

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES

CHAPTER: 9	POLICY NUMBER: IF2	POLICY NAME: Community Facilities		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support				
Support this proposed policy as meeting places reduce social isolation and improve mental health and wellbeing, sufficient health services enable us to respond to the public need, and cultural and sports facilities to support health and wellbeing.	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Although not linked to this representation, some changes are recommended to improve the interpretation of the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain in the supporting text the types of factors which will determine ‘reasonable access’ in Part (2)(a)(ii) of the policy should be judged. • Amend the supporting text to refer to ‘reasonable’ access rather than ‘convenient’ access. • Replace ‘no reasonable demand’ with the more straightforward ‘insufficient demand’ in Part (2)(c) and add information about how this could be demonstrated. 	<p>Amend the supporting text to explain the types of factors which will determine ‘reasonable access’ and substitute ‘reasonable’ for ‘convenient’ in paragraph 9.16</p> <p>Amend Part (2)(c) to read “For commercial community facilities only, there is no reasonable insufficient demand to use the premises for their current/most recent use as evidenced by robust marketing of the premises at current market value for a continuous period of at least 6 months. If the Council requires independent verification of the evidence</p>	45	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board (NHS)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		submitted, this will be at the applicant's expense." Linked changes to the supporting text will be required.		
Policy IF2(3) "Major residential/residential led development is required to make provision for..."				
Extremely concerned that the wording in para 3 has been diluted in comparison with the current policy. The new policy requires major development only to "make provision for" new community facilities, whereas the current Local Plan wording is "provide or contribute to" them. We have recently experienced at Money Hill, under a s106 agreement, the developer only setting aside some land for a community facility, the facility only being built if it is to be purchased or leased from them at commercial rates. That s106 agreement was agreed prior to the current Local Plan being adopted. It would be expected that, under the current plan, the developer would have been required to make a significant financial contribution towards building a facility. Please revert to the current wording.	Change to the policy wording to 'provide for' which would encompass land, buildings and financial contributions.	Amend part (3) to read: "Major residential/ residential-led development is required to make provision provide for new community facilities where no facilities exist or..."	92	Ashby Town Council
Object to part 3 of the draft policy. This states 'major residential/residential-led development is required to make	There is a study underway which will, amongst other things, identify the levels of provision and the	At an appropriate point in the supporting text, reiterate the requirement	150	David Wilson Homes

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
provision for new community facilities where no facilities exist or facilities are insufficient for the demand likely to be generated from new development'. This policy provides no detail in relation to what is regarded as 'insufficient'. It is considered that this policy needs to be reworded to provide sufficient detail. This is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 31 [now paragraph 32] which states: 'the preparation and review of all policies should be under pinned by relevant and up to date evidence'.	demand for playing pitches, built sports and community facilities (including community centres, village halls) and open spaces (including play areas, allotments). This will provide an evidence base to support the application of Policy IF2 and may necessitate changes to the policy. The study is due to be completed before the Reg 19 plan is finalised. This study, and the types of facility it deals with, will help users of the plan apply Part (3) of the policy.	that any development contributions for community development must relate to the nature and scale of the development proposed (Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 and NPPF paragraph 58).		
A need for Community Facilities should be properly defined			180	Ashby Wolds Town Council
Recognise there is a need for major residential development to make provision for new community facilities or to improve existing facilities where these are directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	Noted. The tests for planning obligations cited in this representation are listed in NPPF paragraph 58 and are referenced in the plan's supporting text for Policy IF1 – Development and Infrastructure. For completeness, and to support Part (3) of Policy IF2, they could also be briefly mentioned in the supporting text for Policy IF2 including that any requirement for developer contributions towards community infrastructure must be related to	At an appropriate point in the supporting text, add a reference to the tests for planning obligations (NPPF paragraph 58) which affirm that any development contributions for community facilities must relate to the nature and scale of the development proposed.	245 256	Bloor; Cameron Homes

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	the nature and scale of the development proposed.			
Supporting text				
Do not agree that there should be no definitive list for ‘community facilities’, there should be a list of what is a Community Facility to prevent grey areas and potential conflict.	Types of community facilities are listed in a number of places in the NPPF for example “community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship” (paragraph 98). However it is noted that even the NPPF is not definitive on what may constitute a community facility. The plan’s supporting text provides a description of community facilities as “buildings or spaces which provide a valuable service that local people rely upon, including for their everyday needs”. This, coupled with the examples which follow it and the NPPF, are considered to give sufficient guidance for the determination of planning applications.	No change	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council
We welcome the plan’s support for valued facilities, including protection from loss. However, we recommend some minor changes to make the policy more effective:	Agree that ‘theatre’ can be added to the list of examples in paragraph 9.14. A marketing period of 6 months is considered to strike an appropriate	Add ‘theatre’ to the list of examples of cultural and sports facilities in paragraph 9.14.	538	Theatres Trust

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> paragraph 9.14 should make clear that cultural facilities also includes theatres and other such performance venues. the marketing period for 'commercial' community uses should be increased to at least twelve months, but ideally eighteen or longer, giving the community time to fundraise and submit grant applications. It will also better demonstrate a facility is genuinely no longer required and protect from unnecessary loss in line with paragraph 97 of the NPPF (2023) 	balance between evidencing that a facility is no longer operational and allowing appropriate development to go ahead. Communities can ask for a facility to be identified as an Asset of Community Value. If granted, the local community would have a six-month option to acquire the premises if they are put up for sale.			
Other matters				
A lack of community facilities will increase the need to travel. It is a matter for the District Council to consider whether it should seek contributions via Section 106 Agreements for individual sites or adopt a District Wide Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge to spread funding across all relevant developments.	Noted. The Council has not made any decision to progress a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).	No change	220	CRPE
The lack of growth afforded to the Sustainable Villages will result in a decline in the vitality and viability of village services and facilities and a lack of new investment in physical, social and green infrastructure. This will result	This is primarily a comment about the overall spatial strategy of the plan (Policy S1). Representations to Policy S1 were considered at Local Plan Committee on 14 August 2024	No change	245 256	Bloor; Cameron Homes

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
in a decline in the sustainability of villages such as Heather/Appleby Magna.				
In addition to the provisions outlined in the policy, prior consideration needs to be given to permitting additional sustainable development within a settlement in order to support the continued economically viable use of existing community facilities.	Noted. The draft plan allows for additional development within the most sustainable settlements (see Policy S2).	No change	341	LCC (Property)
Facilities in specific villages				
The current surgery in the village [Ibstock] is already overwhelmed and cannot provide a good service to the current population, this will be drastically increased with a new development. Will they provide a surgery to ease the pressure?	Noted. This representation is primarily an objection to the proposed housing allocation Ib18 – Land off Leicester Road, Ibstock rather than a comment on Policy IF2. The objections to site Ib18 were considered and addressed at the Local Plan Committee meeting on 11 March 2025 .	No change	414	Emily Massey
Facilities in the village [Kegworth] have been taken over by volunteers to avoid them disappearing altogether. Pubs and independent shops have disappeared, businesses being replaced by accommodation usually. The removal of public toilets has impacted many residents - particularly the elderly. This has increased the risk of isolation in the village.	Noted. Policy IF2 will help to prevent the unjustified loss of community facilities by setting clear criteria against which planning applications will be determined. In addition, the new housing proposed in the plan will a) increase the potential customer base for existing facilities; and b) provide for new and enhanced	No change.	565	Mark Payne

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF2 (COMMUNITY FACILITIES)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	community facilities in line with Part (3) of the policy.			

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF6 (LEICESTER TO BURTON LINE)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES

CHAPTER:	POLICY NUMBER: IF6	POLICY NAME: LEICESTER TO BURTON RAIL LINE		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support	Noted	No change	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
ODAPC approve of the policy but would like to see a station at Moira included. This would encourage additional visitors to The Heart of the Forest tourist attractions such as Conkers & Moira Furnace and would also enable people to commute by train to the area to stay at campsites and the youth hostel and to commute to Leicester/Derby for work.	it would be premature in the absence of a definitive and costed proposal to seek to protect certain specific sites for stations, not least because there is a risk that the Council could be served with a Purchase Notice in the event that an alternative proposal at a potential station site was refused planning permission.	No change	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council
A popular reinstatement, which has the full support of Ashby Woulds Town Council, but the failure to propose a station within Moira is seen as a glaring omission within the Heart of the National Forest which would be a missed opportunity not to promote this wonderfully rejuvenated area and facilitate community transport within it. AWTC wants to see a station within the parish and urges NWLDC to build this into the plan.	it would be premature in the absence of a definitive and costed proposal to seek to protect certain specific sites for stations, not least because there is a risk that the Council could be served with a Purchase Notice in the event that an alternative proposal at a potential station site was refused planning permission.	No change	180	Ashby Wolds Town Council
We note and support the content of the policy and welcome the opportunity to		No change	244	Network Rail

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF6 (LEICESTER TO BURTON LINE)

<p>work with the council towards reintroducing passenger services on this line.</p> <p>It should be noted that reintroducing passenger services and increasing rail traffic on this line will have an impact on level crossings and funding will need to be sought for either safety improvements to these crossings or ideally the closure of said level crossings where possible, and the policy should be supportive of these safety measures that will be vital in the delivery of passenger services. We would ask that wording to reflect this is included in the policy so that it is captured in the local plan.</p>	<p>In the event of there being a demonstrable impact upon a level crossing as a result of proposed development, then this would be a material consideration. Policy IF1 (Development and Infrastructure) 2(c) refers to “public transport and associated facilities” which would include level crossings.</p>			
<p>No passenger rail services in NWL. Policy IF6 – Leicester – Burton rail line passing through Swannington. Possible Stations at Ashby and Coalville</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>289</p>	<p>Swannington Parish Council</p>
<p>Whilst the reopening of the Ivanhoe rail line to passenger traffic, either in part or in full, is subject to ongoing business case development and Ministerial funding approvals, nevertheless it is suggested that the Plan could perhaps go further on this matter than is currently being proposed. In particular, should the Plan be seeking to secure developer contributions, if not to works on the line/reinstatement of services themselves, but then at least to the provision of supporting infrastructure,</p>	<p>it would be premature in the absence of a definitive and costed proposal to seek to protect certain specific sites for stations, not least because there is a risk that the Council could be served with a Purchase Notice in the event that an alternative proposal at a potential station site was refused planning permission.</p> <p>Policy IF1 (Development and Infrastructure) addresses the type</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF6 (LEICESTER TO BURTON LINE)

e.g. at stations? If so, this could be something written into proposed Policy IF6, or alternatively perhaps picked up as part of a wider range of transport measures through an area Strategy approach (i.e. through a joint or separate transport Strategies for Coalville and Ashby).	of infrastructure which new development may need to contribute to, this includes “public transport and associated facilities” which would include rail service and potential station sites.			
<p>This policy needs to be strengthened, in particular with regard to safeguarding all possible sites for stations including Coalville, Ashby, Moira, Swannington and Beveridge Lane (for Bardon employment area and Ellistown).</p> <p>Paragraph 9.40 of the proposed policies mentions the railway line that passes close to Castle Donington. Following the cancellation of HS2 Eastern Leg, it is important to find some other way to provide fast rail services between Birmingham and Nottingham, and this line is the obvious route for such a service. However, if it is reopened to passenger services, this would also give an opportunity to open a station at Castle Donington, which would be justified by the major housing and</p>	<p>It would be premature in the absence of a definitive and costed proposal to seek to protect certain specific sites for stations, not least because there is a risk that the Council could be served with a Purchase Notice in the event that an alternative proposal at a potential station site was refused planning permission.</p> <p>There are no current proposals to reopen the rail line to the north of Castle Donington to passenger traffic. However, it would be useful for the Local Plan to indicate support for such a proposal. Therefore, it is proposed to amend policy IF6 accordingly</p>	<p>Amend policy IF 6 to state:</p> <p>Policy IF6 – Leicester to Burton Rail Line <u>Reopening of passenger rail services</u></p> <p>(1) The Council will support the provision of passenger rail services on the Leicester to Burton rail line <u>and that between the Midland Mainline and the Cross County line.</u></p> <p>(2) New development will not be permitted which would prejudice the reopening route of the Leicester to Burton rail line <u>or that between the Midland Mainline and the Cross County line.</u></p> <p>(3) The provision of stations, together with</p>	510	Anthony Kay (Rail Future.org)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF6 (LEICESTER TO BURTON LINE)

employment developments that have been built there in recent years and which are envisaged in this Draft Local Plan. There is therefore a need for a further Infrastructure policy to safeguard land for a station at Castle Donington.		ancillary car parking and facilities such as platforms and shelters, at appropriate locations, including Coalville, and Ashby de la Zouch <u>and</u> <u>Castle Donington</u> , will be supported		
---	--	---	--	--

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES

CHAPTER: 9		POLICY NUMBER: IF7		POLICY NAME: ASHBY CANAL					
MAIN ISSUES RAISED		COUNCIL RESPONSE		ACTION		RESPONDENTS ID		RESPONDENTS NAME	
Draft Policy IF7 continues the support and route protection for the restoration of the Ashby Canal provided by Policy IF6 in the adopted Local Plan. The continued support within the draft Plan for the restoration of the Ashby Canal is welcomed.		Noted.		No change.		33, 92, 132, 175, 357		Inland Waterways Association (Lichfield Branch), Ashby Town Council, Canal and River Trust, Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council, Historic England	
Support within the Local Plan for future restoration is important element in ensuring that new development does not risk making restoration more difficult or even preventing it altogether. The draft policy also recognises that suitable canal side facilities will also be needed to support and encourage people to use of it as a recreational resource. This approach is supported.		Noted.		No change.		132		Canal and River Trust	
Pleased that paragraph 1 supports the restoration of the Ashby Canal and that paragraph 3 supports (in principle) an alternative route. No decision has been made on the feasibility of the historic		Noted. Leicestershire County Council (LCC) own the proposed housing site D8.		No change.		190, 531		Ashby Canal Trust, Ashby Canal Association	

route, as such it is important that any potential alternative route is protected where practicable. The most practical alternative route is along the old Midland Railway, now the Ashby Woulds Heritage Trail, owned by Leicestershire County Council and it is important that this route is protected. The old railway route crosses proposed housing site D8. Our aim is to make sure that all routes remain open at this stage. We therefore object to the current proposal for site D8 but feel there is room for a mutually beneficial solution.	LCC have advised that it is still their intention to sell the land, in its entirety, for development for housing. LCC have advised that they have informed the Ashby Canal Association of their position.			
The total restoration of the Ashby Canal is supported; it would boost tourism in The Heart of the Forest and would provide additional walking/cycling routes to improve residents physical and mental wellbeing. As the restoration of the canal continues to struggle for funding all successful development applications in wards along the restoration route should contribute financially (via S106 monies) to the restoration of the Ashby Canal. They should also provide for the local parishes improving facilities for the local community.	Section 106 contributions are secured to address specific issues arising from a development, such as road improvements, new schools, green spaces, or affordable housing. As such the restoration of the Ashby Canal is not something that would be necessarily funded by Section 106 contributions.	No change.	175, 180	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council, Ashby Woulds Town Council
The protected route of the Ashby Canal is shown on the Draft Policies Map and on Inset Maps 17 and 18. The historic route shown around Oakthorpe is not	Noted. Having reviewed the historic OS map provided as part of the representation it is acknowledged that the protected	The protected route of the Ashby Canal around Oakthorpe will be amended on the	33	Inland Waterways Association

accurate as shown. Historic OS maps show that the canal route passed through part of what is now the garden of Springfield Farm, crossed over Chapel Street further north than shown, and ran through the publicly accessible open space land immediately south of the gardens of the buildings along Stretton View, and crossed Coronation Lane further north than shown on the Inset Map. The continuation of the route through the open fields around Oakthorpe to Canal Street is also partly displaced on Inset Map 17 from the correct historic route. For the protection of the canal route provided by Draft Policy IF7 to be fully effective, the route shown should be corrected.	route of the Ashby Canal needs amending.	Policies Map to reflect the route shown on historic OS mapping. The full route will be checked against the historic OS map and amended if needed.		(Lichfield Branch)
The Ashby Canal is a valuable historic feature, although it is not designated as a conservation area, the existing canal should be acknowledged as a valuable non-designated heritage asset.	The Ashby Canal is a Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset) as far as Snarestone Wharf. The route of the Ashby Canal is afforded protection through Policy IF7 of the Local Plan.	No change.	132	Canal and River Trust
GENERAL COMMENTS				
No comments	Noted.	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF8 (PARKING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES

CHAPTER: 9	POLICY NUMBER: IF8	POLICY NAME: Parking and new development		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support				
Support	Support welcomed	No change	92	Ashby Town council
Car parking standards				
Approving developments with insufficient parking spaces cannot be justified. A four-bedroom house is likely to have four cars not 2, and development applications need to accommodate this increased provision, such that there is no need to park on roads.	The Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) has recently been revised and it now prescribes minimum residential parking standards (see Table 28). The off-street residential standards in the revised LHDB and the requirements in NWL's Good Design Supplementary Planning Document (paragraph 11.9) largely align; for example the minimum requirement for a 4-bed home in both documents is 3 spaces. One difference is for single occupancy dwellings where single occupancy can be enforced (for example because the homes managed by a Registered Social Landlord). In these circumstances the NWL Good Design document allows for a single space per property.	Update the supporting text to refer to the latest version of the LHDG. In due course, update the supporting text to refer to the NWL Good Design Guide when completed.	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF8 (PARKING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	An update of the NWL Good Design Guide is in preparation. The draft version of the Guide cross refers to the LHDB parking standards.			
The supporting text identifies that a review of The Leicestershire Highways Design Guide (2022) and Good Design SPD is currently being undertaken. As such, Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land reserve the right to provide further comments on the relevant evidence base and supporting documents.	Noted.	No change.	214	Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Leicestershire Highways Design Guide Table DG11 provides maximum parking standards, which the NPPF discourages (paragraph 112) unless there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing local road network. There is no such clear justification and therefore the district must ensure that there is clear justification when referring to this guidance or when providing its own parking standards. The Council need to provide flexibility in exceptional circumstances to ensure it is not overly restrictive to potential occupiers, for example, if the business operational hours are 24/7, there are shift workers and the bus service does not run outside	The Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) has recently been revised and Part 3 now prescribes minimum residential and non-residential parking standards (see Tables 28 and 29a) as sought in this representation.	No change	185 186	Clowes Wilson Bowden

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF8 (PARKING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
of normal working hours; then sufficient parking is required to accommodate the total amount of employees.				
Lorry parking				
Re Policy IF8(4), it is noted that further work is emerging to ascertain the specific needs and requirements of HGV parking within the district and the wider Leicestershire area. Given the scale of such developments, which may accommodate HGV facilities, consideration should be given in tandem with the assessment of any Strategic Employment sites going forward and their suitability in terms of their location to the Strategic Road Network and existing employment sites.	<p>The first comment is understood to be suggesting that lorry parking and driver facilities could be incorporated into strategic scale employment site allocations and/or be considered at rejected employment sites.</p> <p>Having undertaken a specific call for lorry parking sites, officers are considering how best to deal with this issue in the Local Plan and will report to a future meeting of the Local Plan Committee on this matter.</p> <p>Subject to that, it is recommended that Part 4 of Policy IF8, which sets out the considerations that will apply to applications for lorry parking proposals, be retained in the plan.</p>	The matter of lorry parking provision will be reported to a future meeting of Local Plan Committee.	186	Wilson Bowden
The comment reads “Policy IF8 Sites for lorry parking including overnight provision”.			289	Swannington Parish Council
Cycle parking				
With regards to point (3), there may be circumstances where developers can be conditioned to provide an offsite cycle parking schemes rather than seeking a	<p>This change can be made.</p> <p>Although not directly related to this representation, a wording change</p>	Amend Part (3) as follows:	341	LCC

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF8 (PARKING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
financial contribution. Suggest this part of the policy is modified accordingly.	is recommended to part 2(b) of the policy to refer to 'reasonable' access in place of 'realistic'. This is to achieve consistency with similar requirements in other policies in the Plan. Also add information to the supporting text about the factors which will determine 'reasonable access'	Where it is demonstrated that the specified level of cycle parking cannot be provided on site, one of the following will be sought as appropriate: a) provision off site or b) a financial contribution will be sought towards the provision of public cycle parking facilities as appropriate. Replace the word 'realistic' with 'reasonable' in Part (2)(b) of the policy. Add information about 'reasonable access' to the supporting text.		
EV charging				
Should provide electric charging points for cars.	The NPPF (paragraph 112) states that parking standard policies should take into account adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. Guidance on this matter is provided in Part 3 of the LHDG to which Policy IF8 refers. Further elaboration is not considered necessary.	No change	175 180	ODAPC Ashby Wolds Town Council
Suggest modifying point (1) along the following lines (new text <u>underlined</u>): »development which will generate vehicle trips must provide appropriate levels of vehicle and cycle parking (and associated facilities - e.g. electric vehicle charging points) having regard		No change	341	LCC

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF8 (PARKING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
to.the.latest.guidance.published.by. Leicestershire.County.Council.and.by. the.District.Council?as.well.as.the. relevant.sections.of.the.building. regulations.;	With respect to the provision of the actual EV charging infrastructure, requirements are dealt with in Part S of the Building Regulations and are therefore not repeated in the draft Local Plan.			
Other matters				
Paragraph 9.56 references the ban on sale of new petrol on diesel cars being introduced in 2030, however the Government has now deferred this until 2035.	Agreed.	Update the supporting text as suggested.	341	LCC
Most streets in new developments are dominated by cars. Most new housing developments do not give the appearance of a safe environment to walk or cycle. A move to minimise the need to own so many cars and use them for short journeys is extremely desirable. Where appropriate, thought could be given to the provision of fewer parking spaces than specified in LCC Guidance. This is in line with a desire to see less car use and achieve a better use of land. Where a new development has access to a wide range of facilities, has a genuine and attractive choice of travel, and can secure that in perpetuity, then developers might be encouraged to propose developments where there are conditions restricting car ownership.	<p>NPPF paragraph 113 indicates that maximum parking standards should only be set where there are compelling reasons to do so. There may be cases where, exceptionally, a lower level of parking provision is appropriate but this would need to be judged at planning application stage based on the specific circumstances of the site and proposal. As written, Part (1) of the policy would allow this to happen.</p> <p>With respect to sustainable modes of transport, Policy IF5(3) sets out how these should be maximised where possible and appropriate.</p>	No change.	220	CPRE

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF8 (PARKING AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
The current parking issues in the new estates in the village [lbstock] is awful and makes access for the emergency services near impossible. Will the development [site lb18] consider the need to provide parking for a minimum of two cars per a household and with areas with extra parking for extra cars and visitors? This will allow emergency access and to ensure safety of pedestrians when crossing or using pavements due to cars parking in them.	The Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) has recently been revised and Part 3 now prescribes minimum residential and non-residential parking standards (see Tables 28 and 29a) with additional parking for visitors as sought in this representation.	No change.	414	Emily Massey