street and Botts lane in Appleby are important to the village environment and the setting of the village and should be designated 'local green spaces ' by the council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Sharon Chapman</p>	<p>home owner</p>
<p>For the most part we support this policy but would suggest it doesn't entirely fulfil the local authority's obligations with regard to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and planning policy.</p> <p>In brief, the WFD encompasses all surface waters in England and Wales. The main objective, summarised in Article 4 of this European legislation (2000/60/EC), is to achieve good ecological status (GES) or good ecological potential (GEP) in all river water bodies. A water body encompasses to the entire stream network draining the river catchment, as classified for the purposes of the WFD. Water bodies designated with a highly modified hydromorphology aim to achieve good ecological potential; while water bodies without this designation aim to achieve good ecological status. Further regulation 17 of the Water Environment (WFD)(E&W) Regulations 2003 places a duty on each public body, including local planning authorities, to 'have regard to' River Basin Management Plans (RBMP's), in this instance the Humber RBMP. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 2) also states planning policies and decisions must reflect and where appropriate promote relevant EU obligations and statutory requirements. It also (para 165) identifies RBMPs as a source of evidence. In legal terms the WFD applies whether or not national planning policy refers to it and is a material consideration for any planning decision. (Further information on the LPA's responsibilities to WFD can be found in the informative below).</p> <p>In light of the above we would advise that a standalone WFD water policy is included within this document, potentially following on from the Nature Conservation Policy, and would advise it is worded as follows: -</p>	<p>It is not necessary to have a standalone Water Framework Directive Policy as it is already covered by other legislation.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Geoff Platts</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>

<p>Policy En1a The Water Framework Directive - Protection and Enhancement of River and Stream Corridors (Nature Conservation)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Planning permission will only be granted for development proposals which would not have an adverse impact on the functions and setting of any watercourse and its associated corridor.2. Development should seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of the watercourse and its corridor through good design.3. Opportunities for de-culverting of watercourses and removal of hard engineering in watercourses should be actively pursued. Planning permission will only be granted for proposals which do not involve the culverting or hard engineering of watercourses and which do not prejudice future opportunities for de-culverting and river restoration.4. Development proposals adjacent to or containing a watercourse should provide or retain a 10m buffer between the top of the river bank and the development, and include a long term landscape and ecological management plan for this buffer. This management plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. <p>The associated wording for this policy could be written as follows: -</p> <p>Watercourses and their associated corridors are a vital element of the Green Infrastructure of the District. They have several valuable functions – as a landscape feature, for biodiversity especially as a corridor to allow movement of species, for recreation, as a water resource and to allow access for river maintenance. WFD Catchments of particular importance in the District, and for which there can be no deterioration in WFD quality, are the Long Whatton Brook, the Ramsley Brook, the Grace Dieu Brook, the Lockington and Hemington Brooks, the Black Brook, the Carr-New Brook, the Ibstock Brook, the Gilwiskaw Brook, the Hooborough Brook, the River Soar, the River Sence, the River Mease, the River Trent and the Coventry and Ashby Canals.</p> <p>The 10m buffer stated in Policy En1a should be maintained as a natural or semi-natural habitat free from built development, parking areas, private gardens and formal landscaping. A buffer should be provided on both sides of a watercourse that runs through a</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

development.

This width of buffer provides the minimum width of habitat needed to provide for the functioning of wildlife habitats, while being able to facilitate informal access for enjoyment of the river. This width also ensures that the river is buffered from land-based activities, e.g. reducing the levels of diffuse pollution reaching the watercourse.

Provision of a 10m buffer may not be achievable in some situations, for example on some town centre sites where there is already significant built development and infringement of the river corridor. Detailed design of the buffer zone will be determined on a site-by-site basis in consultation with the Environment Agency.

Where barriers to fish movement are present in a watercourse adjacent to development proposals, the design should include measures to allow for the natural movement of fish within the watercourse.

(Please note that the wording given above has been taken from the High Wycombe District Council Adopted Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and managing development July 2013 (pages 54 and 55). This document can be found using the following link:

<http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/Core/DownloadDoc.aspx?documentID=6898>

If the LPA considers the above wording to be inappropriate I would be happy to be re-consulted on any suggested changes.

WFD Informative - The Role of Local Authorities under the Water Framework Directive

- Like all other public bodies, local authorities must have regard to River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) and any supplementary plans in exercising their functions. For example, they need to reflect River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) data in Local Plan policies and determination of planning applications.
- Local authorities and other public bodies are required to provide information and assistance that the Environment Agency may reasonably seek in connection with its WFD functions.
- Local authorities, along with other public bodies, have a general responsibility not to compromise the achievement of UK compliance with EU Directives, including the WFD. Non

<p>compliance could potentially lead to the EU Commission bringing legal proceedings and fines against the UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Localism Act 2011 includes a new power for UK Government to potentially require public authorities, including local authorities, to make payments in respect of EU financial sanctions if the authority has caused or contributed to non-compliance with EU Directives. In theory, this power applies to infractions of WFD requirements, including deterioration of water body status, though in practice, Government and the Environment Agency would work with a local authority to resolve the situation and avoid penalty payments. • The Localism Act also sets out the 'duty to cooperate', which requires local planning authorities to cooperate on cross-boundary planning issues, including the provision of infrastructure for water supply and water quality, climate change adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. <p>The information above is taken from the Local Authority Services and the Water Environment – (Executive Summary), Advice Note on the Water Framework Directive for Local Authorities across the Midlands. This document was compiled by the Environment Agency and Sustainability West Midlands (2012). http://www.emcouncils.gov.uk/write/LA%20Services%20and%20Water%20Environment%20Exec%20Summary.pdf</p>				
<p>land already designated as sensitive which lies behind the Church Hall/Bowleys Lane, Top Street/Botts Lane, Appleby Magna should be left as green spaces enhancing the essence of the village</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Janet Christine Denson</p>	<p>non</p>

<p>Green infrastructure</p> <p>We see multifunction green and blue space as a vital and an integral part of any new development. Good green and blue space within a development increases house prices, is good for health and recreation as well as wildlife. Carefully designed green infrastructure can have a range of environmental services such as flood risk management and reducing the levels of pollutants getting into rivers. We support the inclusion of policies in the plan which promote and enhance the quality, uses and extend of green space provision in new developments in the plan area.</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>Spatial planning has a significant role to play in protecting and enhancing wildlife areas. We consider your Plan should have policies to protect both national and local nature sites. Even relatively small green spaces can offer good habitat creation opportunities.</p> <p>We consider the Plan should include policies which support the inclusion of space for wildlife and water in all new development in the plan area. This could be done by promoting the inclusion of multifunctional green and blue space in all new development. Policies which promote sustainable drainage solutions to water management, such as swales and ponds can provide habitat for wildlife as can measures to promote the naturalisations of watercourses.</p> <p>For the most part we support this policy but would suggest it doesn't entirely fulfil the local authority's obligations with regard to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and planning policy.</p> <p>In brief, the WFD encompasses all surface waters in England and Wales. The main objective, summarised in Article 4 of this European legislation (2000/60/EC), is to achieve good ecological status (GES) or good ecological potential (GEP) in all river water bodies. A water body encompasses to the entire stream network draining the river catchment, as classified for the purposes of the WFD. Water bodies designated with a highly modified hydromorphology aim to achieve good ecological potential; while water bodies without this designation aim to achieve good ecological status. Further regulation 17 of the Water Environment (WFD)(E&W) Regulations 2003 places a duty on each public body, including local planning authorities, to 'have regard to' River Basin Management Plans (RBMP's), in this instance the Humber RBMP. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 2) also states planning policies and decisions must reflect and</p>	<p>It is not necessary to have a stand alone Water Framework Directive Policy as it is already covered by other legislation. Other issues raised are covered by other policies within the Local Plan, such as Policy IF1: Development and Infrastructure, Policy IF6: Ashby Canal and the Policies in the Environment section.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Geoff Platt</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>
---	--	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------------

<p>where appropriate promote relevant EU obligations and statutory requirements. It also (para 165) identifies RBMPs as a source of evidence. In legal terms the WFD applies whether or not national planning policy refers to it and is a material consideration for any planning decision. (Further information on the LPA's responsibilities to WFD can be found in the informative below).</p> <p>In light of the above we would advise that a standalone WFD water policy is included within this document, potentially following on from the Nature Conservation Policy, and would advise it is worded as follows: -</p> <p>Policy En1a The Water Framework Directive - Protection and Enhancement of River and Stream Corridors (Nature Conservation)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Planning permission will only be granted for development proposals which would not have an adverse impact on the functions and setting of any watercourse and its associated corridor.2. Development should seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of the watercourse and its corridor through good design.3. Opportunities for de-culverting of watercourses and removal of hard engineering in watercourses should be actively pursued. Planning permission will only be granted for proposals which do not involve the culverting or hard engineering of watercourses and which do not prejudice future opportunities for de-culverting and river restoration.4. Development proposals adjacent to or containing a watercourse should provide or retain a 10m buffer between the top of the river bank and the development, and include a long term landscape and ecological management plan for this buffer. This management plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. <p>The associated wording for this policy could be written as follows: -</p> <p>Watercourses and their associated corridors are a vital element of the Green Infrastructure of the District. They have several valuable functions – as a landscape feature, for biodiversity especially as a corridor to allow movement of species, for recreation, as a water resource and to allow access for river maintenance. WFD Catchments of particular importance in the District, and for which there can be no deterioration in WFD quality, are the Long Whatton Brook,</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

the Ramsley Brook, the Grace Dieu Brook, the Lockington and Hemington Brooks, the Black Brook, the Carr-New Brook, the Ibstock Brook, the Gilwiskaw Brook, the Hooborough Brook, the River Soar, the River Sence, the River Mease, the River Trent and the Coventry and Ashby Canals.

The 10m buffer stated in Policy En1a should be maintained as a natural or semi-natural habitat free from built development, parking areas, private gardens and formal landscaping. A buffer should be provided on both sides of a watercourse that runs through a development.

This width of buffer provides the minimum width of habitat needed to provide for the functioning of wildlife habitats, while being able to facilitate informal access for enjoyment of the river. This width also ensures that the river is buffered from land-based activities, e.g. reducing the levels of diffuse pollution reaching the watercourse.

Provision of a 10m buffer may not be achievable in some situations, for example on some town centre sites where there is already significant built development and infringement of the river corridor. Detailed design of the buffer zone will be determined on a site-by-site basis in consultation with the Environment Agency.

Where barriers to fish movement are present in a watercourse adjacent to development proposals, the design should include measures to allow for the natural movement of fish within the watercourse.

(Please note that the wording given above has been taken from the High Wycombe District Council Adopted Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and managing development July 2013 (pages 54 and 55). This document can be found using the following link:

<http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/Core/DownloadDoc.aspx?documentID=6898>

If the LPA considers the above wording to be inappropriate I would be happy to be re-consulted on any suggested changes.

WFD Informative - The Role of Local Authorities under the Water Framework Directive

- Like all other public bodies, local authorities must have regard to River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) and any supplementary plans in exercising their functions. For example, they need to reflect River Basin Management Plan

<p>(RBMP) data in Local Plan policies and determination of planning applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local authorities and other public bodies are required to provide information and assistance that the Environment Agency may reasonably seek in connection with its WFD functions.• Local authorities, along with other public bodies, have a general responsibility not to compromise the achievement of UK compliance with EU Directives, including the WFD. Non compliance could potentially lead to the EU Commission bringing legal proceedings and fines against the UK.• The Localism Act 2011 includes a new power for UK Government to potentially require public authorities, including local authorities, to make payments in respect of EU financial sanctions if the authority has caused or contributed to non-compliance with EU Directives. In theory, this power applies to infractions of WFD requirements, including deterioration of water body status, though in practice, Government and the Environment Agency would work with a local authority to resolve the situation and avoid penalty payments.• The Localism Act also sets out the ‘duty to cooperate’, which requires local planning authorities to cooperate on cross-boundary planning issues, including the provision of infrastructure for water supply and water quality, climate change adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. <p>The information above is taken from the Local Authority Services and the Water Environment – (Executive Summary), Advice Note on the Water Framework Directive for Local Authorities across the Midlands. This document was compiled by the Environment Agency and Sustainability West Midlands (2012). http://www.emcouncils.gov.uk/write/LA%20Services%20and%20Water%20Environment%20Exec%20Summary.pdf</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>9.3 - We agree with the importance of Green Infrastructure, with all the benefits that it brings.</p> <p>9.5 – Will the recognition and designation of Local Green Spaces be possible on wildlife grounds? – if so, this should be made explicit.</p> <p>Q 41 – Generally, Policy En1 is good. It is very pleasing to see that it covers all the designations listed. However, there is a danger that this plays down the importance of those designations (SSSIs, SACs) which are of national or European importance. These latter designated sites should be given special attention, whilst not lowering the protection for the other sites listed</p>	<p>Noted. The NPPF identifies that the Local Green Space designation can (in addition to other criteria) be used where a green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example the richness of its wildlife. As the criteria for the designation of Local Green Spaces is set out in National Policy it does not need to be repeated in the Local Plan. In regards to SSSI's, national policy in the NPPF seeks to protect and enhance SSSI's and so it does not need to be repeated as part of this local policy.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Andrew and Anne Heaton</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are most important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p> <p>We thought this issue had been resolved.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mr Clive Jayne and Mrs Patricia Jayne</p>	<p>Retired</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Lance Wiggins</p>	<p>Landmark Planning</p>
<p>Areas which were previously classified as "sensitive Areas" such as behind the church hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the rural Setting of the village and should be designated as "Local Green Spaces"</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mr Stuart Morris</p>	<p>Private</p>
<p>Areas which were previously classified as "sensitive Areas" such as behind the church hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the rural Setting of the village and should be designated as "Local Green Spaces"</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Hayley Morris</p>	<p>none</p>

<p>Areas which were previously classified as "sensitive Areas" such as behind the church hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the rural Setting of the village and should be designated as "Local Green Spaces"</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Brenda Wedgbrow</p>	<p>none</p>
<p>Areas which were previously classified as "sensitive Areas" such as behind the church hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the rural Setting of the village and should be designated as "Local Green Spaces"</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mr William Morris</p>	<p>private</p>
<p>As far as I can see, any constraints to development involving the River Mease Special Area of Conservation can be easily overcome by a sliding scale of charges. It appears - and do correct me if I am wrong - that developers merely pay a financial contribution unrelated to the damage they do so that the greater trespasses incur a heavier financial burden which will be a minor if not insignificant deterrent to developers with multi million pound projects. It does appear that the NWLDC recognises that the environment is a significant asset and must not be sold off for less than a very healthy return, but I am not sure how that actually helps to preserve and enhance our environment.</p>	<p>Noted. In regards to the River Mease the Council has recently undertaken a consultation on a revised Development Contributions Strategy (DCS2) which, once adopted will enable North West Leicestershire District Council to continue to allow developments within the river catchment provided a financial contribution is made in line with the DCS2. The purpose of the contributions is to allow measures to be taken so as to allow measures to be put in place so that there is no net increase in the levels of phosphorous as a result of new development. In this way the water quality of the river Mease is maintained at acceptable levels.</p>		<p>Chris and Sue Nicholls</p>	<p>TMBS</p>
<p>I believe the Council should designate Local Green Spaces rather than leaving this to local communities under Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Plans are long term projects that include huge amounts of work and manpower and, as such, may not be appropriate for smaller communities to undertake.</p> <p>Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' such as the field behind the</p> <p>Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and are highly regarded and treasured by villagers. This demonstrated with the Church Hall field in a recent Village Green application and the support this garnered. Although unsuccessful on a minor technicality, this application was supported by well over a hundred villagers of all ages. These areas should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Clare Marsh</p>	<p>Appleby resident</p>

areas previously sensitive areas behind the church hall in appleby and on top street are important to the setting of the village and should be designated local green spaces status	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Mr. j Lewis	1950
Yes; but in practice many sites and species are carelessly or even deliberately damaged often before the development takes place. I have seen examples of this personally.	Noted.	No change.	Steve Johnson	YYYY
The area in Appleby Magna previously designated a sensitive area which lies behind the Church Hall and is bounded to three sides by Bowleys Lane, Church Street and Rectory Lane known as the Church Hall field is important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Space by the Council. I believe this area should be designated Local Green Space also because of the strong feeling of the villagers of Appleby Magna to protect and retain this area as a Local Green Space demonstrated by 100 names listed on the petition submitted in March 2014 for the application for the area to be allocated a Village Green.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Appleby Resident	private individual
Yes	Noted	No change.	Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
Where does the Village Design statement fit in? Under the old Local Plan areas were designated as sensitive sites, these apparently now have no protection. Application was made by Appleby Magna residents in 2013 for a Village Green. this should be designated as a Local Green Space.	Noted. The Appleby Magna Village Design Statement is a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and where appropriate it may be taken into account as a material consideration when determining planning applications. The Appleby Magna Village Design Statement SPD is available on the Council's website. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Whilst I welcome the references to safeguarding SACs, SSSIs and other environmentally sensitive of important sites, and also the references to the importance of local green spaces, I am concerned that the Council does not propose to o designate any Local Green Spaces as part of this Local Plan. For example, in my home village of Appleby Magna, areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane iare important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	Hugh James	n/a

<p>Additional weighting should be given to the below mentioned within the local plan:</p> <p>Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species.</p> <p>I'm of the opinion that adequate policies should be in place to create protection zones for existing communities / hamlets, such as Abbott's Oak, from inappropriate development and urban sprawl.</p> <p>It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks.</p> <p>I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development.</p>	<p>Policy En1 ensures that any new development would only be permitted on protected ecological sites if it did not result in significant harm (that could not be avoided, mitigated or compensated).</p> <p>Hamlets are considered in Policy S3: Settlement Hierarchy and any development would be considered in the context of the Countryside Policy (S4).</p> <p>Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter.</p> <p>Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>J Ball</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Paul Varty</p>	<p>Resident of Appleby</p>
<p>Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Maria Lewis</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Tim Abbott</p>	<p>Householder</p>

In the main yes, but with additional protection. Please see earlier comments.	Noted.	No change.	Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
Areas which were previously 'sensitive areas' behind the Church Hall and between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are important to the setting of the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.	Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.	No change.	JON WALTERS	LPT
Yes	Noted	No change.	Lesley Colley	None
Yes	Noted	No change.	Alison Saxby	N/A
9.1 The NPPF should also recognise there is an advantage in identifying rural land with limited biodiversity and/or limited landscape value where development is favoured in preference to construction on "brown-field" sites with greater ecological value. 9.2 A green infrastructure policy should redress the matter of urban deforestation and embrace the concept of Urban Forestry which includes the management of trees, shrubs and hedges in all gardens, streets, parks, open space, industrial and commercial areas etc. 9.3 Not only does the green infrastructure counter the "heat island effect" but the benefits of urban trees are also in carbon sequestration, filtering particulates and improved air quality. 9.7 Policy En1 (2) I suspect this should read irreplaceable habitats (not habits). The NPPF refers to Aged and Veteran trees with reason. Aged is very different to ancient and the policy should reflect this. (3) New development should be expected to maintain existing ecological habitats as well as networks. I suggest deleting "lines" and define more importantly as "hedgerows and	The spelling error is noted. The wording of the text and Policy will be amend.	Amend Para. 9.30 to include 'improving air quality' Correct spelling error En1 (2) final bullet point, 'habits' to 'habitats'. En1 (2) final bullet point change Third Ancient' to 'Aged'. En1 (3) delete the word 'lines' after hedgerows and trees.	Julian Simpson	NWL Tree Officer

trees”.				
<p>Policy EN1(2) Presume you mean Irreplaceable habitats (rather than habits). In which case these by definition cannot be compensated for and should not be destroyed.</p> <p>Policy EN1 This should include a clause for the designation of Local Green Spaces. In contrast to current para 9.6 this should commit the Council to designating such spaces as part of the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The NPPF allows Local Plans to use this designation and we see no justification for the Council just leaving this to local communities under Neighbourhood Plans. Such plans are long term projects and may not be feasible or appropriate for smaller communities. Council officers have previously not been encouraging about these being undertaken. In contrast the Council is well able to incorporate this in the new Local Plan and could start by carrying forward those areas which were previously covered by E1 Sensitive Site designation under the existing Local Plan or where community initiatives have identified such spaces as important. In Appleby this would cover two areas: the field behind the Church Hall and bounded by Bowley’s Lane and Rectory Lane; the land between Top Street & Botts Lane.</p> <p>Field behind bounded by Church Street, Bowley’s Lane and Rectory Lane. This field had 2 sensitive sites in the previous Local Plan (the corners of Bowley’s Lane and Church St, and of Rectory Lane and Church St) and has recently been subject to a Village Green Claim supported by over 100 residents. While unsuccessful, the public use of this land was accepted by the Inspector who wrote “On balance the evidence was convincing ... that significant numbers of the inhabitants of Appleby Magna have come onto the fields of the application site for recreational activities”. He also accepted that the use had been continuous for the last 20 years (the legal requirement) – and in practice considerably longer, and that in the legal terminology it was ‘use as of right’ (i.e. it was not secretive and the landowner never told people to stop). Further the Village Green claim established that residents did not just stick to the formal footpaths – and the report suggested that more footpaths could well be approved on the land. The application only failed on the grounds that the activities did not use the ‘whole of the land’. That is people walked on some parts of the land but not on ‘the land as a whole’. We feel that this is in the nature of the recreational activity of walking (the principal use) as opposed to something like football games. As such it meets the NPPF criteria for a Local Green Space in that it is in close proximity to the community it serves, it holds a particular significance to the</p>	<p>The spelling error is noted. Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Lindsay Gene</p>	<p>Appleby Magna Parish Council</p>

<p>local community through its use over generations for recreation, and is local in character.</p> <p>The field bounded by Top Street, Snarestone Lane and Botts Lane. This is a sensitive site under the existing Local Plan. It bounds the Conservation Area (and hence part of its setting) and is part of the characteristic of the settlement pattern identified in the Village Design Statement (adopted as supplementary planning guidance) of the fields coming into the heart of the old village. This characteristic was also highlighted by English Heritage in relation to a neighbouring site as evidence of the direct historic relationship between the settlement and its agricultural setting. As such it has local significance because of its historical significance and is demonstrably special to the local community as reflected in the VDS. It also meets the other requirements of a Local Green Space.</p>				
<p>The NPPF allows Local Plans to use this designation and we see no justification for the Council just leaving this to local communities under Neighbourhood Plans. Such plans are long term projects and may not be feasible or appropriate for smaller communities. Council officers have previously not been encouraging about these being undertaken. In contrast the Council is well able to incorporate this in the new Local Plan and could start by carrying forward those areas which were previously covered by E1 Sensitive Site designation under the existing Local Plan or where community initiatives have identified such spaces as important. In Appleby this would cover two areas: the field behind the Church Hall and bounded by Bowley's Lane and Rectory Lane; the land between Top Street & Botts Lane.</p> <p>Field behind bounded by Church Street, Bowley's Lane and Rectory Lane. This field had 2 sensitive sites in the previous Local Plan (the corners of Bowley's Lane and Church St, and of Rectory Lane and Church St) and has recently been subject to a Village Green Claim supported by over 100 residents. While unsuccessful the public use of this land was accepted by the Inspector who wrote "On balance the evidence was convincing ... that significant numbers of the inhabitants of Appleby Magna have come onto the fields of the application site for recreational activities". He also accepted that the use had been continuous for the last 20 years (the legal requirement) – and in practice considerably longer, and that in the legal terminology it was 'use as of right' (i.e. it was not secretive and the landowner never told people to stop). Further the Village Green claim established that residents did not just stick to the formal footpaths – and the report suggested that more footpaths could well be approved on the land. The application only failed on the grounds that the</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Sonia Liff</p>	<p>Chair Appleby Environment</p>

<p>activities did not use the 'whole of the land'. That is people walked on some parts of the land but not on 'the land as a whole'. We feel that this is in the nature of the recreational activity of walking (the principal use) as opposed to something like football games. As such it meets the NPPF criteria for a Local Green Space in that it is in close proximity to the community it serves, it holds a particular significance to the local community through its use over generations for recreation, and is local in character.</p> <p>The field bounded by Top Street, Snarestone Lane and Botts Lane. This is a sensitive site under the existing Local Plan. It bounds the Conservation Area (and hence part of its setting) and is part of the characteristic of the settlement pattern identified in the Village Design Statement (adopted as supplementary planning guidance) of the fields coming into the heart of the old village. This characteristic was also highlighted by English Heritage in relation to a neighbouring site as evidence of the direct historic relationship between the settlement and its agricultural setting. As such it has local significance because of its historical significance and is demonstrably special to the local community as reflected in the VDS. It also meets the other requirements of a Local Green Space.</p> <p>It should also recognise the critical importance of the green area at the heart of the village bounded by Church Street, Mawbys Lane, Top Street and the footpath running between Eastgate House (Top Street) and the Crown pub (Church Street). This is a Grade II* building, the Moat House and land recognised as an ancient monument which is surrounded by a conservation area. It is recognised by historians as an unusual and distinctive settlement pattern and should be properly acknowledged as such in the local plan.</p>				
<p>(a) We welcome policy En1 in principle but have reservations with item 5 (SUDS) and item 6 (supplementary report)</p> <p>(b) There is doubt that the long term maintenance of SUDS can be sustainable in the long term unless an accountable public body takes on responsibility</p> <p>(c) We welcome a supplementary report but disappointed that it is not available for current consultation.</p> <p>(d) We would like development of 'wildlife corridors' to be included in new development</p>	<p>Noted. Existing wildlife corridors will be a consideration in almost all major development proposals, and many smaller ones, and how they are treated will have a major impact on the overall viability and conditions of the ecological network. The creation of new wildlife corridors will occur through the provision of new open space and green infrastructure as part of new developments. In terms of SUDS Leicestershire County Council are the Lead Local Flood Authority and are responsible for the maintenance of SUDS .</p>		<p>Sue McKendrick</p>	<p>Labour Group leader</p>

<p>We support the recognition of mitigation and compensatory measures within Policy En1: Nature Conservation and their value in restricting the potential adverse impacts of development upon sensitive areas of high biodiversity value.</p> <p>We consider that Policy En1 is too rigid and could be re-worded to allow for some flexibility allowing the loss of ecological assets where considered appropriate, by acknowledging the ecological benefits that can be provided through site restoration.</p>	<p>Policy En1 has been prepared by the Council working with Natural England and Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre who have both agreed the wording of the Policy.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Spencer Warren</p>	<p>Heaton Planning Ltd</p>
<p>Areas which were previously designated 'sensitive' behind Church Hall, and the land between Top Street and Botts Lane in Appleby Magna are an important amenity and setting to the village and should be designated Local Green Spaces by the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>D.E.A Shaw</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Should include green spaces in local plan.</p>	<p>Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter. Local Green Space can be designated through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>C Tandy</p>	<p>Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society</p>
<p>National Trust generally supports policy EN1. However, it should be noted that while part (2) aims to ensure that development resulting in 'significant harm' to important sites or features will be refused, there is currently limited or no guidance on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How applications will be determined where there is significant harm to nature conservation interests outside of an important (listed) site or feature, - How applications will be determined where there is lesser harm to an important (listed) site or feature, - Application of the hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation and compensation in all cases, - How mitigation will be sought and achieved, including provisions for aftercare and long term management. <p>We request that the policy is expanded to address these questions and issues.</p>	<p>Noted. A Supplementary Planning Document is to be prepared and will provide further detail on such issues.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Kim Miller</p>	<p>National Trust</p>

<p>Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species. Particularly the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, should be protected, as being an area of particularly attractive countryside.</p>	<p>Policy En1 identifies existing ecologically significant sites, in addition an Ecological Network report has been prepared for the district which identifies the main areas for priority nature conservation. Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Jonathan Bell</p>	<p>n</p>
<p>Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species.</p> <p>It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks.</p>	<p>Policy En1 identifies existing ecologically significant sites, in addition an Ecological Network report has been prepared for the district which identifies the main areas for priority nature conservation. Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mrs Trena Elizabeth Ball</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Supportive of the way that biodiversity is covered, and with the wording of the Nature Conservation policy En1. Also supportive of the commitment within the policy to publish a Supplementary Planning Document on biodiversity.</p> <p>Ecology at the County Council has commented in the past on SHLAA proposals, and have no objections to the allocations. Note many of them are already subject to planning applications, and we have made detailed responses to these, if required. The most significant in terms of biodiversity, is the land east of Coalville, in the Bardon/Ellistown area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Sharon Wiggins</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

<p>Please provide further comments;</p> <p>Policy EN1(2) Presume you mean Irreplaceable habitats (rather than habits). In which case these by definition cannot be compensated for and should not be destroyed.</p> <p>Policy EN1 This should include a clause for the designation of Local Green Spaces. In contrast to current para 9.6 this should commit the Council to designating such spaces as part of the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The NPPF allows Local Plans to use this designation and we see no justification for the Council just leaving this to local communities under Neighbourhood Plans. Such plans are long term projects and may not be feasible or appropriate for smaller communities. Council officers have previously not been encouraging about these being undertaken. In contrast the Council is well able to incorporate this in the new Local Plan and could start by carrying forward those areas which were previously covered by E1 Sensitive Site designation under the existing Local Plan or where community initiatives have identified such spaces as important. In Appleby this would cover three areas: the field behind the Church Hall and bounded by Bowley's Lane and Rectory Lane; the land between Top Street & Botts Lane; and the land at the heart of the village.</p> <p>Field behind bounded by Church Street, Bowley's Lane and Rectory Lane. This field had 2 sensitive sites in the previous Local Plan (the corners of Bowley's Lane and Church St, and of Rectory Lane and Church St) and has recently been subject to a Village Green Claim supported by over 100 residents. While unsuccessful, the public use of this land was accepted by the Inspector who wrote "On balance the evidence was convincing ... that significant numbers of the inhabitants of Appleby Magna have come onto the fields of the application site for recreational activities". He also accepted that the use had been continuous for the last 20 years (the legal requirement) – and in practice considerably longer, and that in the legal terminology it was 'use as of right' (i.e. it was not secretive and the landowner never told people to stop). Further the Village Green claim established that residents did not just stick to the formal footpaths – and the report suggested that more footpaths could well be approved on the land. The application only failed on the grounds that the activities did not use the 'whole of the land'. That is people walked on some parts of the land but not on 'the land as a whole'. We feel that this is in the nature of the recreational activity of walking (the principal use) as opposed to something like football games. As such it meets the NPPF criteria for a Local Green Space in that it is in close proximity to the</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>Amend policy to refer to irreplaceable habitats at (2)</p>	<p>Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment</p>	<p>Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>community it serves, it holds a particular significance to the local community through its use over generations for recreation, and is local in character.</p> <p>The field bounded by Top Street, Snarestone Lane and Botts Lane. This is a sensitive site under the existing Local Plan. It bounds the Conservation Area (and hence part of its setting) and is part of the characteristic of the settlement pattern identified in the Village Design Statement (adopted as supplementary planning guidance) of the fields coming into the heart of the old village. This characteristic was also highlighted by English Heritage in relation to a neighbouring site as evidence of the direct historic relationship between the settlement and its agricultural setting. As such it has local significance because of its historical significance and is demonstrably special to the local community as reflected in the VDS. It also meets the other requirements of a Local Green Space.</p> <p>The green area at the heart of the village bounded by Church Street, Mawbys Lane, Top Street and the footpath running between Eastgate House (Top Street) and the Crown pub (Church Street). This area is of critical importance to the village. It includes the Grade II* building, the Moat House, and land designated as an ancient monument. It is further surrounded by the Appleby Magna Conservation Area. It is recognised by historians as an unusual and distinctive settlement pattern and should be properly acknowledged as such in the Local Plan.</p>				
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species. Particularly the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, should be protected, as being an area of particularly attractive countryside.	Policy En1 identifies existing ecologically significant sites, in addition an Ecological Network report has been prepared for the district which identifies the main areas for priority nature conservation. Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified.	No change.	Jonathan Ball	n/a
Yes	Noted	No change.	Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council
There is no mention or indication of trees or type of trees. Also hedging. increasingly important as a means of coping with climate change, and enhancing environment. Need to maintain, green fingers of the village.	Policy En1 part (3) states that new development will be expected to maintain existing ecological networks, this includes hedgerows and tree lines.	No change.	Mr and Mrs Wrightman	NA

Policy En2 – River Mease Special Area of Conservation

Question 42 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the river Mease Special Area of Conservation? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any change required	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
<p>Page 99, para 9.17. The phosphate issues in the Mease are not caused by the use of pesticides in farming. They are partly caused by soil from fields running off into the river. This is being addressed by a Catchment Sensitive Farming project in the Mease run by the Environment Agency, Natural England and involving local farmers and landowners.</p> <p>Page 100, para 9.20. It is so difficult to prove the negative, i.e. to demonstrate no adverse impact on the River Mease from a proposed development. The Council and Natural England can manipulate this requirement so as to prevent any development if it so wishes. Small developers like farmers can be bogged down with costly consultants' reports which can still be rejected on the precautionary principle.</p> <p>Question 42. We are very concerned about this approach because of the problem with paragraph 9.20 above.</p>	<p>The River Mease SAC is governed by EU regulations to which NWLDC are legally obliged to comply. The Environment Agency agree that pesticides are not a contributing factor for phosphates from agriculture in the River Mease. Agriculture contributes to the phosphate issues from organic (farm yard manure) and inorganic (manmade fertilisers). These can directly end up in watercourses via different pathways or when soil with phosphate and other nutrients bound to it are washed into a watercourse.</p>	<p>Amend text at 9.17: Agriculture contributes to the phosphate issues from organic (farm yard manure) and inorganic (manmade fertilisers). These can directly end up in watercourses via different pathways or when soil with phosphate and other nutrients bound to it are washed into a watercourse.</p>	Paul Tame	NFU
Yes	Noted	No change.	Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted	No change.	Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
I can advise that Litchfield District Council supports the inclusion of policy EN2 River Mease Special Area of Conservation and the cross reference with this policy within the policies relating to development which discharges waste water into the Mease catchment.	Noted.	No change.	Heidi Hollins	Litchfield District Council
N/A	Noted.	No change.	Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
Developers' 'detailed information about drainage' (paragraph 9.19) is not always as detailed as it purports to be and such submissions need to be more rigorously checked. Two recent planning applications (14/00520/FULM and 15/00196/FULM) referred to a 'drainage ditch' on one side of the development site, which was in fact a spring-fed water course which ultimately flowed into the River Mease.	Noted.	No change.	Frank Bedford, MBE	Willesley Environment Protection Association
Yes	Noted.	No change.	david harris	Pyrotect Ltd
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Simon Litchfield	Resident
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Andrew Stone	NA
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Trevor Davis	None

How, as a Parish Council are we supposed to know what is the headroom capacity of our local waste water treatment works when considering new developments. Although there is a scheme (DCS), to find a solution to the phosphates problem has the money already been paid to this scheme found a solution.	Concerns are noted.The headroom capacity of the waste water treatment works is monitored by NWLDC, the Environment Agency and Natural England. The DCS requires developers to pay a direct contribution to keeping water quality high in the River Mease. The DCS contributions directly fund the actions that will help to improve the water quality.	No change.	Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
The well known on going odour/smell issue from the AB produce factory needs to be resolved, even if this requires the plant to shut. This is a public health risk, and makes the Mease area very unattractive to live and travel through. This is a major issue affecting the quality of life for residents living locally now and potentially in new homes.	Noted. This would be an issue for the Council's Environmental Health Team to investigate rather than something that should be included in the Local Plan. Your comments have been passed onto the Environmental Health Team.	No change.	Mr Richard Hine	Resident of Appleby Magna
What discussions have been held with Severn trent regarding water supply and the treatment and sewage, do they have space, or will nearby residents be faced with toilet problems in the future.	The Council has worked with a range of partner organisations, including Severn Trent to address water quality issues in the River Mease. This includes ensuring there is enough headroom at the relevant Wastewater Treatment Works to which it is proposed that flows from new development would go.	No change.	K.V Percival	NA
– As a conservation site of European importance, with its impressive range of species, it is vital that the River Mease is protected from further deterioration. It is important that the measures and procedures put in place to protect the Mease, as set out, are maintained and enforced.	Noted.	No change.	Andrew and Anne Heaton	NA
It would be helpful to identify which Parishes in the District are affected by the River Mease SAC.	Noted, the Parishes within the River Mease Catchment can be included within the supporting text of the Local Plan or within the background paper.	Amend text to include those Parishes within the River Mease Catchment.	Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
Yes	Noted	No change.	Mr. j Lewis	1950
I would like to think the same protection could be bestowed on the River Sence at Hugglescote and all the other watercourses in the district.	Noted. The River Mease is afforded additional protection as it is a Special Area of Conservation identified under the European Union's Habitats Directive.	No change.	Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Hugh James	n/a
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Tim Abbott	Householder
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying

<p>Will the development of the HS2 route have any impact on this area. We had thought that the preferred route was along the A42 corridor.</p>	<p>The proposed route of HS2 would follow the corridor of the M42/A42 on its eastern side. The route would cross the River Mease Special Area of Conservation (SAC) to the north-west of Measham. It is understood that HS2 have worked with Natural England and the Environment Agency to understand the implications of crossing the River Mease SAC. Work undertaken by HS2 provisionally concluded the proposed River Mease crossing would not have an adverse effect on the SAC, this has been agreed by Natural England.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>	<p>Heather Parish Council</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Lesley Colley</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Policy EN1 This should include a clause for the designation of Local Green Spaces. In contrast to current para 9.6 this should commit the Council to designating such spaces as part of the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The NPPF allows Local Plans to use this designation and we see no justification for the Council just leaving this to local communities under Neighbourhood Plans. Such plans are long term projects and may not be feasible or appropriate for smaller communities. Council officers have previously not been encouraging about these being undertaken. In contrast the Council is well able to incorporate this in the new Local Plan and could start by carrying forward those areas which were previously covered by E1 Sensitive Site designation under the existing Local Plan or where community initiatives have identified such spaces as important. In Appleby this would cover two areas: the field behind the Church Hall and bounded by Bowley's Lane and Rectory Lane; the land between Top Street & Botts Lane.</p> <p>Field behind bounded by Church Street, Bowley's Lane and Rectory Lane. This field had 2 sensitive sites in the previous Local Plan (the corners of Bowley's Lane and Church St, and of Rectory Lane and Church St) and has recently been subject to a Village Green Claim supported by over 100 residents. While unsuccessful the public use of this land was accepted by the Inspector who wrote "On balance the evidence was convincing ... that significant numbers of the inhabitants of Appleby Magna have come onto the fields of the application site for recreational activities". He also accepted that the use had been continuous for the last 20 years (the legal requirement) – and in practice considerably longer, and that in the legal terminology it was 'use as of right' (i.e. it was not secretive and the landowner never told people to stop). Further the Village Green claim established that residents did not just stick to the formal footpaths – and the report suggested that more footpaths could well be approved on the land. The application only failed on the grounds that the</p>	<p>Noted. The designation of Local Green Space does not have to be done through the Local Plan. The loss of open spaces is addressed in Policy IF3. The remaining areas identified as E1 in the adopted Local Plan which are outside of the Limits to Development of Appleby Magna on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map will be covered by the draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Sonia Liff</p>	<p>Chair Appleby Environment</p>

<p>activities did not use the 'whole of the land'. That is people walked on some parts of the land but not on 'the land as a whole'. We feel that this is in the nature of the recreational activity of walking (the principal use) as opposed to something like football games. As such it meets the NPPF criteria for a Local Green Space in that it is in close proximity to the community it serves, it holds a particular significance to the local community through its use over generations for recreation, and is local in character.</p> <p>The field bounded by Top Street, Snarestone Lane and Botts Lane. This is a sensitive site under the existing Local Plan. It bounds the Conservation Area (and hence part of its setting) and is part of the characteristic of the settlement pattern identified in the Village Design Statement (adopted as supplementary planning guidance) of the fields coming into the heart of the old village. This characteristic was also highlighted by English Heritage in relation to a neighbouring site as evidence of the direct historic relationship between the settlement and its agricultural setting. As such it has local significance because of its historical significance and is demonstrably special to the local community as reflected in the VDS. It also meets the other requirements of a Local Green Space.</p> <p>It should also recognise the critical importance of the green area at the heart of the village bounded by Church Street, Mawbys Lane, Top Street and the footpath running between Eastgate House (Top Street) and the Crown pub (Church Street). This is a Grade II* building, the Moat House and land recognised as an ancient monument which is surrounded by a conservation area. It is recognised by historians as an unusual and distinctive settlement pattern and should be properly acknowledged as such in the local plan.</p>				
<p>(a) The issue of phosphates in the River Mease (Mease Special Area of Conservation) is an ongoing situation, and as such this policy needs to be continued until a technical solution can be found.</p> <p>(b) The Labour Group is critical that it appears little effort has been taken to find the source of abnormal phosphate levels in the watercourse.</p> <p>(c) We strongly object to proposed policy En3 (3). We understand a technical solution for phosphate reduction is a long way off. Permitting the use of the use of industrial scale 'septic tanks' on new housing development will provide uncertainties for new residents in the long term. We need to have certainty on which public body will take on adoption & maintenance in perpetuity.</p>	<p>Noted. The high phosphorous levels in the River Mease are attributed to pesticides used in farming and discharges from waste water treatment works within the catchment area.</p> <p>A non-mains drainage solution would only be considered in exceptional circumstances and would need to be supported by the Environment Agency and also demonstrate that it would not alone or cumulatively have an adverse impact, directly or indirectly, upon the integrity of the River Mease SAC.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Sue McKendrick</p>	<p>Labour Group leader</p>

Development should be directed away from catchment area.	The River Mease SAC designation does not prevent development per-se, it allows for development provided it meets the provisions of Policy En2 which seeks to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the integrity of the SAC.	No change.	C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
7. Policy EN2 River Mease. This policy will only be effective if the Environment Agency and other parties respond promptly and positively to development proposals otherwise it could delay the delivery of development.	Noted. The Council cannot comment on the workings of the Environment Agency.	No change.	Andrew Thomson	Thomson Planning Partnership
<p>In particular contents of criterion 2 and 3 of the policy. William Davis have significant doubts whether those criteria could be satisfied to allow the release of 1750 dwellings on the site north of Ashby, a study needs to be prepared to see if this amount of housing can be accommodated at Ashby.</p> <p>it is noted that para 9.20 of the Local Plan, that a planning application 'must be refused' unless and applicant can demonstrate no adverse on the River mease SAC.</p> <p>The applicants to the north of Ashby are unlikely to be able to meet this approach.</p>	Noted. It would be for the developer/s of the site north of Ashby to demonstrate that proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the River Mease SAC.	No change.	Simon Chadwick	Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis

Policy En3 – The National Forest

Question 43 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the National Forest? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any change required?	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted	No change.	Lisa Marron	Resident
No a more ambitious 50% woodland cover should be aspired for. A recent overseas visitor commented on the lack of woodland in the heart of the national forest and I have to agree	The National Forest Company advise that they have historically had a target of 33% woodland cover but generally now refer to a target of 'about a third'. It is appropriate for the Local Plan to reflect the targets of the National Forest Company. The wording will be amended to reflect the National Forest Company's target of 'about a third' woodland cover target.	No change.	Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted	No change.	Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	Noted	No change.	Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
Yes	Noted	No change.	Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted	No change.	Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Page 102, para 3.2 policy EN3 para 5 . The draft Local Plan says that new developments will be "examples of sustainable design". i.e. exemplars of good design, perhaps with timber construction in the National Forest.	Noted. One of the North West Leicestershire Place Making Principles includes National Forest or locally-inspired identity. The National Forest provides a source of inspiration for the design and environmental performance of buildings.	No change.	Gerald Dalby	NA
Yes	Noted	No change.	Sue McGlynn - Clerk to Coleorton Parish Council	Coleorton Parish Council
All National Forest planting should be within the development.	Noted. There may be instances where forest planting may not be possible on-site, for example the site may be too small or the soil may not be compatible with tree planting.	No change.	Steve Palmer	NA
Yes	Noted	No change.	Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
Within the Heart of the National Forest [Policy EN3 (5)], healthy mature trees and hedges must be retained unless removal is an absolute necessity. Also, mature trees in a state of decay are important to fauna and flora and hence biodiversity and should only be removed where they present a significant danger.	Noted. All policies in the Local Plan have to be read together. Policy En1: Nature Conservation states that planning permission will be refused where a development proposal would result in significant harm (which cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated for) to a range of ecologically significant sites which includes Ancient woodlands, mature plantation, rich ancient hedgerows and ancient or veteran trees.	No change.	Frank Bedford, MBE	Willesley Environment Protection Association
Yes	Noted	No change.	None	none
Yes	Noted	No change.	david harris	Pyrotect Ltd
Yes	Noted	No change.	Simon Litchfield	Resident

<p>Site ELAA:17 - Money Hill/Cliftonthorpe, Ashby</p> <p>We strongly disagree with the employment allocation of this prominent greenfield countryside side which is directly adjacent to 150 newly completed dwellings. Instead the plan should highlight the unique potential for developing footpath and associated recreational links northwards from Ashby to the outstanding National Forest countryside beyond the A511 in line with plan objectives 1 and 12.</p> <p>The analysis shows no awareness of the opportunities to develop the existing leisure potential of this land. There is no mention that the sensitive western site is divided by a brook with endangered great crested newts and surrounded by walkways on all sides. These are already used regularly by many ramblers, (dog) walkers and horse riders from the adjacent equestrian centre. It offers unique opportunities for improved and forested footpath and bridleway links northwards across the A511 to the outstanding countryside areas of the Pistern Hills, Staunton Harold and Calke Abbey and the wider and developing National Forest network.</p>	The issues of employment allocations is detailed under Policy Ec2.	No change.	Robert Yates	Cliftonthorpe Residents Management Company
There are concerns that public access to land purchased for new woodland is only for a minimum of 5 years. This could restrict access to large sections of the National Forest in future years.	Noted. This is not a matter for the Local Plan.	No change.	Karen Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Yes	Noted	No change.	Andrew Stone	NA
But ensure access to a wider group of people: include cyclists and horse-riders to all National Forest sites.	Noted.	No change.	Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan. • I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, and Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate. 	Noted.	No change.	Mrs J.S Chapple	NA
Yes	Noted	No change.	Trevor Davis	None
Agree, but feel Measham has not had its fair share of woodland planting.	Noted. New developments within the National Forest contribute towards the creation of the forest through on-site and off-site (elsewhere within the National Forest) planting in accordance with the most up to date National Forest Planting Guidelines.	No change.	Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council

National Forest should be given the highest level of protection possible from future developments, and the planting of new forest areas encouraged.	Noted. The National Forest is not intended to prohibit development but rather to create a mix of built and woodland areas. The draft Local Plan requires new developments to contribute to the creation of the National Forest by providing on-site or off-site (elsewhere within the National Forest) planting.	No change.	Mr Richard Hine	Resident of Appleby Magna
Supporting paragraph 9.30 Suggest the following text is included - There is also increasing evidence that woodland creation and woodland management can help in reducing flood flows, particularly in smaller catchments.	Noted, text to be amended.	Amend text at 9.30 to include "There is also evidence that woodland creation and woodland management can help in reducing flood flows, particularly in smaller catchments".	Geoff Platts	Environment Agency
- National Forest – The benefits of the National Forest, as set out, must be recognised – it provides economic as well as environmental benefits .The NF is becoming a place to visit, which it never was previously – so needs continuing support as detailed.	Noted. These benefits are already noted in Paragraph 9.30. The National Forest Policy supports the development of the forest and also the The Heart of the National Forest in terms of forest-related tourism and leisure activities.	No change.	Andrew and Anne Heaton	NA
Yes	Noted	No change.	Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
the fields between Greenhill Road and the north side of Bardon Hill should be incorporated into the National Forest to stop unscrupulous property developers from applying to build houses on them.	This area is already within the national forest boundary.	No change.	Yvonne Willars	retired

<p>The National Forest Company strongly support this Policy and are grateful for the amendments made since the previous version. A few further minor amendments are requested:</p> <p>Throughout the Policy (and Plan as a whole) please refer to The National Forest (with capitals) or the Forest.</p> <p>Paragraph 1 part e should state 'achieve the National Forest Company's woodland cover targets'. While the 33% target remains, this may be broken down to specific targets for different parts of the Forest during the plan period.</p> <p>Please can the National Forest Planting Guidelines referred to in paragraph 2 be included as an Appendix for ease of reference.</p> <p>In Paragraph 2 after 'open space provision' please add 'associated with woodland'. This is to differentiate between open space within a woodland (which we would expect to be included) and open space such as mown grass or football pitches, which would not contribute towards meeting the guidelines.</p> <p>A further paragraph could be added that states 'Development should contribute towards creating a National Forest character to accord with the first Place Making Principle set out in Policy S5.'</p>	<p>We will ensure the National Forest or Forest is referred to with Capitals in the Local Plan. Amendments will be made to En3 (1) (e) and En3 (2). In regards to the National Forest Planning Guidelines these are available elsewhere and therefore do not need to be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>We will ensure the National Forest or Forest is referred to with Capitals in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Replace wording: En3 (1) (e) "Achieve the National Forest Company's woodland cover targets". En3 (2) after open space provision insert "associated with woodland".</p>	<p>Philip Metcalfe</p>	<p>The National Forest Company</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mr. j Lewis</p>	<p>1950</p>
<p>But more needs to be done to improve cycle/pedestrian accesses into the National Forest.</p>	<p>Draft Local Plan Policy IF4: Transport Infrastructure and New Development requires new development, where appropriate, to contribute towards improvements to cycle links within and beyond individual sites including linkages to key Green Infrastructure, such as the National Forest.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Michael Ball</p>	<p>Individual</p>
<p>The National Forest is one of the districts greatest achievements. England now has the greatest woodland cover since the black death and this is even more so here in The National Forest. Long may it continue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Steve Johnson</p>	<p>YYYY</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Lesley Birtwistle</p>	<p>not applicable</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Mrs Paula Ashfield</p>	<p>Paula Ashfield</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>Hugh James</p>	<p>n/a</p>

<p>Although I do have the following additional comments:</p> <p>Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species.</p> <p>It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks.</p> <p>I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development.</p> <p>I would like to see the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, protected from any future development, for the below mentioned reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This particular area of land is confirmed as an important wildlife corridor linking Bardon Hill SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest), Charnwood Lodge NNR (National Nature Reserve), Holly Rock Fields SSSI, and Coalville Meadows SSSI. o This site lies outside of the town's identified Limits to Development, as defined in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, and is considered best and most versatile agricultural land. o This site is visible from particular points of interest to Coalville, and very much in the landscape between Bardon Hill and Warren Hills. For anybody familiar with Leicestershire, and Bardon Hill (being the highest point in Leicestershire) would confirm that this area and its incredible views of Leicestershire, is very much a jewel in the Crown of North West Leicestershire. o To both Coalville residents and the wider local Leicestershire area, these fields are a valued asset to the community, considered of high community and landscape value. With this particular area being considered as an attractive gateway to Coalville, in what I would consider a tranquil area. 	<p>Policy En1 ensures that any new development would only be permitted on protected ecological sites where it would not result in significant harm (that could not be avoided, mitigated or compensated).</p> <p>The Countryside Policy (S4) protects land outside the Limits to Development for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife and the wealth of its natural resources.</p> <p>Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter.</p> <p>Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>J Ball</p>	<p>N/A</p>
---	---	-------------------	---------------	------------

Yes	Noted.	No change.	Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Recognition of 'Heart of National Forest' in En3 is welcomed.	Noted.	No change.	Tim Abbott	Householder
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
Tourism in this area was developing well, but it is in danger of being damaged by the increasing urbanisation of the Heart of the Forest area.	The Draft Local Plan Policy (En3) supports the provision of tourism and leisure activities associated with the National Forest in the Heart of the National Forest area. New development that takes place within the National Forest area is required to contribute towards the creation of the Forest through the provision of tree planting and other landscape areas within them and/or elsewhere within the National Forest in accordance with National Forest Planting Guidelines.	No change.	Lesley Colley	None
Stronger Approach" needed to include the Ivanhoe Line for "Conkers" day-trip tourism.	Policy IF5 supports the reinstatement of the Leicester to Burton rail line.	No change.	George F Stapley	NA
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Alison Saxby	N/A
<p>Policy En3 is once again predicated on the ability of planning authorities to overcome viability assessments in order to ensure appropriate recompense from developers. The biased use of viability assessments needs to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If commuted sums result, how will the purchased and planted areas be maintained after the five year period? What will stop them falling into disrepair? 	<p>When looking at Section 106 requirements and viability a balanced view has to be taken. The issue of maintenance has been clarified with the National Forest Company who advise that land they buy would be retained by them and the on-going management of the woodland after the initial five years would be funded from their budgets.</p> <p>The National Forest Company do occasionally pass on land that they buy to other organisations such as the Forestry Commission or the Woodland Trust, but generally not within the first 5 years, so again the land would be maintained by them at their cost.</p>	No change.	Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council
<p>9.27</p> <p>Although woodland cover in the National Forest is around 20% with an objective of 33%, it should be noted that tree canopy cover (which is different to woodland cover) in North-West Leicestershire as a whole, is only 14.6%. (+/- 1.12% standard error. Ref. www.itreetools.org). An objective should be to steadily increase canopy cover across the whole district over 25 years with re-assessments every 5 years.</p> <p>9.31</p> <p>Again the Urban Forestry concept should be recognised as it is not only woodlands but all trees which contribute to the environmental benefits. There must be a recognition that large trees with space to grow are required for community wellbeing and health as well as for their intrinsic beauty and</p>	<p>Para 9.27: The National Forest Company advise that the 20% figure actually relates to Forest cover and includes, woodlands, parkland and other habitats. Whilst it is different to canopy cover, given that most of the District is covered by The National Forest, there is little need for two different targets. Forest cover is the measure used Forest wide by the National Forest Company and referred to in other Local Plans. Policy En3 (1) (b) Policy to be amended. Policy En3 (1) (e) The National Forest Company do not have a target expressed in such terms nor monitor such a target. Forest cover relates to more than trees and young woodlands do not have a canopy. Woodland or forest cover is the term used in The National Forest Strategy Strategy, Guide for Developers</p>	<p>Para 9.31 - add text: "The National Forest is not just about planting woodlands but increasing tree cover within urban areas, large trees with space to grow are required for community wellbeing and health as well as for their intrinsic beauty and cultural heritage".</p> <p>Policy En3 (1) (b) Add " and resilient" after sustainable.</p> <p>Policy En3 (2) add "resilient" - second sentence after Landscaping will generally involve.</p> <p>Policy En3 (2) At the beginning of the last sentence add "Landscaping does not just include woodland planting and" the appropriate mix...</p>	Julian Simpson	NWL Tree Officer

<p>cultural heritage.</p> <p>In this respect all existing TPO's should be reviewed and areas of expected development surveyed to determine the importance of any trees which may be at risk.</p> <p>9.32 Policy En3</p> <p>(1)(b) I suggest this should read: "Create an attractive, sustainable and resilient environment." Landscaping needs to be diverse and varied with the right tree in the right place. Effective design can follow the "garden city" principal but only with lower density housing.</p> <p>(1)(e) In this respect the objective would be better expressed as % canopy cover.</p> <p>(2) Landscaping should involve sustainable, resilient and diverse woodland planting based on long-term management plans.</p> <p>New supplementary landscape planning guidelines are important to achieve this.</p> <p>Trees need to be given greater weight in the decision making process to reverse the decline in the quality and character of urban landscapes.</p> <p>There is a potential to use trees with form suited to challenging site conditions and make use of vertical space, using tall, thin trees and species with proven urban performance. This requires an understanding of their mature size, underground environment, moisture uptake, arboricultural characteristics and potential impact and inconvenience for future occupants.</p>	<p>and Planners and in other Local Plans. Policy En3 (2) National Forest Company advise that they are happy for the policy to be amended to include 'resilient' and the need for long-term management plans. Need to be clear that acceptable landscaping does not just include woodland planting. The National Forest Company would be happy to work with the council to produce supplementary guidance. In relation to the right species of trees being used, the Policy can encourage tree planting but if they are not the right species in the right spaces then they will not succeed. The expertise of the Tree Officer is required to ensure that this is the case.</p>			
<p>(a) Strong objection to En3 (5) that 'the area between Ashby and Swadlincote be known as the 'Heart of the National Forest.'</p> <p>(b) Areas of mining regeneration in the Coalville Area need to be included within the benefits of National Forest Investment. This is another example of the Conservatives devaluing Coalville's heritage and amenities.</p>	<p>Noted. The Heart of the National Forest is geographically determined and sits centrally within the National Forest boundary.</p> <p>Coalville is within the National Forest and new development would be required to contribute towards the creation of the forest through the provision of tree planting and other landscape areas within new development or elsewhere within the National Forest in accordance with National Forest Planting Guidelines.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>20% of development should be trees.</p>	<p>Noted. New developments within the National Forest are required to contribute towards the creation of the forest, the required contribution will depend on the size of the development.</p>	No change.	C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society

This general purpose of this policy is supported.	Noted.	No change.	Kim Miller	National Trust
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment	Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation
Yes	Noted.	No change.	Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
I do not agree that there is sufficient emphasis on the preservation and particularly on the planting of trees and woodland (including hedgerows) to emphasis Ashby's place at the heart of the National Forest	The Draft Local Plan Nature Conservation Policy (En1) seeks to protect ancient woodland, Mature plantation or secondary woodland and rich ancient hedgerows. In addition Policy En3 seeks additional tree planting.	No change.	Ian Retson	n/a
Yes	Noted	No change.	Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council
I do not agree that the open spaces that we prize in and around our town are adequately protected from future development by the policies proposed in the Plan which fail to meet objective 11. I do not agree that a 60% increase to the size of our town which compromises objectives 10 and 12 is justified; the proposed infrastructure improvements (Transport, Education, Leisure, and Healthcare) to support such growth are totally inadequate.	Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter.	No change.	Cliftonthorpe Residents c/o Robert Yates	n/a

Policy En4 – Charnwood Forest

Question 44 Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Charnwood Forest? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any change required	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted	No change required	Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	Noted		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	Noted		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
Yes	Noted		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Phil Ellis	Whitwick Parish Council
pg 104 para 9.39. What is "sustainable woodland management"? This surely means long term woodland management para 9.40. What is "sustainable tourism"? why not simply "encourages tourism", omitting "sustainable"?	To be consistent with other policies it is agreed that it would be appropriate to delete reference to 'sustainable' before tourism. Sustainable woodland management is concerned with determining how to manage woodland or forest today in such a way that similar, or greater, benefits, health and productivity are ensured in the future (Woodland Trust, 2010).	Delete reference to sustainable tourism	Gerald Dalby	NA
Yes	Noted		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
The suggested approach to the Charnwood Forest, consideration should be given to national proposals to limits speed restrictions on rural roads due to unexpected hazards such as Cattle Farm vehicles using these roads.	Noted.		Brian Duncombe	Charley Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		David Harris	Pyroprotect Ltd
Yes	Noted.		Simon Litchfield	Resident
Yes	Noted.		Andrew Stone	NA
Yes	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
Yes	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Charnwood Forest is the most important area for wildlife in the whole of Leicestershire ; although only a small part of Charnwood Forest is in NWL, it is important that we maintain its biodiversity value. Whilst welcoming the attention given to Charnwood Forest, is Regional Park status really still a sensible approach, when there is so little political emphasis on the English Regions now? It would be better to seek AONB status for Charnwood.	Regional Parks are non-statutory partnership-led initiatives. Each Regional Park is unique and has its own specific objectives to provide varying combinations of environmental, social and economic benefits. Charnwood Forest does not have any national landscape designation. Natural England are responsible for formally designating AONB and advising on policies for their protection. An AONB is not something that the Local Authority can designate.		Andrew and Anne Heaton	NA
Yes	Noted		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning

Yes	Noted		Yvonne Willars	retired
Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
A regional park is a great idea as long as the Bardon Quarry 'extension' does not set a precedent for a spiders web of such quarries in time, the region will then benefit greatly in the decades to come.	Noted. There is a need to balance economic considerations associated with minerals workings. The supporting text at 9.40 identifies that mineral working can provide biodiversity, geodiversity and access opportunities.		Steve Johnson	YYYY
I would like to see a stronger protection policy for the former Charnwood Forest APAC. At the recent public inquiry in respect of the Gladman proposal south of Greenhill Road, Coalville, the appellants placed much emphasis on the fact that that no specific landscape character protection policy was being carried forward to the new local plan. It seems clear that, in accordance with the NPPF, Inspectors in appeal situations will be likely to take note of a properly assessed landscape character designation that demonstrates that this area is more than simply locally valued.	Regional Parks are non-statutory partnership-led initiatives. The adopted Local Plan (2002) does not have a specific Charnwood Forest Policy. Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified. The identification of the Charnwood Forest Regional Plan boundary is based on landscape assessment. The Draft Local Plan has a specific policy relating to the Charnwood Forest. The Policy is not a protection policy as such, but recognises the importance of the Charnwood Forest area in terms of landscape etc.		Stuart Moffat	Resident
Yes	Noted		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Noted		Hugh James	n/a
Although I do have the following additional comments: Included within the final local draft plan should be policies in place to protect specific sites and areas, recognised for their contribution to the ecological network, being both green infrastructure / wildlife corridors providing habitat for species. It is important that policies recognise and afford proper protection for our open spaces and Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside, as well as providing valuable wildlife habitat and enhancing biodiversity through protection of green infrastructure within established ecological networks. I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development. I would like to see the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, protected from any	Policy En1 ensures that any new development would only be permitted on protected ecological sites if it did not result in significant harm (that could not be avoided, mitigated or compensated). Hamlets are considered in Policy S3: Settlement Hierarchy and any development would be considered in the context of the Countryside Policy (S4). Policy IF3 supports the provision of new open space whilst also protecting against the loss of existing open space should it not be surplus to requirements. A Supplementary Planning Document is also proposed to provide further guidance on this matter. Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside (APAC) were identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Structure Plan which has now expired. National Planning Policy does not require APAC to be identified.		J Ball	N/A

<p>future development, for the below mentioned reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This particular area of land is confirmed as an important wildlife corridor linking Bardon Hill SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest), Charnwood Lodge NNR (National Nature Reserve), Holly Rock Fields SSSI, and Coalville Meadows SSSI. o This site lies outside of the town's identified Limits to Development, as defined in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, and is considered best and most versatile agricultural land. o This site is visible from particular points of interest to Coalville, and very much in the landscape between Bardon Hill and Warren Hills. For anybody familiar with Leicestershire, and Bardon Hill (being the highest point in Leicestershire) would confirm that this area and its incredible views of Leicestershire, is very much a jewel in the Crown of North West Leicestershire. o To both Coalville residents and the wider local Leicestershire area, these fields are a valued asset to the community, considered of high community and landscape value. With this particular area being considered as an attractive gateway to Coalville, in what I would consider a tranquil area. 				
Yes	Noted		Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
But designate it for protection permanently.	Regional Parks are non-statutory partnership-led initiatives. The Charnwood Forest Regional Park falls within Leicestershire County Council, Charnwood Borough Council, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and North West Leicestershire District Council. The Policy is not a protection policy as such, but recognises the importance of the Charnwood Forest area in terms of landscape etc.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted.		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted.		Lesley Colley	None
Screening of new and existing development is necessary to protect the natural characteristics of the area.	Noted.		Julian Simpson	NWL Tree Officer
Yes	Noted.		Sonia Liff	Chair Appleby Environment

<p>(a) The Labour Group agrees in principle with Policy En4 but:</p> <p>(b) It is understood that the so called 'Charnwood Forest Regional Park Steering Group' led by Leicestershire County Council has not met for some considerable time, nor has it any agreed policies.</p> <p>(c) The Charnwood Forest within NWL is considered by the public as a diverse wild landscape. Most of the land benefits from the 'Right to Roam' legislation. Tourism initiatives should be supported but large scale housing, employment or industrialised agricultural schemes resisted.</p>	<p>Noted. The Charnwood Forest Regional Park Steering Group meet quarterly, whilst there are no policies the Steering Group have an agreed Action Plan which is a broad overarching document.</p> <p>Policy En4 aims to protect the Forest and where appropriate provide for sustainable tourism initiatives.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>Policy En4 should be amended so that it clarifies that "rural diversification" includes proposals for the re-use of existing buildings for employment uses and that such proposals are also supported.</p>	<p>Rural diversification is a broad term that could include employment uses and could involve either new build or re-use. To do as suggested would make the policy very prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy En4 gives priority to proposals which include farm diversification, therefore it is already supported in the Policy. A definition of farm diversification will be added to the glossary.</p>		Andrew Thomas	Thomas Taylor Planning
<p>No comment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>This general purpose of this policy is supported.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		Kim Miller	National Trust
<p>Our local plan should not allow for any development / encroachment into our existing green infrastructure, most importantly Charnwood Forest. Which as a recognised Regional Park, is also identified as a priority living landscape by the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust.</p>	<p>Policy IF3 protects against the loss of existing open spaces that are not surplus to requirements. In regards to development Regional Parks do not provide land with any statutory protection and any proposed developments within them are subject to the usual planning procedures. The Charnwood Forest Policy (En4) intends to ensure that the traditional working landscape of the Charnwood Forest, as well as the character and appearance of the area, is maintained.</p>		Johnathan Bell	n
<p>As regards the Charnwood Forest, the Borough Council is pleased that the draft Local Plan identifies the importance of Charnwood Forest and its unique character and appearance through Policy En4. The aims of the policy to protect and enhance the landscape, biodiversity, natural history and cultural heritage of the Charnwood Forest are supported.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		David Pendle	Charnwood Borough Council

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our local plan should not allow for any development / encroachment into our existing green infrastructure, most importantly Charnwood Forest. Which as a recognised Regional Park, is also identified as a priority living landscape by the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust. 	<p>Policy IF3 protects against the loss of existing open spaces that are not surplus to requirements. In regards to development Regional Parks do not provide land with any statutory protection and any proposed developments within them are subject to the usual planning procedures. The Charnwood Forest Policy (En4) intends to ensure that the traditional working landscape of the Charnwood Forest, as well as the character and appearance of the area, is maintained.</p>		Mrs Trena Elizabeth Ball	NA
Yes	Noted.		Sonia Liff, Chair Appleby Environment	Appleby Environment, a long standing community organisation
No answer	Noted.		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
<p>Our local plan should not allow for any development / encroachment into our existing green infrastructure, most importantly Charnwood Forest. Which as a recognised Regional Park, is also identified as a priority living landscape by the Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust.</p>	<p>Policy IF3 protects against the loss of existing open spaces that are not surplus to requirements. In regards to development Regional Parks do not provide land with any statutory protection and any proposed developments within them are subject to the usual planning procedures. The Charnwood Forest Policy (En4) intends to ensure that the traditional working landscape of the Charnwood Forest, as well as the character and appearance of the area, is maintained.</p>		Jonathan Ball	n/a
Yes	Noted		Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council

Policy En5 – Area of Separation

Question 45 Do you agree with our suggested approach to protect the open and undeveloped area between Coalville and Whitwick? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any change required	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	Noted		Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	Noted		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
I would suggest a change of wording from no development which would have a significant effect and replace it with no development that would have an adverse effect . Other than that I am pleased to see the Green Wedge being protected - as we were assured .	The word 'significant' has the effect of quantifying the extent of any adverse impact. Whilst it is accepted that it would be appropriate to delete the word 'significant' it is considered that it would not be appropriate to leave the wording of the policy so open. It is proposed, therefore, to delete the word 'significant' and replace it with 'demonstrably'. In this way it will be necessary to demonstrate that there is an adverse impact.	Change to the Policy wording: 'significant' be changed to 'demonstrably'	Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
The areas of separation are supported, but it is suggested that wider application of the policy should be considered to areas such as that between Ashby and Packington.	The issue of separation is considered as part of Policy S4 which states that development (individually or cumulatively) will only be approved where it does not undermine the physical or perceived separation or undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
Separation land between all village/town centres should be protected. To avoid losing village identity	The issue of separation is considered as part of Policy S4 which states that development (individually or cumulatively) will only be approved where it does not undermine the physical or perceived separation or undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		Mark Hutchinson	Mark Hutchinson

<p>NWLDC own Urban Fringe and Green Wedge review papers state how</p> <p>“ Development on land to the south of the disused railway would be relatively easy to integrate without altering the character of the land or sense of separation”. May 2012 Green Wedge review NWLDC</p> <p>This conclusion is supported by two independent landscape and visual impact studies which reviewed the land south of the disused railway in considerable detail.</p> <p>Combined both reports from two separate consultants concur with NWLDC findings.</p> <p>“The site is designated as Green Wedge, the evidence base prepared by the Local Authority has concluded that this designation can no longer be supported.</p> <p>Development potential has been identified within the site south of the disused railway and a distinction has been drawn between the character of this site and its ability to provide the function of separation when compared to the wider landscape setting to the north.</p> <p>Development will not result in the physical or perceived coalescence of settlement, and will not affect the existing separation function provided by the wider area of open farmland to the north.”</p> <p>Based on the available evidence the inclusion of land south of the dismantled railway within the proposed Area of Separation is not supported. Therefore, application 14/00808/OUTM should not be included within the proposed designation, thus included within the proposed housing allocations</p>	<p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF makes it clear that a key principle of the planning system is to “take account of the different roles and character of different areas...”.</p> <p>When viewed from Stephenson Way development on that part of proposed Area of Separation at Broom Leys Farm will, it is considered, affect the perception of separation between Coalville and Whitwick in functional terms and would represent a significant intrusion in to the otherwise undeveloped area.</p> <p>In addition, it is considered that the development of the current Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would undermine the delivery of the local plan strategy for Coalville, that is the south east Coalville major urban extension. The whole of the urban extension benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission, and in part has detailed permission with development underway. The Council is concerned, therefore, that the current Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation is a strategic policy designation that runs to the heart of the plan. To deviate from the overall strategy of the plan at this stage would undermine the considerable investment of both public and private sectors in pursuit of the current strategy for Coalville and the wider district.</p>		George Breed	Persimmon Homes NMID
<p>No, allow Coalville and Whitwick to merge. Concentrate building and economic development in this area, in a sustainable way.</p>	<p>Noted. The merging of these settlements would be detrimental to the character of each of the settlements.</p>		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
<p>Any other proposed uses will need to demonstrate why they cannot be accommodated elsewhere within the District.....this doesn't go far enough</p> <p>'Other proposed uses' shouldn't even be considered</p>	<p>Noted. Whilst the Areas of Separation are protected from most forms of built development there may be instances where sustainable development may be acceptable provided it would not compromise the open and undeveloped character of the area of separation.</p>		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council

While we welcome the 'Area of Separation' designation for the Green Wedge, we would request that the word 'significantly' be deleted from Policy En5 (Development will not be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would significantly adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area)	The word 'significant' has the effect of quantifying the extent of any adverse impact. Whilst it is accepted that it would be appropriate to delete the word 'significant' it is considered that it would not be appropriate to leave the wording of the policy so open. It is proposed, therefore, to delete the word 'significant' and replace it with 'demonstrably'. In this way it will be necessary to demonstrate that there is an adverse impact.	The word 'significant' be changed to 'demonstrably'	Phil Ellis	Whitwick Parish Council
But I think it would be useful to have some other areas of separation within the District, particularly between villages which have lost protection because the current policy E1 Sensitive Areas is not longer in force.	Noted. Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		Sue McGlynn - Clerk to Coleorton Parish Council	Coleorton Parish Council
Other than those mentioned there are other historic communities which need protection from coalescence. Such as Hugglescote, Donington Le Heath, Ravenstone etc. The plan should detail the direction of any developments in villages to prevent coalescence.	Noted. Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		Steve Palmer	NA
N/A	Noted.		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council
If it is brownfield and derelict then build on it.	Noted. Whilst the use of brownfield land is supported in national planning policy the area between Coalville and Whitwick is largely undeveloped and would not constitute brownfield land.		None	none
No its an ad hoc theory in the plan	Noted.		David Harris	Pyrotect Ltd
Yes	Noted.		Simon Litchfield	Resident
Yes	Noted.		Andrew Stone	NA
But also ensure that Hugglescote is allowed to keep its strong identity. There needs to be clear separation of Hugglescote from proposed new housing developments.	Noted. One of the key objectives (No.10) of the draft Local Plan is to conserve and enhance the identity, character and diversity and local distinctiveness of the district's built and historic heritage. Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		Mary Lorimer	Not applicable
Why? NIMBY again	Noted.		Trevor Davis	None
Yes	Noted.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council
Areas of Separation– These should be maintained.	Noted.		Andrew and Anne Heaton	NA
Yes	Noted.		Nick Wilkins	NW
Yes	Noted.		Lance Wiggins	Landmark Planning
Yes	Noted.		Yvonne Willars	retired

I agree that the Green Wedge should be retained with the strongest preservation possible as Areas of Separation and Countryside. However the wording referring to Areas of Separation should be subject to a change and the word 'significantly' should be deleted from the draft policy: P105 "development will not be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would significantly adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area"	The word 'significant' has the effect of quantifying the extent of any adverse impact. Whilst it is accepted that it would be appropriate to delete the word 'significant' it is considered that it would not be appropriate to leave the wording of the policy so open. It is proposed, therefore, to delete the word 'significant' and replace it with 'demonstrably'. In this way it will be necessary to demonstrate that there is an adverse impact.	The word 'significant' be changed to 'demonstrably'	Jo Straw	.
I agree that the Green Wedge should be retained with the strongest preservation possible as Areas of Separation and Countryside. However the wording referring to Areas of Separation should be subject to a change and the word 'significantly' should be deleted from the draft policy: P105 "development will not be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would significantly adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area"	The word 'significant' has the effect of quantifying the extent of any adverse impact. Whilst it is accepted that it would be appropriate to delete the word 'significant' it is considered that it would not be appropriate to leave the wording of the policy so open. It is proposed, therefore, to delete the word 'significant' and replace it with 'demonstrably'. In this way it will be necessary to demonstrate that there is an adverse impact.	The word 'significant' be changed to 'demonstrably'	Sean Straw	.
Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
It is important that communities and villages don't coalesce into sprawling towns then cities. Some people prefer to live in cities but the choice should be there to not do that for others. Green space is important for both people and wildlife. Its no fun after all, walking a dog through a busy town. Areas of separation should be just that.	Noted		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Although, I'm also of the opinion that adequate policies should be in place to create protection zones for existing communities / hamlets, such as Abbott's Oak, from inappropriate development and urban sprawl.	The Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		J Ball	N/A
Yes	Noted		Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
But also extend this to Abbots Oak hamlet which is particularly unique as well for its remote nature but is currently under threat from urban sprawl of coalville. Policy protection please.	The Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying
Yes	Noted		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Lesley Colley	None

<p>The Whitwick Action Group would like to support Areas of Separation Policy En5 subject to the word significantly being deleted from the draft policy (page 105 reference Policy En5).</p> <p>" Development will not be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area"</p> <p>The Green Wedge policy has been vigorously tested through a planning appeal for Stephenson Green and later through the High Court and it continues to be a relevant designation and we ask that the Green Wedge continues to be robustly protected by these two policies.</p> <p>Reasons for retaining the area currently protected by Policy E20 Green wedge</p> <p>The green wedge protects the open area that maintains separation between the settlements and provides for an informal recreation opportunity. The character of the settlements is distinguished by the strategic gap between them and the urban form is shaped by the existence of the wedge in its totality.</p> <p>The Green Wedge gives strategic separation between the ancient villages of Whitwick, Thringstone and Swannington from the more recent town of preventing coalescence.</p> <p>The Green Wedge protects structurally important areas of open land and preserves the strategic landscape. It gives easy walking access to the countryside from Coalville's Green Space Study Report December 2011 clearly indicates that the area is highly valued for its informal recreational facility of walking through the area in close proximity to where people live.</p> <p>The Green Wedge acts as a funnel and protects structurally important areas of open land and preserves the strategic landscape. It provides a wildlife habitat with links to open countryside.</p> <p>Any development of the Green wedge would have an adverse effect on valuable agricultural land. Farmland is a valuable green infrastructure. It is not a contrived green environment but provides an irreplaceable amenity.</p> <p>The Green Wedge contributes towards the well-being of local people and enhances their lives. The Green Wedge encourages families to spend time engaged in outdoor pursuits and thus promotes exercise. Local Children currently have the opportunity to grow up understanding nature and appreciating the beauty and tranquillity of their countryside.</p>	<p>Noted. The word 'significant' has the effect of quantifying the extent of any adverse impact. Whilst it is accepted that it would be appropriate to delete the word 'significant' it is considered that it would not be appropriate to leave the wording of the policy so open. It is proposed, therefore, to delete the word 'significant' and replace it with 'demonstrably'. In this way it will be necessary to demonstrate that there is an adverse impact.</p>	<p>The word 'significant' be changed to 'demonstrably'</p>	<p>Whitwick Action Group</p>	<p>Whitwick Action Group</p>
---	---	--	------------------------------	------------------------------

<p>There can be no doubt as to the wishes of the local community, we have clearly expressed our opinions and would like to add this to our previous comments. Our local community greatly values the Green wedge and believes that it should be saved and protected in its entirety by robust policies within the Local Plan.</p>				
<p>I would like to ask if the parcel of land behind the residents properties from numbers 13 Church Lane to 65 Church Lane owned by Mr R Whitemore at no 19 Church Lane, could be considered to be listed as an area of separation.</p> <p>This land has a Group TPO in place and would be ideal to form an area of separation to protect the trees and the privacy of the residents which was detailed as a major concern of the Planning Inspectorate in the refusal for development earlier this year.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would give us strong consideration to discuss this in your review meeting with a view to implementing this, as this would also form a natural continuation for Whitwick cemetery.</p>	<p>The extent of the Area of Separation (to the rear of Church Lane) in the Draft Local Plan follows the boundary of the current Green Wedge which does not extend further north-east than Whitwick Cemetery.</p>		Mr J Doonan	NA
<p>Other regions of the district which are of the border of the county and are adjacent to built up developments of the neighbouring county should be identified as areas that should be maintained as areas of separation to prevent coalescence of the counties.</p>	<p>Outside of the Limits to Development land identified as Countryside (the majority of the District) would be subject to the Draft Local Plan Countryside Policy (S4) which seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements. If a development proposal was cross-boundary the Council would work with the adjacent authority to ensure sustainable development.</p>		Alison Saxby	N/A
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		Sonia Liff	Chair Appleby Environment
<p>(a) The Labour Group agrees in principle with Policy En5</p> <p>(b) Policy En5 needs to be expanded to all NWL communities. Communities be encouraged to define 'Areas of Separation' between their settlements.</p> <p>(c) The Labour Group demand a policy to deal with 'Coalescence', maintaining separation between settlements on the boundary with another local authority or Parish. Where an area of countryside is the only separation and reliance on another authority for services is necessary for sustainability, that separation should be maintained in perpetuity</p> <p>(d) All 'Areas of Separation' be enshrined in perpetuity</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Outside of the Limits to Development land identified as Countryside (the majority of the District) would be subject to the Draft Local Plan Countryside Policy (S4) which seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements. If a development proposal was cross-boundary the Council would work with the adjacent authority to ensure sustainable development.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader

<p>The Draft Local Plan proposals map shows an extensive area south of Church Lane, between Thornborough Road and Hermitage Road as forming part of the proposed Area of Local Separation. There is the opportunity for some limited development on land west of Whitwick Cemetery that would not threaten the separate identity of Coalville and Whitwick.</p>	<p>Currently the extent of the Area of Separation (to the rear of Church Lane) in the Draft Local Plan follows the boundary of the current Green Wedge designation which does not extend further north-east than Whitwick Cemetery.</p> <p>The Area of Separation Policy (En5) does not prevent development per se.</p>		Helen Prangley	Western Range
<p>Other designations in the district required.</p>	<p>For areas outside of the Area of Separation designation Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>There is no specific support for the designation of Areas of Separation within national planning policy. Indeed, on the basis that the NPPF requires Plans to be positively prepared, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change and meet not only the objectively assessed needs of the District but respond positively to wider opportunities for growth also, it must be right that such a negative and restrictive policy should only be adopted in the event that the evidence in its favour is compelling.</p> <p>Perhaps more importantly, the Council's justification for the designation (as set out within its Green Wedge Background Paper 2012) is woefully inadequate. For the case for the designation to be compelling it must be underpinned by a thorough analysis of the land itself and the development that surrounds it (focussing, in particular, on form, function, character, and settlement identity). At the very least, the analysis should present clear evidence on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) where Coalville ends and Whitwick begins; ii) how the character and identity of the two settlements differ; iii) precisely where separation is required and why; and, iv) what specific harm would be caused by developing land that the Council believes should be kept open. <p>Moreover, in the light of the overarching need to provide for sustainable growth in line with the NPPF, it should be necessary also to weigh in the balance the development potential of the land, the sustainability of the location and the benefits that would flow from allowing its release for residential development.</p>	<p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF makes it clear that a key principle of the planning system is to "take account of the different roles and character of different areas..." whilst paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that " Plans should allocate land [for development] with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in the Framework".</p> <p>The proposed Area of Separation recognises the important role played by the undeveloped open area between Coalville and Whiwtick in terms of maintaining the separation of these two settlements. Development on this area would result in the undesirable coalescence of Coalville and Whitwck.</p> <p>Furthermore, sufficient sites have been identified elsewhere to meet the identified housing requirements. Development on this area would represent the unwarranted and unnecessary loss of this important open and undeveloped area, and undermine the overall strategy of the local plan, with respect to Coalville and also the wider district. The Council is concerned that development within the existing Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would undermine the successful delivery of the south east Coalville major urban extension, which benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission across the whole site, and detailed permission that is under construction on specific parcels. Development of the existing Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would therefore go to the heart of the plan, and is not the preferred strategy of</p>		Tim Evans	Bilfinger GVA

<p>However, the GW Background Paper contains no such analysis. Instead, it contains superfluous information on the history of the Green Wedge and the Council's assessment of it; irrelevant references to NPPF policy on Local Green Spaces; a biased and incomplete summary of the Council's Green Spaces Consultation; no reference at all to the Regeneration Strategy for Coalville produced by the Council for the Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment (see below) or the Council's Sustainability Appraisal; and incomplete summary of the Settlement Fringe Assessment (see below); and conclusions, at paragraphs 10.26 and 10.27 that do not flow either from the information that precedes or follows them and are not underpinned by relevant evidence. Indeed, the evidence base compiled by the Council demonstrates that the designation is inappropriate, unnecessary and, if adopted, would prevent much needed, sustainable development and impact adversely on the Plan's flexibility and its ability to achieve the most sustainable pattern of development. It confirms that:</p> <p>a) the land is the most sustainable for new housing development in the Whitwick urban area;</p> <p>b) the land has been assessed for its contribution to the urban fringe and its ability to accommodate growth in the context of the need to respect the setting of settlements and has been found to be the most suitable for development of all the sites in and around Coalville Urban Area (see Settlement Fringe Assessment); and,</p> <p>c) it has been specifically assessed for its ability to accommodate development that maintains an appropriate degree of separation between Coalville and Whitwick and which complements the wider urban form and has found to be suitable. This analysis, contained within the Coalville Regeneration Strategy contemplated a Settlement Structure Plan which was drawn to reinforce the centres of Thringstone, Whitwick, Swannington, Ravenstone and Ellistown, with new centres based on an existing and proposed network of streets. Of particular relevance to the Area of Separation Designation is the fact that the Foundation's Plan defined the extent of the settlements of Coalville and Whitwick and identified also where separation needs to be maintained. The conclusions reached by the Foundation were accepted / endorsed by the Council's Cabinet in October 2009 when Officers reported that "accommodating growth in Greater Coalville can still be achieved whilst also preserving the physical identity and character of the separate villages" and went on to emphasise that "to achieve this, a policy for any development in that part of the Green Wedge between Stephenson Way and Hall Lane (in effect the eastern part of the Green Wedge) would need to</p>	<p>the Council, which together with the private sector developers has invested significant sums to bring forward the major urban extension.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>require the provision of an open area of to the east of Hermitage Road and south of Hall Lane to preserve the physical separation of Whitwick from Coalville.” (see Prince’s Foundation Regeneration Strategy for Coalville; pages 25-27. And NWLDC Cabinet Report of 20 October 2009: paragraph 5.4.23).</p> <p>With regard to (c) it will be noted that our Client has applied for planning permission for the development of part of the land adjacent to Hall Lane. Through that application it has looked very closely at the issue of settlement separation.</p> <p>Moreover, it has designed proposals that would retain a significant green buffer between Whitwick and Coalville that is consistent with the Council’s evidence on separation and could be constructed without prejudicing the Council’s proposals to designate the land as an Area of Separation. Our Clients proposals are shown on the attached Illustrate Masterplan.</p> <p>As things stand, the Council’s Area of Separation proposal has not been positively prepared, is not justified, impacts adversely on the ability of the Plan to be effective, and is at odds with the NPPF. As a consequence, Policy En5 is not sound.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p>I would like included again, that the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, be clearly identified and protected in the local plan, as being an unallocated Greenfield land located outside the limits to development of Coalville, as defined in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan, confirmed as being an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside, forming part of the Charnwood and National Forests. Therefore, should be protected against any future development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see the land at Greenhill Farm, south side of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire, protected from any future development, for the below mentioned reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This particular area of land is confirmed as an important wildlife corridor linking Bardon Hill SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest), Charnwood Lodge NNR (National Nature Reserve), Holly Rock Fields SSSI, and Coalville Meadows SSSI. o This site lies outside of the town's identified Limits to Development, as defined in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, and is considered best and most versatile agricultural land. o This site is visible from particular points of interest to Coalville, and very much in the landscape between Bardon Hill and Warren Hills. For anybody familiar with Leicestershire, and Bardon Hill (being the highest point in Leicestershire) would confirm that this area and its incredible views of Leicestershire, is very much a jewel in the Crown of North West Leicestershire. <p>To both Coalville residents and the wider local Leicestershire area, these fields are a valued asset to the community, considered of high community and landscape value. With this particular area being considered as an attractive gateway to Coalville, in what I would consider a tranquil area.</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation between Coalville and Whitwick have been designated as they fall within the Limits to Development and therefore are not subject to the Countryside Policy. Outside of the Limits to Development land identified as Countryside (the majority of the District) would be subject to the Draft Local Plan Countryside Policy (S4) which seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements. Policy S4 seeks to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife and the wealth of its natural resources.</p> <p>In regards to the protection of designated ecological sites such as SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites Policy En1: Nature conservation seeks to protect such areas.</p>		Mrs Trena Elizabeth Ball	NA
---	---	--	--------------------------	----

<p>No don't agree with this approach, they consider that housing land could be provided in the area that could maintain an appropriate amount of separation between Coalville and whitwick and doubt whether the principle of separation between Coalville and Whitwick should be provided as an appropriate objective given the importance the need to provide appropriate levels of housing and the role Coalville in making that provision.</p>	<p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF makes it clear that a key principle of the planning system is to “take account of the different roles and character of different areas...” whilst paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that “ Plans should allocate land [for development] with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in the Framework”.</p> <p>The proposed Area of Separation recognises the important role played by the undeveloped open area between Coalville and Whiwtkick in terms of maintaining the separation of these two settlements. Development on this area would result in the undesirable coalescence of Coalville and Whitwck.</p> <p>Furthermore, sufficient sites have been identified elsewhere to meet the identified housing requirements. Development on this area would represent the unwarranted and unnecessary loss of this important open and undeveloped area, and undermine the overall strategy of the local plan, with respect to Coalville and also the wider district. The Council is concerned that development within the existing Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would undermine the successful delivery of the south east Coalville major urban extension, which benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission across the whole site, and detailed permission that is under construction on specific parcels. Development of the existing Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would therefore go to the heart of the plan, and is not the preferred strategy of the Council, which together with the private sector developers has invested significant sums to bring forward the major urban extension.</p>		Simon Chadwick	Signet Planning on behalf of William Davis
--	--	--	----------------	--

<p>Yes. Other regions of the district which are of the border of the county and are adjacent to built up developments of the neighbouring county should be identified as areas that should be maintained as areas of separation to prevent coalescence of the counties.</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation between Coalville and Whitwick have been designated as they fall within the Limits to Development and therefore are not subject to the Countryside Policy. Outside of the Limits to Development land identified as Countryside (the majority of the District) would be subject to the Draft Local Plan Countryside Policy (S4) which seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements. If a development proposal was cross-boundary the Council would work with the adjacent authority to ensure sustainable development.</p>		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
<p>The policy arbitrarily restricts development in sustainable urban and rural settlements contrary to the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.</p> <p>Policy En5 designates Areas of Separation the identification of such designations must be predicted on a robust comprehensive evidence base that can be used in the planning balance.</p> <p>Areas of separation have been questioned by inspectors in recent appeal decision. due to not being compliant with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Gladman therefore object to the area of separation</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF makes it clear that a key principle of the planning system is to “take account of the different roles and character of different areas...”. The proposed Area of Separation recognises the important role played by the undeveloped open area between Coalville and Whiwtick in terms of maintaining the separation of these two settlements. Development on this area would result in the undesirable coalescence of Coalville and Whitwck and undermine the overall strategy of the local plan, with respect to Coalville and also the wider district. The Council is concerned that development within the existing Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would undermine the successful delivery of the south east Coalville major urban extension, which benefits from a resolution to grant planning permission across the whole site, and detailed permission that is under construction on specific parcels. Development of the existing Green Wedge / proposed Area of Separation would therefore go to the heart of the plan, and is not the preferred strategy of the Council, which together with the private sector developers has invested significant sums to bring forward the major urban extension..</p>		Phil Bamford	Gladman on behalf of Wilton Balmore.
<p>I’m of the opinion that adequate policies should be in place to create protection zones for existing communities / hamlets, such as Abbott’s Oak, from inappropriate development and urban sprawl.</p>	<p>For areas outside of the area of separation designation Draft Local Plan Policy S4: Countryside seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements.</p>		Jonathan Ball	n/a

<p>Yes but why are other areas of separation e.g. Castle Donington, Hemington, Lockington etc not considered with the same approach.</p>	<p>The Areas of Separation between Coalville and Whitwick have been designated as they fall within the Limits to Development and therefore are not subject to the Countryside Policy. Outside of the Limits to Development land identified as Countryside (the majority of the District) would be subject to the Draft Local Plan Countryside Policy (S4) which seeks to prevent development (either individually or cumulatively) that would undermine the physical or perceived separation and open undeveloped character between nearby settlements</p>		<p>Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council</p>	<p>Castle Donington Parish Council</p>
<p>In response to Q45 I agree with the suggested approach but would urge the Council to include an adjoining piece of land into that area of separation. The land to the rear of 19 and 63 Church Lane Whitwick has been the subject of a number of planning applications the latest of which was refused; a decision subsequently upheld at appeal (APP/G2435/A/14/2222723) see attached decision notice.</p> <p>The main issues were the effects of the proposed development on the character & appearance of the area including its effect on trees protected by a Group Tree Preservation Order, and on the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of properties fronting Church Lane taking particular account of privacy.</p> <p>The residents have been fighting against any development on this site for a number of years & feel that the group tree preservation order is a valuable protection but if a developer wishes to develop, the trees could be removed/damaged “accidentally” during an investigation stage, such are the small fines involved.</p> <p>Given that En5 suggests that (pt 2) development will not be permitted which would significantly adversely affect or diminish the present open & undeveloped character of the area it seems absurd that the proposed area of separation abuts this piece of land but doesn’t include it even though the points made by the planning inspector are roughly the same.</p> <p>The parcel of land forms part of the garden of 19 Church Lane, even though an entrance has been formed through to this land through an area that was previously the garden of No 61 Church Lane. As this land (as garden land) is now regarded as Greenfield land and any proposed development would not be favourably regarded, it would seem logical to include this land – which extends down to the leisure centre – in any area of separation. Indeed I would argue that it is more logical to include it than exclude it</p>	<p>The boundary of the Area of Separation follows the boundary of the previous Green Wedge designation.</p> <p>When compared to land to the rear of 19 and 63 Church Lane, Whitwick the Area of Separation is markedly different in terms of landscape, tree cover and openness. The existing designation provides a logical, defensible boundary.</p>		<p>Ruth Robinson</p>	<p>NA</p>

<p>I would strongly urge the Council to consider including this area in the Area of Separation proposed to protect the character of the site & to add further protection to the group tree preservation order.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

Policy En6 – Land and Air Quality

Question 46 Do you agree with our suggested approach to Land and Air Quality issues? If not what changes do you suggest? - Please provide further comments;	NWL Response	Any change required	Name	Business or organisation name;
Yes	noted		Lisa Marron	Resident
Yes	noted		Mr s Whitehouse	Personal
Yes	noted		Sue Colledge	colledge's florists
Yes	noted		Nigel Garnham	Packington Nook Residents Association
Encourage the use of low emission/ zero emission vehicles so those who have no choice but to use their own vehicles i.e. those who live in a an area not served by public transport have the ability to access the area but in a way that doesn't increase air pollution, by installing a number of charge points in the car parks around the area.	Planning cannot require people to use low emission vehicles but can only try and ensure development is located so that people have the option to use alternatives. National Planning Policy (NPPF, Para. 34) encourages the use of sustainable transport modes to ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Para. 35 of the NPPF states that "developments should be located and designed where practical to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles". The provision of electric charging points is set out in National Policy and therefore does not need to be repeated in local policy.		Stella Farrar	none
Yes	Noted		Mark Chadbourn	Emerald Eye Ltd
Yes	Noted		Alison Wright	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Samantha Lockwood	Long Whatton and Diseworth Parish Council

Air quality won't improve until you have a structured transport plan.	<p>Noted. The County Council are the Highways Authority and are responsible for publishing Transport Plans for Leicestershire. The current Local Transport Plan is LTP3 which consists of two parts, the long-term Strategy (2011-2026) and the short-term (3 year) Implementation Plan(s).</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with the highway authorities to ensure that development takes account of the impact upon the environment and regard will be had to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans submitted to support planning applications (Policy IF4). Proposals for development on land within or close to an Air Quality Management Area will be supported providing that a planning application is accompanied by a detailed investigation and assessment of the issues and appropriate mitigation measures are identified (Policy En6).</p>		david harris	Pyrotect Ltd
Yes	Noted		Andrew Stone	NA
Yes	Noted		Trevor Davis	None
Agree, but feel local knowledge by the Parish Council should be acknowledged with regards to old coalfields workings.	Noted. The Parish Council, in its response to planning applications or consultations on planning policy documents, is able to provide any relevant information on previous coalfield workings.		Measham Parish Council	Measham Parish Council

<p>Generally, the approach suggested within this policy for land quality issues is satisfactory.</p> <p>For development of specific areas within NW Leicestershire, the risk management framework provided in CLR11 (Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination), should be followed when dealing with land affected by contamination. This is expected to include detailed investigations and assessment of the site conditions and potential pollution issues identified.</p> <p>Additionally, the Environment Agency 'Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice' (GP3) document sets out our position on a wide range of activities and developments, some of which include but are not restricted to protection of groundwater resources, addressing land contamination issues, waste management, sustainable drainage etc (revisions to Parts 4 and 5 are currently being finalised). This should essentially be referred to for any proposed development and is available from our website: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-principles-and-practice-gp3.</p> <p>We are aware of issues with the sewerage infrastructure, i.e. lack of available capacity for future development, in parts of Coalville. Modelling for individual developments has indicated potential increase in foul flooding and pollution arising from increase frequency of combined storm overflow operation. However, Severn Trent Water Limited currently have a ongoing program of improvements (the "Coalville Sewerage Strategy") in order to address these issues.</p>	<p>Noted. Wording to be added to the supporting text.</p>	<p>At the end of paragrpagh 9.48 add in: "The Environment Agency set out their position on the protection of ground water resources in their document 'Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice'. Regard should be had to this document for any proposed development. Add in anew paragraph after 9.46 "Further information regarding the management of land contamination can be found in advice published by the EA as part of the risk management framework (CLR11). Regard should be had to this document for any proposed development".</p>	<p>Geoff Platts</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>
<p>Land and air quality should be maintained – NWL needs to work closely with the Environment Agency. The attention paid to soils in En6 is welcome.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Andrew and Anne Heaton</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>		<p>Lance Wiggins</p>	<p>Landmark Planning</p>
<p>The A511 should be upgraded to a dual carriageway from Bardon Island to the A42 to reduce congestion and vehicle emissions. the only other source of air pollution is the dust from local quarries.</p>	<p>Where appropriate new development will be expected to contribute towards highway improvements. Draft Local Plan Policy IF4 (Transport Infrastructure and new development) sets out highway improvements which includes, in part (e), the provision for local road improvements to the A511 corridor between J22 of the M1 and J13 of the A42.</p> <p>The Council is responsible for assessing the present and future air quality in the District. The Council must identify the main sources of pollutants affecting air quality in relation to the requirements of the National Air Quality Strategy.</p>		<p>Yvonne Willars</p>	<p>retired</p>

Yes	Noted		Mr. j Lewis	1950
It must be very difficult to avoid the issue of air pollution while also planning for more car use. The fact that motor vehicle manufacturers have been found to be lying about emissions must throw another spanner in the works too. Policies encouraging less car use or of non polluting vehicles need to be bought forward by by local and national government. Of course as in all things, the public need to care enough to make the politicians change the policies.	<p>The Draft Local Plan seeks to achieve a sustainable pattern of development so that people have the option to use alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>The main focus of national planning policy is sustainable development, a Core Principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is for planning to "actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable".</p> <p>Policy IF4 of the Draft Local Plan identifies that, where appropriate, new development will be expected to contribute towards the provision of new public transport services, or the enhancement of existing services, to serve developments so that accessibility by non-car modes is maximised.</p> <p>Whether people to then chose to use the private car or public transport is something outside of the remit of the planning system.</p>		Steve Johnson	YYYY
Yes	Noted		Lesley Birtwistle	not applicable
Yes	Noted		Mrs Paula Ashfield	Paula Ashfield
Yes	Noted		Paul Varty	Resident of Appleby
Yes	Noted		Tim Abbott	Householder
Policies with specific reference to traffic flow and air quality that will be unacceptable/inappropriate following development should be set in place and not solely for the protection of AQMAs which are out of date and with infrequent updates in monitoring data. Since the recent vehicle emissions scandal, this has become more important than ever especially air quality close to schools.	All councils have to assess the present and future air quality of their area in relation to the requirements of the National Air Quality Strategy. As AQMAs are areas designated by local authorities because they are not likely to achieve national air quality objectives by the relevant deadlines it is appropriate to ensure that new development does not make any existing problems worse.		Jane Tebbatt	Quarrying

So long as the District Council monitor very closely what developers findings are re 9.47	Noted. In regards to Air Quality and Noise the Council's Environmental Health Department would corroborate the evidence submitted by a developer. In regards to Coal Mining and associated issues the Coal Authority are statutory consultee's and as such are consulted on applications that fall within the 'Coal Mining Development Referral Area' - which (as identified in Paragraph 9.46) covers the majority of the District. The Coal Authority would be able to verify any Coal Mining Risk Assessments submitted as part of planning applications.		Heather Parish Council	Heather Parish Council
Yes	Noted		Lesley Colley	None
Yes	Noted		Alison Saxby	N/A
KPC believe that there is an AMA on London Road in addition to the two areas identified in the Local plan. KPC believes that the developments around the airport and Roxhill SRFI development are likely to lead to further deterioration in Air quality and noise pollution as the local plan does not have any preventative measures identified to address these issues, only monitoring.	<p>The Council's Environmental Health Department are responsible for assessing the present and future air quality of the district in line with the requirements of the National Air Quality Strategy. Their monitoring involves identifying the main sources of pollutants affecting air quality and identifying any likely impacts (such as new developments, new roads and/or junction alterations) on air quality within areas of the district not currently being monitored.</p> <p>The AQMA at High Street, Kegworth includes London Road, up to the driveway for Alton Lodge.</p>		Vicky Roe	Kegworth Parish Council

<p>(a) The issue of air quality and land contamination is an ongoing problem, and as such this policy needs to be continued until a technical solution can be found.</p> <p>(b) The Labour Group notes the number of air quality monitoring sites but the Draft Plan appears to have no concern for our High Streets and Town Centres where there is a large number of motor vehicles.</p> <p>(c) There is nothing in the draft Local Plan to indicate efforts to REDUCE air pollution.</p>	<p>In regards to the longevity of the Policy, once the Local Plan is adopted it will cover the period to 2031.</p> <p>The Council's Environmental Health Department assess the present and future air quality in the District in line with the requirements set out in the National Air Quality Strategy. The National Air Quality Strategy sets out three stages of review and assessment for councils to follow. Air quality in the district is continually reviewed and assessed every year as part of which areas are identified that are not currently being monitored but may be impacted upon by new developments, new roads and/or junction alterations.</p> <p>In terms of air pollution Draft Local Plan Policy IF4 provides for new development, where appropriate, to contribute towards cycle links, footpaths and public transport in order to offer more transport choices, reduce reliance on the private car and to reduce emissions.</p>		Sue McKendrick	Labour Group leader
<p>New areas of development should be checked not only existing ones.</p>	<p>Policy En6 refers to proposals for new development and sets out requirements for developers in terms of land and air quality.</p>		C Tandy	Ashby de la Zouch Civic Society
<p>The Coal Authority supports this policy which sets out a suitable framework for addressing land instability, including that arising from mining legacy. The Coal Authority considers that the unstable land criteria are appropriate and relevant to North West Leicestershire and positively comply with the requirements of the NPPF and NPPG. This has responded positively to the informal consultation the Council undertook with The Coal Authority in September 2014.</p> <p>Change Requested - Amend Policy En6 to read as follows:</p> <p>Policy En6 – Land and air quality</p> <p>Proposals for development on land that is (or suspected of being) subject to land instability issues or contamination, or is located within the defined Development High Risk Area or within or close to an Air Quality management Area or close to a known source of noise will be supported where:</p> <p>a) A planning application is accompanied by a detailed investigation and assessment of the issues; and</p> <p>b) Appropriate mitigation measures are identified which avoid any adverse impacts upon the site or adjacent areas, including</p>	<p>Wording to be amended as suggested.</p>	<p>Delete reference to Coal Mining Development Referral Area and replace with "defined Development High Risk Area". Delete last sentence of 9.46 and replace with " and those exceptions as identified on the Coal Authority's exemptions list, all new development proposals within the defined Development High Risk Area must be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent, in order to identify any potential risks to the new development and any required remediation measures required. These assessments must be carried out by a suitably qualified person to the current British Standards and approved guidance".</p>	Chris MacArthur	The Coal Authority

<p>ground water quality.</p> <p>Development should avoid any adverse impact upon soils of high environmental value (for example wetland and other specific soils) and ensure that soil resources are conserved and managed in a sustainable way.</p> <p>9.46 North West Leicestershire has a long history of coal mining and heavy industry. This has left a legacy of potential land instability and contamination issues. The Coal Authority has a defined a 'Development High Risk Area' that covers most of the district. In this area the potential land instability and other safety risks associated with former coal mining activities are likely to be greatest. They include, for example, areas of known or suspected shallow coal mining, recorded mine entries and areas of former surface mining. Other than householder developments and those exceptions as identified on the Coal Authority's exemptions list, all new development proposals within the defined Development High Risk Area must be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, or equivalent, in order to identify any potential risks to the new development and any required remediation measures required. These assessments must be carried out by a suitably qualified person to the current British Standards and approved guidance.</p> <p>Reason – In order to ensure that issues of land stability are clearly identified in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.</p>				
Yes	Noted.		Mrs. A Saxby	n/a
Yes	Noted.		Fiona Palmer, Clerk to the Parish Council	Castle Donington Parish Council

