

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

CHAPTER 4	POLICY NUMBER – IF1	POLICY NAME – DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
-----------	---------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Policy needs to make clear the threshold where such infrastructure provision would be required.	The thresholds will vary depending upon the type of infrastructure required.	No change	8	James Mattley
Maps provided showing the details and locations of National Grids Assets.	Noted	No change	62	Avison Young o/b/o National Grid Electricity Transmission
Support	Noted	No change	92, 175	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council, Oakthorpe, Donsithorpe and Acresford Parish Council
The policy should include reference to other means of securing developer contributions other than S106 Agreements	It is agreed that it would be helpful to include reference to S278 agreements as well.	In part (3) add in the following text at the end: “or Section 278 Legal Agreements for highways infrastructure” Include reference in supporting text to Section 278 agreements.	112	National Highways
The supporting text should include reference to the need to support public	Noted	No change	139	Leicester City Council

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
transport provision between Leicester City and North West Leicestershire.				
Broadly welcome the policy but note that the supporting evidence base in respect of playing pitches and other recreation facilities needs to be updated. Part (2)(b) should include reference to sport and leisure facilities under community facilities.	<p>Work to update the evidence base is well underway and will be used to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Part (d) of the policy already includes reference to open spaces, sport and recreation facilities. Therefore, there is no need to also include reference under 2(b).</p>	No change	143	Sport England
Development can only be required to mitigate its own impact. It is important to understand the existing issues in respect of infrastructure provision and to ensure that any contributions would mitigate any impacts.	<p>The supporting text already makes clear that “the nature and scale of any planning obligation required has to be related to the scale and type of development proposed”.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will identify the different type of infrastructure which are required to support development.</p>	No change	147	Gladman Developments
Object to the wording of part 1 of the policy as it states, “development <u>will</u> [be supported by ...]”. Development should only be required to mitigate its	It is accepted that development can only be required to address the impacts arising from the development itself. The policy	No change	150	Savills on behalf of David Wilson Homes (East Midlands)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
own impact and cannot be used to address existing deficiencies.	specifically states, “and make contributions as appropriate to,..”. The word appropriate provides the necessary assurance that only those requests which arise directly from the impact of a development will be considered acceptable.			
Supportive of the proposed policy but note that it will be necessary to ensure that sites are deliverable from a viability perspective.	The need to ensure that sites are viable is accepted. A viability assessment of the plan will be undertaken to inform the Regulation 19 version.	No change	182	Boyer Planning o/b/o Redrow Homes East Midlands
No comments to make at this stage but reserve the right to comment on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan when available.	Noted	No change	183	Turley o/b/o Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Redrow Homes Ltd and Wilson
Support the provision of a strategic policy. Requests should be clearly identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and considered as part of any viability evidence to support the plan. Some elements of growth may require strategic infrastructure which together with a delivery mechanism should be outlined in the plan. Other non-strategic infrastructure may require a different approach.	Noted. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change	185	Pegasus Group o/b/o Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support the provision of a strategic policy. Requests should be clearly identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and considered as part of any viability evidence to support the plan. Some elements of growth may require strategic infrastructure which together with a delivery mechanism should be outlined in the plan. Other non-strategic infrastructure may require a different approach.	Noted. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change	186	Pegasus Group o/b/o Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
<p>The proposed approach is appropriate and that it is important to identify any infrastructure requirements as early as possible and to ensure that they are viable.</p> <p>It noted that the Government intends to introduce a new Infrastructure Levy that may offer an opportunity to deliver the infrastructure required to support new development in a more efficient manner.</p>	Noted. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Viability Assessment is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.	No change	187	Define Planning & Design Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Ltd
To maintain the current levels and to accommodate future additional demand created by population growth as the result of new dwellings and other development additional policing resourcing should be taken into consideration.	Development can only be required to address the demonstrable impacts arising from the development itself. Subject to this being the case, contributions towards the provision of additional facilities to support the work of the police can	In part 2(b) add in reference to 'community safety'	205	Leicestershire Police

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	be considered appropriate. To do this it is considered that the policy should be made to include reference to community safety.			
Welcome parts 4 and 5 of the draft policy but consider that the policy should allow for some negotiation to be had between the Council and developers on individual sites. This will enable regard to be had to a sites context and any site specific infrastructure provision.	Paragraph 10 of the Planning Obligations Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that all planning obligations are negotiable. Therefore, it is not necessary for the policy to specifically refer to negotiation.	No change	214	Stantec Uk Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Have concerns regarding the use of transport modelling to support the Local Plan which represents “predict and provide” rather than “determine and provide”. Consider that the Viability Assessment is too late in the process.	The transport modelling is necessary to understand the potential impacts arising from new development. This will include factoring in the potential contribution from sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. The Viability Assessment can only be undertaken when the infrastructure implications arising from new development are clear and these can only be determined when the proposed sites have been agreed.	No change	220	CPRE Leicestershire
Part 5 of Draft Policy IF5 includes “and / or” after part (b), but not after part (a). This should be changed so “and /	This is IF5 – make sure picked up	No change	229	Planning Prospects Limited o/b/o

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
or” is also included after part (a). Public transport services may well be part of any solution and require a financial contribution, but this will not be so in every case, so it must be made clear that these are alternatives to be considered individually or in combination.				P,W,C & R Redfern
This policy wording should be revised to include major economic and employment assets in the district including EMA, along with developments that are within the EMAGIC site, that is one of the tax Sites that are part of the East Midlands Freeport.	This is general policy which will apply to all potential developments. It is not clear as to what this referring. Clarification has been sought but no response has been received.	No change	230	East Midlands Airport
Agree with large parts of this draft Policy IF1 however any infrastructure requirements secured by way of a Section 106 agreement must meet the CIL (Regulation 122) tests. The following wording should be added to part 2) of draft Policy IH1:“Subject to conformity with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 the type of infrastructure required to support new development includes, but is not limited to”.	Meeting the CIL test is a legal requirement which does not need to be expressly included in the policy.	No change	232	Stantec IK Ltd o/b/o Caddick Land

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
No specific comments on this draft policy at this stage but wish to reserve the right to review and comment on the second part of the 'Infrastructure and Delivery Plan' once it is available.	Noted	No change	234	Turley o/b/o IM Properties
Note that development can only be required to mitigate its own impact. The Infrastructure Development Plan must show the existing and known deficiencies in the current infrastructure, before reaching any conclusion on the cumulative effects of new development, and any contribution that is needed from new development to mitigate any impacts. The policy wording should include the opportunity for negotiation around policy requirements for site specific reasons, to reflect any viability challenges identified in the Plan Viability Assessment and for any sites whose circumstances fall outside the parameters of the typologies tested.	<p>Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and a Viability Assessment is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 version of the plan.</p> <p>The IDP will have regard to existing provision together with the outcome of consultation with the various services providers.</p> <p>Paragraph 10 of the Planning Obligations Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that all planning obligations are negotiable. Therefore, it is not necessary for the policy to specifically refer to negotiation.</p>	No change	237	Home Builders Federation
It is noted that Part 1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared, but as the Local Plan makes further progress, each of the allocations will be subject to a more detailed assessment in Part 2 of the IDP. We would welcome the opportunity to review this document in	Noted and agreed that cross boundary discussions in respect of the merging plans for both North West Leicestershire and Hinckley & Bosworth will continue.	No change	238	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>due course and wish to continue working with officers of your Council and Leicestershire County Council to explore the most effective delivery mechanisms for cross-boundary strategic transport schemes required to manage and mitigate the combined impacts of growth.</p> <p>HBBC would like to reserve further comment regarding the 'soundness' of the plan until the pre-submission consultation stage, when any remaining evidence base documents and the policies contained within the Plan have been fully drafted.</p>				
<p>Policy IF1 is not consistent with the provisions of paragraph 57 of the NPPF. The wording needs to be adjusted so that it is made clear in paragraph (1) that the delivery of infrastructure, or contributions towards the delivery of infrastructure, will be sought where it is necessary to do so to make the development acceptable in planning terms and where the infrastructure / contributions sought are directly related to and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.</p>	<p>As set out in the supporting text to the policy, the need to ensure that any contributions are directly related to and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to any proposed development is a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. There is no need for the policy to expressly state this as well.</p>	No change	243	Avison Young o/b/o Jelson Homes

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>Bloor Homes notes the types of infrastructure listed in draft Policy IF1 to support new development. The infrastructure should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Where new development generates a demand for new or improved infrastructure, Bloor Homes recognises that a reliable mechanism such as a planning obligation is necessary.</p> <p>Any infrastructure should be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery plan is being prepared and will support the Regulation 19 plan.</p> <p>Noted. This is a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.</p>	No change	245	Evolve Planning o/b/o Bloor Homes
<p>Cameron Homes notes the types of infrastructure listed in draft Policy IF1 to support new development. The infrastructure should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Where new development generates a demand for new or improved infrastructure, Cameron Homes recognises that a reliable mechanism such as a planning obligation is necessary.</p> <p>Any infrastructure should be necessary to make the development</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery plan is being prepared and will support the Regulation 19 plan.</p>	No change	256	Evolve Planning o/b/o Cameron Homes

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	Noted. This is a requirement of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.			
<p>The County Council is engaged with NWLDC on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan development process and welcome the opportunity to input meaningfully from an early stage.</p> <p>From a highways perspective the policy would benefit from reference to measures that address the cumulative and cross boundary impacts.</p> <p>It is important that schools and home shave access to high quality broadband to support learning.</p> <p>The plan makes reference to Superfast broadband whereas government targets refer to ultrafast, gigabit capable fibre.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The transport modelling being undertaken to support the plan will consider cumulative and cross boundary impacts. However, it is considered that an amendment part (1) of the policy would be appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. The National Planning Policy Framework refers to “full fibre broadband connections” which should be used instead in order to ensure consistency</p>	<p>Amend part (1) to state:</p> <p>“... in order to mitigate its impact, individually and cumulatively with other development, upon the environment and communities”</p> <p>That part(e) be amended to state: “The provision of full fibre broadband connection”</p>	341	Leicestershire County Council
Concerns raised regarding flooding on Duck Lane Appleby Magna due Victorian age drains. New development will make this worse.	If a service or facility is already at capacity, development can only be required to address the demonstrable impacts arising from the development itself. It is for infrastructure providers to	No change	440	Natalie Pettitt

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>There are capacity issues at local hospitals and doctors. It is very difficult to get appointments if you work.</p> <p>The catchment for secondary schools keeps changing which results in siblings going to different schools and friendship groups being broken up.</p> <p>Appleby is the forgotten village, and to our health, child's education and environment the more houses you put into the village the more damaging it will be for everyone.</p>	<p>address any existing deficiency in provision.</p> <p>The catchments for schools are identified by the County Education authority. Having a Local Plan in place will make it easier for them to plan for future requirements, rather than dealing with ad hoc speculative proposals.</p>			
<p>If you're going to keep allowing housing developments you need to make developers build amenities to accommodate them. Doctors surgeries, schools and other childcare settings, substantial green zones for children to play, conservation, infrastructure for vehicles and goods lorries as we live in a national forest zone and already have a high density of through traffic from local businesses. Build on external areas such as Hugglescote massive development which has been allowed without any substantial infrastructure being built to accommodate it.</p>	<p>Consistent with the Community Infrastructure Level Regulations 2010 New development can only be required to address the impact arising from the development itself and must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Policy IF1 seeks to ensure that such provision is made as part of new development.</p>	No change	469	Kyle Warner

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>It is considered unnecessary to keep land for a new school at Ibstock [part of the proposed development off Leicester Road Ibstock] since currently neither St Denys infant school, nor the junior school are full and neither are projected to be at capacity in the next 6 years. Consequently, an additional mainstream school would not benefit the community.</p> <p>However, there is a need for additional capacity is in specialist school provision.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will identify the specific requirements for new education provision based on consultation with the education authority.</p>	No change	495	Ibstock Junior School
<p>The primary school in Ibstock is not even full! So it doesn't make sense at all and the traffic is bad enough as it is, why anyone would want to make it worse I really don't know.</p>	<p>The Education Authority has previously indicated that the primary school was full. The situation pertaining at the time that any planning applications for additional housing development are being considered will determine whether any contributions are required towards schools in the locality.</p>	No change	496	Eeden Varney
<p>There is a lack of clarity on what additional services will be explicitly committed to with the new houses. Please can the actual new surgeries and schools and core utilities to support the additional housing be listed and audited for completion?</p>	<p>The initial Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies which sites will contribute towards the provision of different types of infrastructure. This is being updated.</p>	No change	621	James Norton

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF1 (DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>The proposed approach is considered to be appropriate. It is important that the infrastructure delivery requirements are identified as quickly as possible and that they consider how infrastructure delivery should be funded. That should then be taken account of in a comprehensive Viability Assessment that considers the cumulative costs of the plan's policy requirements. RSL also note that the Government intends to introduce a new Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that may offer an opportunity to deliver the infrastructure required to support new development in a more efficient manner.</p>	<p>The initial Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies which sites will contribute towards the provision of different types of infrastructure. This is being updated. A Viability Assessment will also be undertaken.</p> <p>The potential for a new CIL is noted and its development will be monitored and if necessary introduced at a later date.</p>	No change	656	Define Planning & Design Ltd o/b/o Rosconn Strategic Land

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

CHAPTER: 9	POLICY NUMBER: IF3	POLICY NAME: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
------------	--------------------	-----------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support				
Support	Support welcomed. Although, not linked to these representations, it is suggested that the Plan's supporting text be updated to include the NPPF's definition of green infrastructure.	Replace the Landscape Institute's definition of green infrastructure at paragraph 9.17 of the supporting text with the definition in the NPPF Glossary.	45 92 185 186 245 256	Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Integrated Care Board; Ashby Town Council; Clowes Developments; Wilson Bowden Developments; Bloor Homes; Cameron Homes
IF3 Part (1)				
Reword Part (1) as follows: "...and enhances the existing network of multi-functional spaces and natural features throughout the district <u>where possible</u> ."	The starting sentence of Part (1) states that the Council expects major development to deliver new green infrastructure 'where appropriate'. In these circumstances, the further caveat suggested in this representation is not considered necessary.	No change.	214	Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy IF3 is not justified and will not be effective. The first sentence should be amended to read: "The Council will expect all major development, where	The NPPF confirms the cross-cutting importance of green infrastructure to deliver wide-ranging benefits. It identifies its	No change.	243	Jelson Homes

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<i>necessary and</i> appropriate, to contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure which connects to and enhances the existing network of multi-functional spaces and natural features throughout the district”.	role in climate change, health and well-being, ecology and air quality. In these circumstances, the policy expectation that GI will be provided is reasonable. The inclusion of the phrase ‘where appropriate’ would deal with situations where this is not feasible and adding ‘necessary’ as an additional qualification is not needed.			
Recommend adding reference to Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards in the policy wording and supporting text. These standards can provide the output measures so that developers have certainty over what green infrastructure is needed on site. They can be included as site specific and area-based requirements in site allocation policies.	Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework helps support the delivery of high-quality GI. The Framework is made up of a number of components including the 15 Principles (January 2023) which help describe the attributes and functions of good quality GI and its wide-ranging benefits and the Standards (January 2023) which provide more specific information about good GI and how to plan, deliver and maintain it. The Standards include criteria/ attributes relating to quantity, size, proximity, capacity, quality, accessibility, type and process (planning and management of green infrastructure) and are designed to be used consistently as guidelines.	Add commentary about Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles & Standards to the supporting text for Policy IF3.	223	Natural England

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	<p>The GI Framework and its Standards are described as 'voluntary'.</p> <p>Overall, the GI Framework is a very useful source of information and best practice guidance. The Standards do include measures which relate to a whole area (e.g. accessible greenspace standards) where the achievement of these standards is not wholly in the gift of the planning system. They may also prove to be some overlap with the requirements in the forthcoming Local Plan Policy IF4 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities. For these reasons, it is recommended that Natural England's GI Framework is referenced in the supporting text and not in the policy itself.</p>			
<p>Natural England made comments on Policy AP5 – Health and Wellbeing. You may want to incorporate or cross-reference these health aspects within this GI policy.</p>	<p>Agreed. The health and wellbeing benefits of GI, which are also acknowledged in the NPPF (paragraph 96c), could be expanded upon in the supporting text for Policy IF3.</p>	<p>Add to the supporting text (paragraph 9.19) that GI can have a positive impact by providing opportunities for more active and healthy lives and can help to address some of the environmental causes of poor health e.g. by</p>	223	Natural England

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		reducing urban summer temperatures by cooling the air.		
<p>The supporting text acknowledges that blue infrastructure falls within the definition of green infrastructure but it is disappointing that it is not explicitly mentioned in Policy IF3. This would enable the following important benefit which can be facilitated by the planning regime to be included in the policy:</p> <p>“Opportunities for weir removal and de-culverting should be sought where possible to improve the network of blue infrastructure”.</p>	<p>The Green Infrastructure Study, which the policy refers to, includes a range of measures to improve the district’s GI, including as an example restoring the condition of rivers in Measham. Overall, the measures suggested in this representation is considered too specific for inclusion in the policy itself. Although not directly linked to this comment, it would be worth the policy referring to any future update to the GI Study, in case the study is reviewed during the lifespan of the plan.</p>	<p>Amend Part (1) to read: “.... identified in the Green Infrastructure Study (or its successor).”</p>	404	Environment Agency
IF3 Part (2)				
<p>Amend Part (2) to encourage/secure improvements to existing green infrastructure. “.... Existing trees, woodlands and hedgerows should be retained <u>and enhanced</u> wherever possible.”</p>	<p>Part (1) refers to enhancing the existing GI network. Amending Part (2) as proposed would be consistent with the intent of the policy.</p>	<p>Amend Part (2) to read: “Proposals that cause loss or harm to the green infrastructure network, including its function and amenity value, will not be permitted unless the need for and benefits of the development outweigh any adverse impacts. Existing trees,</p>	146	National Forest Company

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		woodlands and hedgerows should be retained and enhanced wherever possible.”		
Other matters				
To help GI standards to be delivered, local authorities should set GI targets. These should include delivery levels over time. For instance, the % of people having good quality publicly accessible greenspaces within 15 minutes’ walk from home by 2030.	Noted. This will be a matter for the Local Plan Monitoring Framework which will be included in the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. Regarding GI specifically, the draft Local Plan notes that planning policies act on new development and have limited influence over the current use of land. The example of a target in Natural England’s representation would not be an appropriate monitoring measure for a Local Plan policy.	No change.	223	Natural England
The plan does not appear to have adopted a strategic approach to GI. Neighbouring authorities in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire have taken a more strategic approach, based on the Greater Nottinghamshire Blue-Green Infrastructure Strategy . The Erewash Local Plan Review contains Strategic Policy 5: Green Infrastructure which designates a number of strategic green infrastructure corridors one of	At this point there is not an equivalent to the Greater Nottinghamshire study in Leicester and Leicestershire. The Landscape Sensitivity and Green Infrastructure Study for Leicester and Leicestershire (2017) is the most recent assessment of strategic-scale GI opportunities. This was prepared to support the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth	No change.	341	LCC

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>which (the Trent Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor) forms part of the shared County/LPA boundary. Considering the challenges relating to climate change/flood risk/ local nature recovery experienced in the River Trent/River Soar corridor, this appears shortsighted.</p>	<p>Plan and focuses on six likely locations for strategic scale development.</p> <p>In the absence of a current, comprehensive Leicester and Leicestershire-scale GI study, the new Local Plan can rely on the NWL Green and Blue Infrastructure Study (2022) which is referenced in Policy IF3 to provide a sufficiently strategic approach (NPPF paragraph 188).</p>			
<p>We recommend that the supporting text identifies that Green Infrastructure can be used to deliver BNG. “Open space can be used for Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SUDS) to manage surface water. Open spaces can also be used for Natural Flood Management (NFM) schemes to hold back flood water from natural watercourses, to reduce downstream flooding. NFM schemes can also be used for biodiversity benefits such as new wetland areas”. Please consider specifically naming these two types of flood risk management for open spaces.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.19 as follows: “..... Green infrastructure provides opportunities for increased physical activity, but also helps create a sense of place, and-provides habitats for wildlife and can help deliver Biodiversity Net Gain. It also tends to be multi-functional. and so It can act as defences against flooding including as Natural Flood Management (NFM) by holding back flood water to reduce downstream flooding</p>	<p>404</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
		<p><i>which in turn can have biodiversity benefits by creating new wetland areas. Green infrastructure can also</i></p> <p>alleviate some of the effects of climate change such as increased temperatures by providing cooling opportunities and absorb air pollution.”</p>		

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

CHAPTER: 9		POLICY NUMBER: IF5	POLICY NAME: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED		COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENT ID	RESPONDENT NAME
Principle of policy					
[The policy] is supported to reduce the amount of personal travel and to encourage active travel (pedestrian and cycle links).		Noted	No change	45	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Support		Noted	No change	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
[Supports a general policy for transport infrastructure in new development. Such a policy encourages sustainable transport infrastructure]		Noted	No change	185; 186	Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments)
[Supports the draft policy and supports the provision of active travel through the provision for walking and cycling to be an integral part of the design process for major new housing development]		Noted	No change	245; 246	Evolve Planning (Bloor Homes);
It is recognised within the supporting text to the policy that the settlement hierarchy (Draft Policy S2) and the site allocations seek to reduce the need to travel by locating development in the Districts most		Noted	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes & Taylor Wimpey)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

sustainable locations. This approach is supported.				
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

General comments				
[Natural England supports sustainable transport; there is a link to climate change policy. There is a strong link to green infrastructure, We also note the link to Green Infrastructure, cycle and pedestrian routes could incorporate verges or boundaries of natural habitat and street trees to connect to other habitats and green spaces.]	The adopted Local Plan (IF4) requires 'linkages to key Green Infrastructure'. This has not been included in IF5 because a new policy on Green Infrastructure (IF3) is proposed. There is the opportunity to provide further clarity on what we mean by 'well-designed' pedestrian and cycle links in part (3)(a), incorporating reference to green infrastructure.	Update the supporting text at Regulation 19 stage, to cross reference Policy IF3 and to provide more detail to what is meant by well-designed in part (3)(a), using the wording provided by Natural England.	223	Natural England
[The Local Plan must recognise that, due to the spatial spread of the district, the private car will remain a preferred choice for many residents; appropriate infrastructure improvements and provisions should form part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Transport infrastructure provision needs to be informed by a robust evidence base in close collaboration with the County Council as highways authority.]	Noted, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is pending and will incorporate transport considerations once the transport modelling work is complete.	No change	185; 186	Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments)
[To ensure new development is supported by the required infrastructure, it is critical that the Council identifies infrastructure requirements/funding and engage with the highways authority as early as possible]	Noted	No change	187; 656	Define Planning & Design (Bloor Homes); Define Planning & Design (Rosconn Strategic Land)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

[Paragraph 9.33 - Reserve the right to provide further comments once the relevant evidence (the North West Leicestershire Good Design SPD and the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide) is available to view]	Noted; the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide was adopted in December 2024. The Good Design is out to consultation until 17 September 2025.	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes & Taylor Wimpey)
[Comments about the access proposals/sustainable transport measures for Money Hill]	Noted	No change	214	Stantec UK (Bloor Homes & Taylor Wimpey)
See comments on IF1	Noted – see IF1	See IF1	220	CPRE Leicestershire
[The final policy will be influenced by ongoing and planned Local Plan transport assessment work. A more bespoke approach may be required to address cumulative and cross-boundary transport impacts, likely in the form of area transport strategies. The International Gateway and areas such as Coalville and Ashby are expected to need these strategies.]	Noted – the transport modelling is expected later in the autumn. This is likely to identify specific transport improvements that are required as a result of the proposed allocations. We will review whether the policy needs to make reference to specific transport strategies / highways improvement schemes (as adopted Local Plan IF4 does currently) at that time.	Consider if the policy needs to make reference to specific transport strategies / highways improvement schemes once the transport modelling is completed.	341	Leicestershire County Council

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

<p>[The transport strategy will influence future housing locations and therefore school place requirements. Good transport networks near schools are required to provide staff, pupils, and families with various travel options. School travel plans should guarantee safe access, supported by good transport links. The County Council will need to understand how infrastructure—including schools, libraries, and healthcare—will be delivered alongside new development to ensure sustainable growth.]</p>	<p>Comments noted but no changes to Policy IF5 are proposed unless LCC can demonstrate otherwise.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>[Paragraph 5.26 notes the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, yet increased development will lead to more traffic, emissions and congestion. While it is proposed that more people might live within cycling distance of their jobs, they are more likely to drive in from other urban centres where they have established connections. Re IF5 paragraph 9.31, the impact upon the highway network is an important consideration when determining planning applications]</p>	<p>It is correct that where people choose to live and work cannot be controlled. However, the planning system can provide the <i>opportunities</i> for people to live in proximity to employment opportunities and to access sustainable transport modes; this is what the Local Plan aims to do.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>350</p>	<p>Teresa Walker</p>
<p>[Suggest paragraph 9.34 is strengthened as follows: “we may will require new public transport routes within the development site or a contribution towards the enhancement of existing services”]</p>	<p>Agreed; this would be consistent with the wording at part (3) of the policy.</p>	<p>At Regulation 19 stage, change the supporting text as suggested.</p>	<p>353</p>	<p>Derbyshire County Council</p>

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

[The roads are already congested, so what measures will address this? Will speed limits be reduced to 30mph and enforced, and will police presence increase with population growth? Public transport is non-existent so will this be improved?]	These comments relate to proposed housing allocation lb18. These are detailed issues that would be addressed through the planning application submission. Draft Policy IF5 seeks to address the issues of traffic increase, highway safety and public transport connection which are referenced in this comment.	No change	414	Emily Massey
The increased traffic would destroy the local environment increase pollution and detrimental to local wildlife.	Impact upon wildlife and air quality are planning considerations; they are dealt with in Policies En1 and En6.	No change	580	Karl Piggot
The traffic would be greatly increased. This would create a lot of air pollution which in turn would affect the residents and also the local wildlife.			581	Kathleen Piggot
IF5(2) New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement on the local highway network will require a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement to assess and mitigate any negative transport impacts.				
[Amend part 2 to include reference to the strategic road network]	Noted. This wording could be added, or to simplify the policy and avoid confusion, 'local highway network' could be deleted.	Amend part 2 to read “ <i>New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement on the local highway network will require a Transport Assessment...</i> ”	112	National Highways

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

In the case of section (2) of IF5, the wording should be expanded as follows: "(2) New development that is likely to generate significant amounts of movement on the local highway and public transport networks will require a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement to assess and mitigate any negative transport impacts."	This is not considered to be necessary in light of the above changes	No change		Network Rail
[Part 2 which references 'any negative transport impacts' is inconsistent with the NPPF which states that any significant impacts from development on the transport network or on highway safety should be "cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree". We would therefore encourage officers to revisit this wording in order to comply with NPPF §114.	This part of the policy should be amended to avoid inconsistencies with the NPPF. It also reads that only negative impacts need to be assessed which is not the case	Amend this part of the policy to say "...to assess the impacts of development and, where necessary, provide appropriate mitigation."	183; 204	Turley (Clowes Developments, Redrow, Wilson Estates); Mather Jamie (Paul Fovargue)
<p>IF5(3) Having regard to its scale, type and location, new development will be required to maximise accessibility by sustainable modes of transport by: (a) Providing well-designed pedestrian and cycle links within the development; (b) Where necessary, providing for a bus link within the development; and (c) Taking opportunities to link to existing footpaths, cycleways and bus routes in the wider area.</p> <p>IF5(4) The district's strategic cycling and walking routes, as identified in the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, will be safeguarded. Any development proposals which would impact these routes will be expected to accommodate them within the development.</p>				
[Part 3b should be amended as follows: Where necessary	Agreed that a bus link will not always be required and appropriate is a better term.	Replace 'necessary' with	234	Turley (IM Properties)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

appropriate , providing for a bus link within the development.]		‘appropriate in part (3)(b).		
--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

[Welcome the focus on promoting sustainable travel and for new developments to be accessed by well-designed pedestrian and cycle links and a bus link, where necessary. This includes the preparation of the Local and Walking Cycling Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for the district which will help to provide appropriate infrastructure for supporting mode shift.]	Noted	No change	112	National Highways
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Improvements to existing cycling and walking routes are required as they are more intensively used due to new developments and increased tourism. • All new developments should include social paths and provide connections to current trails. • The poor surfacing on the Measham to Donisthorpe trail has led to repeated complaints and accidents. A short section was resurfaced section around 4-5 years ago but no further improvements have been made. The trail is unsuitable for cyclists, walkers, and wheelchair users.] 	<p>These comments are noted and officers agree with the points made in the first two bullet points.</p> <p>Whilst the Measham to Donisthorpe route is not identified as a priority route in the Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, these comments have been passed on to the Council's health and wellbeing team who are keeping a working log of where improvements to infrastructure are needed and will add these comments to that log.</p>	No change to the policy itself	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and Acresford Parish Council.
[Section 3 should state that development will maximise accessibility via sustainable modes including green infrastructure such as EV charge points for residents who	New development must provide electric vehicle charging points in accordance with Part S of the Building Regulations. The need for any additional 'green	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

have no choice but to use private vehicles, to support the transition to electric vehicles and enable the infrastructure to be in place]	infrastructure' would need to be defined (it is too broad a term) and justified as part of the Regulation 19 consultation			
We support the principle of including safeguarding provisions within the draft policy, albeit in practice this may need to be widened out to include other forms of transport infrastructure (i.e. not just the LCWIP corridors), subject to the outcomes of the ongoing/planned transport evidence.	This part of the policy could be broadened with some minor amendments.	Amend part (4) to read " <i>The district's strategic cycling and walking routes, <u>including those as identified in the...</u></i> "	341	Leicestershire County Council
IF5(5) Development that Development that has a demonstrable transport impact will be required to financially contribute towards: (a) Public transport services; (b) Any sustainable transport measures necessary to make the development acceptable; and/or (c) Any offsite highways improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of development.				
[The policy should be expanded to include Section 278 agreements as a form of mitigation. Section 278 is an alternative to S106 and allows the developer to control the delivery and timing of the highway scheme]	Noted	Delete 'financially' from the opening sentence. At Regulation 19 stage, add text on S106 and S278 agreements.	112	National Highways
[Part (5) should be amended; 'demonstrable' has a negative connotations whereas a term such as 'noticeable' or 'perceptible' would achieve the same result without being unnecessarily negative.]	Officers think that demonstrable is an appropriate term.	No change	147	Gladman Developments
[The development must mitigate its own impact and not be utilised to	Noted	No change	147	Gladman Developments

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

address existing deficiencies present in the authority]				
Part 5 of Draft Policy IF5 includes “and / or” after part (b), but not after part (a). This should be changed so “and / or” is also included after part (a). Public transport services may well be part of any solution and require a financial contribution, but this will not be so in every case, so it must be made clear that these are alternatives to be considered individually or in combination	Noted	Add “and/or” at the end of part (a).	225	Planning Prospects (St Modwen Logistics)
[Part 5c should be amended as follows: <i>Any offsite highways improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of the development to an acceptable level.</i>]	‘Necessary to mitigate’ is considered an appropriate qualifier.	No change	234	Turley (IM Properties)
[Part (5) is not consistent with the NPPF and in order to be sound should be amended as follows: <i>Development that has a demonstrable adverse impact on highway safety or the operation of the highway network will be required to mitigate its effects to ensure that its residual impacts on highway safety are not unacceptable and its impacts on the road network will not be severe. Such mitigation should focus on measure required to minimise vehicle trips, increasing movement by active and shared travel,</i>	Noted	No change	243	Avison Young (Jelson Homes)

APPENDIX D – POLICY IF3 (TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW DEVELOPMENT)

<i>and only after such measures have been explored, the delivery of off-site highway infrastructure.</i>				
[Adequate funding to mitigate impacts to railway safety and operations including level crossings and railway stations should be provided by developers and we feel that the wording should be expanded to reflect these potential impacts. In view of this we would ask that the draft wording in section (5)(a) should reflect this so that it is captured in the local plan.	There are currently no passenger rail services or stations in the district – Policy IF6 deals with the potential Leicester To Burton Rail Line. Freight rail does operate through the district and there are some level crossings. Any developer contributions would need to be fully justified in accordance with the legal tests in the CIL Regulations. It may be more appropriate for impacts upon rail safety and operation to be assessed in Transport Assessments rather than add this requirement to a policy that seeks to provide sustainable transport / highways improvements measures.	Add supporting text to at Regulation 19 stage to confirm that Transport Assessments should, where appropriate, take into account impacts upon railway safety and operation.	244	Network Rail
We note that Paragraph 9.34 (Public Transport) only seems to relate to bus services and we would ask that this paragraph is expanded to include rail, particularly in relation to the enhancement of existing services so that this is captured in the local plan.	There is no passenger rail in the district. Policy IF6 deals with the potential Leicester to Burton Rail Line.	No change	244	Network Rail