

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

CHAPTER 10	POLICY NUMBER – EN1	POLICY NAME – NATURE CONSERVATION/BIO DIVERSITY NET GAIN
------------	---------------------	--

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support	Noted	No change	92	Ashy de la Zouch Town Council
In general terms we support the principles enshrined in this Section but note that both IW1 and EMP90, if allowed, will fall woefully short of any capability of showing a biodiversity net gain of 10%. Rather, they will produce a massive degradation of biodiversity in the area - which no amount of mitigation will be able to restore. In net zero and biodiversity terms it makes no strategic sense to destroy something in one location and attempt to mitigate it in another, the primary casualty will still suffer death by a thousand cuts. A far more sound policy would be to protect first and to mitigate second. We therefore call on NWLDC to adopt a policy of utilising brownfield sites as a first priority and to only even consider greenfield desecration once all brownfield potential has been exhausted.	<p>As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, the objective of net gain “is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value <u>relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat</u> [underlining added]”. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that it will not be possible for this requirement to be addressed onsite at either IW1 (Isley Woodhouse) or EMP 90 (land south of East Midlands Airport).</p> <p>The amount of brownfield land in North West Leicestershire and which does not already benefit from planning permission, is limited and largely comprises of small areas/ The Local plan allocates the site of the former Hermitage Leisure Centre in Whitwick for housing, and also includes an allowance for</p>	No change	115	Protect Diseworth

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	redevelopment of sites around Coalville Town Centre			
It is suggested that part 1(a) should refer to “the time a planning application is submitted” rather than when it is determined. Part 1(d) is confusing as it is not clear as to whether it relates to only part (c) (i) to (v) or just to biodiversity requirements.	The current legislation built in an allowance for sites already in the process of being determined such that the provisions would not apply. It is possible that any future changes would do likewise. However, if it did not the current proposed wording of part(a) could result in delays to both the determination and delivery of development. Therefore, it is agreed that a change is required.	<i>That part (a) be amended to state “Ensuring that development provides a net gain in biodiversity consistent with any national policy prevailing at the time that a planning application is determined <u>submitted</u>”</i>	147	Gladman Developments
The policy is supported as it accords with the National Planning Policy Framework. Should the Council seek a requirement higher than the national standards, these would need to be justified and tested.	Noted. It is not proposed to seek higher requirements than those required nationally.	No change	150	Savills o/b/o David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Policy EN1 is in alignment with national policy on biodiversity net gain and is therefore supported.	Noted	No change	161	Mather Jamie o/b/o The Trustees of Lord Crawshaw 1997 Discretionary Settlement
The Parish Council supports nature conservation/biodiversity.	Noted	No change	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe and

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
				Acresford Parish Council
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	<p>National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that it is be renumbered to become part (c).</p> <p>In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	184	Pegasus Group o/b/o Hallam Land Management
Clowes are supportive of the need to address net losses to biodiversity	Noted	No change	185	Pegasus Group o/b/o Clowes

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
through the provision of enhancement to deliver an overall net gain.				Developments Ltd
Wilson Bowden is supportive of the need to address net losses to biodiversity through the provision of enhancement to deliver an overall net gain.	Noted	No change	186	Pegasus Group o/b/o Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	<p>National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).</p> <p>In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p>"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable"</p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	193	Pegasus Group o/b/o Hallam Land Management

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.			
Policy EN1 is in alignment with national policy on biodiversity net gain and is therefore supported.	Noted	No change	204	Mather Jamie o/b/o Paul Fovargue
<p>The policy should make reference to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>The plan does not provide guidance in respect of where any of-site provision should be accommodated. The requirement for any off-site provision to be located close to a development site should be removed.</p>	<p>Part (a) of the policy requires that development deliver biodiversity net gain that is consistent with national policy. This provides flexibility in the event that national policy requirements increase or decrease.</p> <p>It is proposed that part (d) which refers to offsite provision be deleted.</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p>“Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable”</p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	214	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	<p>National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).</p> <p>In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.</p>	<p>That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):</p> <p>“Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable”</p> <p>That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.</p>	216	Pegasus Group o/b/o Westernrange
<p>10.29 the wording should be updated to reflect the introduction of mandatory net gain on 12th February 2024.</p> <p>10.30 the metric will be known as the Statutory Biodiversity Metric.</p>	The supporting text to the policy will be updated.	That the supporting text be amended to take account of changes since the draft plan was published.	223	Natural England

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>10.32 We are pleased to note the joined up across different policies that enhancing biodiversity has many benefits including health & wellbeing, creating attractive places and climate change mitigation.</p> <p>An explanation of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Leicestershire & Rutland as it develops should be provided.</p> <p>Statutory guidance on alignment between Local Plans and LNRS is anticipated as part of the Governments work on planning reform. LNRS will guide BNG off site units where they can be most effective for ecological connectivity.</p> <p>As well as this policy there should be a clear strategy for BNG delivery within allocated sites for development.</p>				
<p>This policy is supported but it should recognise the need for the biodiversity net gain projects to not compromise the aviation safety and aerodrome safeguarding requirements of EMA. A cross reference to the EMA aerodrome safeguarding policy (Ec9) could usefully be added.</p>	<p>Part (1) of policy Ec9 (East Midlands Airport: Safeguarding) already seeks to ensure that new development does not affect the operational integrity of the airport. However, it is agreed that it would be helpful to include a refence in the supporting text to policy En1 cross refer to policy Ec9.</p>	<p>That the supporting text to policy En1 include reference to the need for biodiversity net gain projects to not compromise the aviation safety and aerodrome safeguarding requirements in accordance with Ec9 (East Midlands Airport: Safeguarding)</p>	230	East Midlands Airport

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
We agree that it is important to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the district, but ensuring development provides a net gain in biodiversity consistent with national policy at the time a planning application is determined. Caddick's proposals for land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth would achieve a biodiversity net gain of over 20% which is considerably higher than the statutory minimum and this is one of the many benefits that favour the Site's allocation.	Noted	No change	232	Stantec UK Ltd o/b/o Caddick Land
Support the need to provide biodiversity net gain in accordance with national requirements. However, requirement (d) is considered to go beyond the national requirements. Furthermore, on site provision may not be the most beneficial in terms of biodiversity net gain. Requirement (e) duplicates national requirements and should be deleted	National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).	That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c): "Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable" That part (c) be renumbered as part (d) and that part (e) be deleted.	235	Pegasus Group o/b/o Davidsons & Westernrange

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	In respect of part (e) The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.			
Bloor Homes supports the emerging Policy in principle. However, the policy should recognise there may be some circumstances where local provision is not possible and national biodiversity credits cannot be ruled out in some circumstances.	National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that this be renumbered to become part (c).	That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c): "Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable" That part (c) be renumbered as part (d)	245	Evolve Planning o/b/o Bloor Homes
Bloor Homes supports the emerging Policy in principle. However, the policy should recognise there may be some circumstances where local provision is not possible and national biodiversity	National policy allows for any BNG provision to be on-site, offsite or delivered via statutory biodiversity credits. Part (d) of the proposed policy is intended to	That part (d) be deleted and replaced with the following as (c):	256	Evolve Planning o/b/o Cameron Homes

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
credits cannot be ruled out in some circumstances.	make clear that the Council's preference is for provision to be made on site wherever possible. It is accepted that this may always be possible or even preferable, but it is considered that it is appropriate for the policy to make this clear. It is considered that the policy would benefit from some rewording. In addition, it is suggested that it is be renumbered to become part (c).	"Having a preference for any biodiversity provision to be made on-site wherever possible and practicable" That part (c) be renumbered as part (d)		
In respect of part (e) it is not clear as to how a requirement for developments to have a management plan will this be monitored.	The Environment Act 2021 requires the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan. As such, therefore, this part of the proposed policy would duplicate national requirements and so it would be appropriate to delete it.	That part (e) be deleted	289	Swannington Parish Council
This is a key policy in demonstrating NWLDC's approach to environmental conservation and mitigating and adapting to climate change. Biodiversity provides good education opportunities and an understanding of how it can contribute to a child's local community.	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
In 10.28, it is emphasised that there is a need to boost the levels of bio	As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance , the objective	No change	350	Teresa Walker

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
diversity and yet the proposals for development are highly likely to diminish these levels of biodiversity.	of net gain “is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value <u>relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat</u> [underlining added]”. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that it will not be possible for this requirement to be addressed onsite at either IW1 (Isley Woodhouse) or EMP 90 (land south of East Midlands Airport).			
There can be no question that if either IW1 or EMP90 are developed, neither can be built sustainably or be designed to achieve a net biodiversity gain of 10%, whatever mitigations might be employed. Further development, on top of what has gone before, will completely destroy the entire ecology, ethos and character of the area, as well as create a mighty mess of urban and industrial sprawl where no-one would voluntarily choose to live or work.	As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance , the objective of net gain “is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value <u>relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat</u> [underlining added]”. There is no evidence at this stage to suggest that it will not be possible for this requirement to be addressed onsite at either IW1 (Isley Woodhouse) or EMP 90 (land south of East Midlands Airport).	No change	376	Jim Snee
Welcome this section and have the following comments to make: Para 10.29. January 2024 should be changed to February 2024 in order to reflect the mandatory go-live date.	Noted. The supporting text at 10.29 and 10.30 will be updated accordingly.	No change	404	The Environment Agency

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>Para. 10.30. We recommend that the last sentence is amended to read: "...habitats will need to be secured, managed and monitored for at least 30 years".</p> <p>Para 10.31. We recommend the wording is amended to state the preference for and therefore encouragement for on-site gains.</p>	Noted. Supporting text to be amended.			
Rural development, both housing and commercial, must be permitted. So that rural individuals can live, work and invest in the environment. From planting hedges or installing renewables there must be a sustainable local population and economy. Otherwise the Council will not achieve their environmental objectives.	Noted	No change	422	Country Land and Business Association
10.32 notes the importance of "health and well being", the need to create "attractive places" and to respond to "climate change". Covering the land with buildings and infrastructure does not allow for any of these. Green spaces are important, small though they may be in the universal scheme of things, to peoples mental and physical health, and to the well-being of the natural habitats around us.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	539	Shirley Briggs

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
The policies don't consider the local wellbeing of the residents or wildlife only the businesses who want to make money out of developing the area. If you carry on like this we won't have any rural environments left.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	580	Karl Pigott
The environment would be very much affected. With lots more traffic. This would also affect the wildlife, and mental and physical health of the residents who can at the moment walk in the country lanes to see the birds and wild life, farm animals etc.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	581	Kathleen Pigott

APPENDIX E- POLICY E1 (NATURE CONSERVATION/BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN)

Increasing development will have an impact on biodiversity, loss of habitats and scheme to compensate for loss will not be as good as the lost environment.	The Local Plan has to seek a balance between meeting the future housing and employment needs, whilst also protecting and seeking improvements to the environment. Policy En1 will ensure that new development helps to improve biodiversity across the district consistent with national legislation.	No change	597	Sue Bull
---	---	-----------	-----	----------

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

CHAPTER: 10	POLICY NUMBER: En3	POLICY NAME: THE NATIONAL FOREST
-------------	--------------------	----------------------------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
(1) In the National Forest, as defined on the Policies Map, we will support development that: (a) Provides opportunities for diversification of the economy, especially in relation to the woodland economy and tourism, including visitor accommodation which accords with Policy Ec12 and reflects the National Forest Company's Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Design Guide.				
Hoped the policy would be more supportive of tourism accommodation in the Forest than elsewhere in the District, particularly where the Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Guide has been taken into account.	Policy En3 does support tourism accommodation in the National Forest which accords with the National Forest Company's Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Guide.	No change.	146	National Forest Company
(3) Where planting and landscaping cannot be accommodated within or close to the development site or where the only potential area of planting or landscaping is small or is isolated with limited connectivity to other habitats, a commuted sum may be agreed.				
The removal of "in exceptional circumstances" from Clause 3, is completely unacceptable. There needs to be early additional consultation with this council and the other wards directly impacted by the National Forest Company vision for The Heart of the Forest. Cannot support the watered-down clause 3 as it leaves the door open for trees that should be planted in or close to our ward being planted miles away, this will not support the local area's development. ODAPC object to this – no exception, <i>trees not more houses!</i>	NWLDC have worked with the National Forest Company (NFC) on the drafting of the National Forest Policy and supporting text. It was during this joint working that the removal of 'in exceptional circumstances' was agreed. Monitoring of sites undertaken by the NFC demonstrates that where the requirement is for a small area of planting and landscaping, this is often not provided or is provided but the quality and connectivity is such that it does not contribute to National Forest cover. As	No change.	175	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish Council (ODAPC)

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

	such, the NFC may wish to request a financial contribution in these circumstances, which is not considered 'exceptional' therefore the reference to 'exceptional' has been omitted.			
SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL POLICY CRITERIA				
En3 - Policy wording We would encourage the following criterion to be included in the Policy relating to development in the Heart of the National Forest. Suggested additional criterion: <u>Within the Heart of the National Forest development should support the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. The following types of development will be supported:</u> <u>A) Tourism and leisure attractions</u> <u>B) Visitor accommodation where it complies with the Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Design Guide.</u> <u>C) Proposals associated with the woodland, environmental and green economy and education or research in those sectors.</u> <u>D) Enhancements to the footpath and cycleway network.</u> <u>E) Small scale renewable energy installations.</u> <u>F) Volunteer facilities.</u> <u>Development in the Heart of the National Forest should strengthen linkages to nearby urban areas and</u>	<p>The National Forest Company was in the process of updating The Heart of the National Forest Vision Document at the time the draft Local Plan document was being prepared. As the Vision document has now been published the Policy should include reference to The Heart of the National Forest Vision.</p> <p>Officers have recently (July 2025) met with the National Forest Company and revised wording for Policy En3 has been agreed. It was also considered that an illustrative map, included as an appendix in the Local Plan, showing the broad location of the Heart of the National Forest would be useful.</p> <p>Additional supporting text will be added to provide additional detail about the Heart of the National Forest and the associated Vision document.</p>	<p>Policy amended to include the following additional criteria (4):</p> <p>Within the Heart of the National Forest development should demonstrate support for the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision by: Strengthening linkages to nearby urban areas and leisure and tourism attractions. Being exemplars of sustainable design and construction and Seeking to promote the use of non-motorised modes of travel. The District Council will support the National Forest Company and others</p>	146	National Forest Company

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

<p><u>leisure and tourism attractions. Development will be exemplars of sustainable design and construction and seek to promote the use of non-motorised modes of travel. The District Council will support the National Forest Company and others in the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. Development in the Heart of the National Forest should demonstrate compliance with the Vision.</u></p>		<p>in the delivery of the Heart of the National Forest Vision. Development in the Heart of the National Forest should demonstrate compliance with the Vision.</p> <p>Additional supporting text will be added to include additional detail about the Heart of the National Forest Vision Document.</p> <p>Parts (1), (2) and (3) of the policy amended as follows: Part (1)(b) of the policy include reference to educational opportunities. Part (2) to include 2 new criteria: (b) ensure the siting and scale of the proposed development is appropriately related to its setting within the Forest; and (c) respect the character and appearance of the National Forest.</p>		
---	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

		Part (3) revised to make the policy wording clearer. Provide an illustrative map showing the broad location of the Heart of the National Forest to be included as an appendix in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.		
GENERAL COMMENTS ON POLICY En3				
Support the aims behind the policy and have no overriding issues with the policy and requirements. Would recommend a change to the policy wording to make it clearer that residential development is accepted in the National Forest. The policy currently appears to not directly support residential development within the National Forest. This is especially critical as some of the key locations for housing delivery fall within the National Forest. Similar terminology could be used to that within Draft Policy En4 which identifies there are some developments which would be given priority but does not rule out other development as long as it meets the policies criteria.	The policy supports 'development' and the supporting text sets out the requirements for woodland planting and landscaping as part of new developments, including residential developments. The site allocation policies for sites that fall within the National Forest include provision for tree planting and landscaping in accordance with draft Policy En3. Whilst residential development is not clearly stated in the policy it is inferred that residential development will be supported in the National Forest, providing it accords with the policies in the Local Plan.	No change.	147	Gladman Developments
Disappointing that the Draft Policy is not as specific about the Heart of the National Forest as the Adopted Plan.	A new criterion (4) to be added to the policy that refers to the	See changes above in response to the National	175, 180	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe & Acresford Parish

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

<p>The draft Policy does not specifically refer to tree planting within that area – unlike the clear definition within sections 4 and 5 of the Adopted Local Plan Policy.</p> <p>The removal of clauses 4 and 5 is completely unacceptable. Early consultation should take place with those wards directly impacted by the National Forest Company vision for The Heart of the Forest, and its impact on the new Local Plan.</p>	<p>Heart of the National Forest Vision.</p> <p>The requirement for tree planting within the National Forest (including within the Heart of the National Forest) is set out in Part (2)(a).</p>	<p>Forest Company's comment.</p>		<p>Council (ODAPC), Ashby Woulds Town Council</p>
COMMENTS ON SUPPORTING TEXT				
<p>Para. 10.46 The reference to carbon sinks is dated and may not be true. Instead, reference could be made to government policy to increase tree planting such as the Environment Act which sets out the policy to increase woodland and tree canopy cover in England to 16.5% of land area.</p>	<p>Noted and agree the suggested amendments to the supporting text.</p>	<p>Supporting text to be updated as suggested.</p>	146	<p>National Forest Company</p>
<p>Para. 10.49: Request the second sentence referring to the thresholds in the Guide is omitted as the National Forest planting thresholds are in the process of being updated. It's unlikely that the thresholds for residential and commercial/industrial development would change, but there should be further clarity the types of developments which require National</p>	<p>Noted and the supporting text will be updated. The council will await updated information on revised guidance on National Forest planting thresholds.</p>	<p>Amend the supporting text to reflect the most up to date information from the National Forest Company at the time of drafting the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	146	<p>National Forest Company</p>

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

Forest planting [changes to the Guide will be communicated to NWLDC].				
<p>We would request that the section of 10.49 from 'other appropriate habitats...' is amended as detailed below to more accurately reflect what is sought from National Forest woodland planting and landscaping.</p> <p>Third sentence to start with: <u>National Forest woodland planting and landscaping</u></p> <p>Add additional text onto the end of paragraph 10.49: <u>other appropriate habitats such as wood pasture, parkland and ponds where they form part of a connected green infrastructure network. Public access should be included in areas of green infrastructure and footpath/cycleway connections to adjoining woodlands and public rights of way should be incorporated.</u></p>	Noted and agree the suggested amendments.	Supporting text updated to reflect the changes suggested.	146	National Forest Company
<p>The Heart of the Forest Vision is due to be launched in April 2024, and would suggest the following text to be added to the end of paragraph 10.52: <u>The Vision identifies three investment priorities and six investment zones which will support more diverse and thriving wildlife; improve wellbeing; will be accessible for everyone; encourage</u></p>	Noted and agree the amendments suggested to the supporting text.	Supporting text updated to reflect the changes suggested.	146	National Forest Company

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

<u>more people to visit and stay for longer; create greener jobs, support sustainable modes of travel and renewable energy and increase participation and volunteering opportunities.</u>				
Suggested additional paragraph in supporting text: <u>Development will be expected to incorporate the required National Forest planting in addition to compliance with Biodiversity Net Gain requirements set out in Policy En1 – Nature Conservation / Biodiversity Net Gain (Strategic Policy). The strategic significance multiplier in the metric will apply to woodland habitats and tree planting within the National Forest.</u>	Noted and agree that the additional wording could be added to the supporting text.	Supporting text updated to reflect the changes suggested.	146	National Forest Company
GENERAL COMMENTS				
Policy En3 is supported to offer a range of leisure opportunities for communities and visitors	Noted.	No change.	45	Leicester Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board
Support	Noted.	No change.	92	Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
Appropriate green infrastructure and energy development should be supported in the National Forest and Charnwood Forest Regional Park. A	Noted. Any proposals that require planning permission will need to be consistent with the proposed policy. Whether this is	No change.	107	Kirsten Cunningham Bardon Aggregates

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

balanced approach to conservation and green infrastructures can be met that provides long term aims of protecting, enhancing the landscape and biodiversity.	the case or not will depend upon the specific proposal and circumstances.			
We support draft policy En3 and the proposals at Corkscrew Lane have been designed with the National Forest designation in mind.	Noted.	No change.	204	Tom Collins
The proposals at Money Hill will provide tree planting throughout the site and landscaping in accordance with Draft Policy En3.	Noted.	No change.	214	Scarlett Lambeth Stantec obo Bloor Homes Midlands and Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Welcome policy.	Noted.	No change.	223	Natural England
Bloor Homes supports draft Policy En3. Land South of Heather presents an opportunity for the creation of tree planting as part of a landscape led approach development and the delivery of new recreational facilities to support the local community.	Noted.	No change.	245	Neil Cox obo Bloor Homes
There are no concerns with this policy and appears to reflect the current state of thinking in the Heart of the Forest area.	Noted.	No change.	341	Leicestershire County Council
National Forest tourism policies should continue to apply to the Fishing Lakes	Swannington is within the National Forest and as such	No change.	569	Phil Ellis

APPENDIX E- POLICY E3 (NATIONAL FOREST)

site off Spring Lane, Swannington - these units should not become for residential occupation to help meet housing targets.	provision (1)(a) of the policy, relating to the woodland economy and tourism, would apply.			
Being in the heart of the National Forest development should be kept as an absolute minimum.	The Local Plan is required to allocate development sites for housing and employment uses in the district to meet future needs. Policy En3 requires new development within the National Forest to contribute towards the creation of the forest.	No change.	597	Sue Bull

APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

CHAPTER 10	POLICY NUMBER – EN5	POLICY NAME – AREA OF SEPARATION		
MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
This policy, as it stands, is not directly relevant to Ashby. However, we would advocate including a paragraph to make it clear that this policy does not prevent other Areas of Separation being designated in Neighbourhood Plans if there is sufficient evidence to justify them.	Noted and agreed.	That the supporting text note that Areas of Separation could be designated through Neighbourhood Plans where justified.	92	Ashby De la Zouch Town Council
The policy wording is not considered to be as permissive as it needs to be, particularly in the context where insufficient housing is being provided in the Coalville Urban Area. Alternative wording is suggested which would support development which “ <i>clearly maintains the separation between the built-up areas of these settlements</i> ”.	The current wording for policy En5 is the same as that used in the adopted Local Plan and which was approved by the then Local Plan Inspector. However, it is considered that the wording of the part (2) of the policy could make more positive.	That part (2) be amended to state: “Development will not only be permitted which, either individually or cumulatively, would not demonstrably adversely affect or diminish the present open and undeveloped character of the area”.	150	Savills o/b/o David Wilson Homes East Midlands
The Planning Inspector who examined the adopted Local Plan recognised that there may be a need to review the boundaries of the Area of Separation in the light of increased development needs. As such this scenario has	Since the consultation was undertaken, and in view of the significant need for additional housing, the extent of the Area of Separation has been reduced in	That the extent of the Area of Separation be amended to reflect the previous decisions in respect of proposed housing allocations	195	Marrons o/b/o William Davis Homes

APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>come to pass, particularly in view of the primacy of the Coalville Urban Area in the spatial strategy. The designation is restrictive and need to be justified by evidence.</p> <p>It is noted that the 2022 study reassessed the boundaries of the Area of separation, but it is considered that the study is not robust. In particular, the NPPF does not, as suggested, provide a precedent for the Area of Separation.</p> <p>Concerns are also expressed regarding the methodology used such that it does not provide a substantial basis to conclude that it is appropriate to limit development given the sustainable location in the Coalville Urban Area, the most sustainable location in the district.</p>	<p>order to accommodate some housing development.</p> <p>The Council's consultant who undertook the Area of Separation study has provided a response to the detailed comments. These are attached to this appendix.</p>	<p>within the current Area of Separation.</p>		
<p>Natural England suggests that opportunities should be taken to enhance the biodiversity value of Areas of Separation and the potential to make connections with the wider Green Infrastructure network. There may also be opportunities for Biodiversity Net Gain off-setting sites within these areas.</p>	<p>Noted. This can be addressed through references in the supporting text.</p>	<p>That the supporting text notes the potential for biodiversity net gain opportunities within the Area of Separation.</p>	<p>223</p>	<p>Natural England</p>

APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>The approach taken by the Council in respect of the Area of Separation is flawed. Whilst the Inspector who considered the adopted Local Plan supported the Area of Separation, that was in the context of spatial strategy being promoted and with the development requirements at that time. The evidence presented by the Council in support of the Area of Separation is not considered to be robust, particularly as it does not assess whether the release of land in the Area of Separation would still meet the central objective of policy En5. A detailed critique of the approach is presented.</p> <p>Coalville and Whitwick have already merged, they are indistinguishable from each other (particularly, and importantly, in the immediately vicinity of the AoS), and they function as a single urban area. It is not necessary to keep the land open and doing so is forcing much needed development to less sustainable .</p>	<p>Since the consultation was undertaken, and in view of the significant need for additional housing, the extent of the Area of Separation has been reduced in order to accommodate some housing development.</p> <p>The Council's consultant who undertook the Area of Separation study has provided a response to the detailed comments. These are attached to this appendix.</p>	<p>That the extent of the Area of Separation be amended to reflect the previous decisions in respect of proposed housing allocations within the current Area of Separation.</p>	243	Avison Young o/b/o Jelson Homes
<p>It is not clear as to why the Swannington Incline, Hough Hill, and Snibston 3 are not included in the Area of Separation</p>	<p>The Coalville-Whitwick Area of Separation covers those parts that are within the built-up area and which cannot be regarded as countryside. The three areas referred to however can be</p>	<p>No change</p>	289	Swannington Parish Council

APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
	regarded as countryside and are protected as such.			
No comments	Noted	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council
<p>The Area of Separation (Formally Green Wedge) should be increased not depleted. In particular land adjoining the roundabout of the A511/Hermitage Road which has previously had permission for housing development should be included. The land plays an important role in maintaining physical separation, protects identity and prevents coalescence and serves as the gateway for the public to access the land beyond. The public foot path which runs through the plot is a widely used amenity and gives access the newly planted National Forest areas and paths that weave through Area A.</p> <p>Broom Leys Farm should not lose its designation of AoS or be built upon. Developing this area would have a detrimental effect on the open landscapes that enrich people's lives. In addition, development would without doubt compromise the air quality further. We do need new housing within the district, including much needed</p>	<p>The parcel of land adjoining Hermitage Road (parcel 14), together with adjoining land to the rear of properties on Hermitage Road, is proposed to be excluded from the area of development in order to maintain a buffer between new development and existing dwellings.</p> <p>The Area of Separation study (2022) identifies this parcel as being of secondary importance. In the 2023 study the site is identified as being within Priority A (forms coherent extension with suitable access, can be adequately mitigated and is available and promoted).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>	<p>406</p>	<p>Jo Straw</p>

APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
genuinely affordable housing. This should be delivered in the right places and in line with local need. Depleting the Area of Separation is not the right place for housing development nor is it a sequentially preferable location.	In view of the need to identify sufficient land to meet the housing requirements and the conclusions of the 2023 study, it is considered appropriate to no longer include this area within the Area of Separation.			
This policy re. Coalville & Whitwick is to be welcomed (although I doubt it is strong enough for residents of those areas) but where is a similar policy directive for the Northern Parishes? The statements in relation to both Housing development (already allocated & proposed) and Industrial/Commercial expansion will effectively create an enormous urban conurbation around J23 of 3/5 miles with a large busy Airport at its centre.	The Coalville-Whitwick Area of Separation is unique in that it is surrounded by built development. The separation of settlements in other instances is identified as an issue for consideration under policy S4 (Countryside).	No change	475	David Manley
If land to South of Church Lane, Whitwick is developed, the remaining buffer up to the Incline should be designated as an area of separation between Whitwick and Swannington.	The land in question can be more properly considered as part of the countryside between Whitwick and Swannington.	No change	569	Phil Ellis
Proposed housing at C46 [Broom Leys Road] violates the statement "there is a presumption against development that would result in the physical coalescence of Coalville and Whitwick and the loss of the separate identity of	The 2022 Area of Separation study identified the area of land covered by C46 as being of Secondary importance to the Area of Separation as whole. This is partly because of the	No change	618	Sandra Ramp

APPENDIX E- POLICY E5 (AREA OF SEPARATION)

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>the two settlements." The earlier version of the Local Plan excluded land at C46.</p> <p>The area of separation is extremely important to this area and there is a large opposition to building on it.</p>	<p>vegetation along the former mineral railway and the adjacent Coalville Rugby Club. In view of the significant need for land for more housing, and in view of the evidence outlined above, it is considered appropriate to allocate this part of the Area of Separation for future housing development.</p>			