

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET – TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 2026



| | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Title of Report | GOOD DESIGN GUIDE FOR NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE | |
| Presented by | Tony Safell Portfolio Holder for Planning PH Briefed: Yes | |
| Background Papers | <u>Current Good Design Guide for North West Leicestershire 2017</u> | Public Report: Yes |
| | <u>Good Design Guide - supplementary planning document March 2026</u> | Key Decision: Yes |
| Financial Implications | The cost of preparing the Good Design Guide is being met from the Planning Skills Delivery Fund received in October 2024. | |
| | Signed off by the Section 151 Officer: Yes | |
| Legal Implications | The preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will need to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 | |
| | Signed off by the Monitoring Officer: Yes | |
| Staffing and Corporate Implications | There are no direct staffing or corporate implications. | |
| | Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes | |
| Purpose of Report | To update Cabinet on the preparation of the Good Design Guide SPD and the outcome of public consultation held between July and September 2025. To present a revised Good Design Guide for North West Leicestershire for consideration, with a recommendation that the Local Plan Committee adopts the SPD. | |
| Reason for Decision | The Council's Constitution (Part 2, Section D5, paragraph 2.2.1) requires the Local Plan Committee to receive reports from Cabinet on proposed SPDs. | |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Recommendations | <p>THAT CABINET:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RECOMMENDS THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE ADOPTS THE GOOD DESIGN GUIDE FOR NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT; AND 2. DELEGATES AUTHORITY TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE TO AGREE ANY MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE FINAL DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT PRIOR TO ADOPTION AT LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE. |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Since 2007, the Council has improved the design quality of new development, while not compromising the number of planning consents for new homes. In 2017, the first Good Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was produced by the Council which raised the bar further still.
- 1.2 As set out as a target in the Council Delivery Plan, the Council is working to raise the quality of new development even further. As part of this journey, the Council was one of 14 authorities who took part in the National Model Design Code Pilot programme in the summer of 2021 with grant funding from Government. The Council's funding bid, agreed with Government, was to refresh and update the Council's existing Good Design Guide SPD and align it with the National Model Design Code. The new Good Design Guide is the result of that work.
- 1.3 This new Guide looks to build upon the sound foundation, aspirations and vision set out in 2017, while seeking to respond to challenges identified with stakeholders, as well as evidence from what has been built across the district and what is seen as best practice nationally.
- 1.4 Since the Council adopted its award-winning design initiative, there has been a significant transformation in design quality across the District. It is acknowledged, however, that not all schemes have been a total success, and lessons have been learnt from those which have not reached the design quality expected. However, officers are generally satisfied that many developers have responded positively and enthusiastically to the Council's design expectations.

2.0 THE NEW GOOD DESIGN GUIDE SPD FOR NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE

- 2.1 One of the key aims in the Council's Delivery Plan 2023-28 is that the Council will secure high quality design in new developments and that a new local design guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will have been produced which developments will need to comply with. Once agreed by Cabinet and then adopted at Local Plan Committee, planning applications will be assessed against the new document.
- 2.2 An SPD is a document which provides further information about a policy or policies in a development plan. An SPD can be a helpful way to provide guidance on matters such as how a policy should be interpreted in development management decisions, what information applicants need to supply to meet the requirements of a policy and procedural arrangements. Importantly an SPD is not itself part of the development plan,

but it is capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions. In addition, an SPD cannot be used to change or add to the policies in the adopted Local Plan. Such policy changes can only be made through the Local Plan Review.

- 2.3 The guidance contained within the new SPD is based on what the Council has achieved in North West Leicestershire over the last 15 years, but also how the Council can strive to improve the design quality of developments further. The document explains how good design is measured locally and provides applicants with the clarity and certainty they have asked for.
- 2.4 The draft SPD has been developed encompassing a series of visits to housing developments both within North West Leicestershire and across the country to inform what constitutes good and best practice. It also showcases examples of the design quality of the development that, if adopted by developers, are more likely to be approved. Some initial informal consultation with stakeholders including the National Forest Company, Leicestershire County Council Highways (LCC Highways), a local housebuilder and planning consultancy took place in 2024 to help inform the development of the document.
- 2.5 Once adopted, the new SPD will give Council the tools to ensure that the developments that are brought forward, enhance the built environment and are ones that the Council can be genuinely proud of.

3.0 CONSULTATION

3.1 At Local Plan Committee on 21 May 2025, members agreed that the draft Good Design Guide for North West Leicestershire SPD be approved for public consultation. The consultation ran between 23 July and 17 September 2025.

3.2 The consultation on the draft Good Design SPD received comments from ten external organisations or individuals. The external organisations were:

National Highways, LCC Highways, National Forest Company, Historic England, Environment Agency, Natural England, the Coal Authority, Leicestershire Police, Ashby de la Zouch Town Council and one planning consultant.

The comments received have generally focussed on three chapters within the document: Context, Movement and Nature.

- 3.3 A summary of the consultation responses received is attached as Appendix 1 to this report and in table form, this outlines the main issues raised, the Council's response, the action taken to deal with the issue and the name of the respondent's organisation.
- 3.4 In total there were 110 comments or observations received from the external organisations and internally. Of these, 22 were comments of support/no comment relating to chapters or sections within the document, which were noted. These are shown marked as blue in Appendix A.
- 3.5 A further 63 comments and observation from external organisations and internally suggested changes which have been agreed and are now proposed within the revised document. These are shown marked as green in Appendix A.

- 3.6 There are 25 comments which have been noted, but no changes to the document are recommended. The reasons for not amending the document to take account of those comments are shown marked as brown in Appendix A.
- 3.7 Officers are satisfied that the consultation responses have been adequately dealt with, and in particular, detailed discussions have been held with LCC Highways to ensure the relevant chapters of the document are generally in accordance with the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide. Members will see that the majority of comments received have either supported the Good Design Guide or resulted in a significant number of amendments to the document. Where comments have not resulted in changes, the reasons why are clearly set out in Appendix A.
- 3.8 A link to the document which has been amended to take into account the consultation responses where appropriate can be found here:
[Good Design Guide - supplementary planning document March 2026](#)

4.0 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 Formulation of an SPD is an Executive function, but adoption is a Council function which has been delegated to the Local Plan Committee.
- 4.2 Therefore, Cabinet is asked to recommend to the Local Plan Committee that it formally adopts the Good Design Guide for North West Leicestershire SPD at its meeting on 22 April 2026.

| Policies and other considerations, as appropriate | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Council Priorities: | Insert relevant Council Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning and regeneration - Communities and housing - Clean, green and Zero Carbon - A well-run council |
| Policy Considerations: | Paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, all local planning authorities should prepare design guides or codes consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code. The Good Design Guide will align with national planning policy and the design policy in the new Local Plan. |
| Safeguarding: | None identified. |
| Equalities/Diversity: | An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed. |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Customer Impact: | The new Good Design Guide will provide clear clarity for customers on the Councils expectations for the design of new development. |
| Economic and Social Impact: | New development offers the opportunity to use good design to create healthy, social and economically vibrant places that work well for everyone. The aim of the document is that it will promote good and well-designed buildings and spaces and create meaningful places - places that people can be proud of, will last for generations and help to make people's lives happier and more fulfilling. |
| Environment, Climate Change and Zero Carbon: | The new Good Design Guide contains guidance on how to deal with green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, biodiversity, energy consumption and sustainable construction including water management. |
| Consultation/Community/Tenant Engagement: | Consultation of the draft document took place between 23 July and 17 September 2025. |
| Risks: | If applications are refused as contrary to the Good Design Guide, there is a risk that appeal inspectors may allow a poor-quality development and result in developers submitting schemes of a much lower standard of design on the basis that a precedent has been set. This risk should be mitigated by aligning the Good Design document with national policy contained in the NPPF, the National Model Design Code, design policy in the Council's Local Plan and by consultation with key stakeholders including major house builders. |
| Officer Contact | Chris Elston Head of Planning and Infrastructure chris.elston@nwleicestershire.gov.uk |

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Consultation Responses to Good Design SPD (August/September 2025)

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------|----|------------------------------------|----|-------------------------|
| 22 | Support, no comment/ no action necessary | 25 | Point Noted but no change proposed | 63 | Agreed and changes made |
| 0 | Outstanding comments in discussion | | No comments on Chapter | | |

CHAPTER: General Comments

| SECTION | | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT |
|---------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 1 | <p>Security considerations are primarily focused on residential development and public spaces. These principles should also be applied to other types of development, such as industrial estates and educational facilities.</p> <p>Suggested wording: “Proposals will be expected to demonstrate how the design has been influenced by the need to plan positively to reduce crime and the fear of crime, and how this will be achieved.”</p> | Agreed | <p>This will be made more explicit.</p> <p>Introduction. Change to ADD:</p> <p>‘In all development, safety and security is of paramount importance, and proposals will be expected to demonstrate how this has been achieved.’</p> <p>Retail and active frontage Add: Code relating to Security: ‘Roller shutters must be perforated and powder coated’ and ‘Roller shutter boxes must be located internally’</p> <p>Schools Add: Code relating to Boundaries: ‘Boundary fencing alongside the public realm and around entrances must be designed in harmony with the buildings and structures’ and</p> | Leicestershire Police |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | <p>'Public art should be considered to offer a distinctive and attractive boundary'. 'Extensive lengths of perimeter fencing should be screened with planting.'</p> <p>Local Facilities Add: Code relating to Design: 'Safety and security must be integrated into any proposals.'</p> <p>Additional Checklist question added at the top: 'Has safety and security been well considered and integrated into the proposals'</p> | |
| 2 | 2 | | Can more best practice images be used from around North West Leicestershire, Leicestershire or the Midlands. | Agreed | Local examples added | Ashby de le Zouch Town Council |
| 3 | 3 | | Use of more local images | Agreed | Local examples added | JJM Planning |
| 4 | 1 | | General support for the document | Response welcomed | n/a | Historic England |
| 5 | 4 | | Request for more terraced units to show how these can be delivered. | Agreed Additional wording added to expand on how Frontage Parking needs to be delivered. | Change to: Separate pages for Frontage Parking and Side Parking. | NWLDC Strategic Housing |
| 6 | 2 | | No comments regarding the document | Response welcomed | n/a | National Highways |
| 7 | 3 | | No comments regarding the document | Response welcomed | n/a | Coal Authority Planning Team |
| 8 | 4 | | Illustrations throughout are extremely helpful and provide a clear, simple, quick and efficient way of communicating information. | Response welcomed | n/a | Davidsons |
| 9 | 1 | | Document should make it clearer for those undertaken smaller projects so that they do not navigate the whole document | Each chapter contains a table at the end, which indicates what may be applicable depending on different types and scale of application. | No change proposed | JJM Planning |
| 10 | 2 | | Recommend the avoidance of tandem parking, as it can lead to on street parking. | Noted | No change proposed. | LCC Highways |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | | | Only two spaces will count towards minimum parking standards. | This point is valid, though the alternative is an overreliance on frontage parking, which can have a more detrimental impact on the street scene. | | |
| 11 | 3 | | Risk of layouts not being adoptable if guide is not in accord with the LHDG | Noted. For information. | No action required | |
| 12 | 4 | | Could be more reference to people with disabilities. | Noted. This is an important issue that the document seeks to address. A number of chapters currently refer to this topic: Housing Quality refers to the need to consider adaptability from the outset. Social Interaction has been amended to take into account the design of seating for different users. | No action required | |
| 13 | 5 | | Any DPD documents should not be in conflict with the Highway Authority standards, particularly with regard to road adoption standards and requirements. | Noted. For information. | No action required | |
| 14 | 6 | | Document could reference Health Impact Assessments. | Noted. The Local Plan is proposing Draft Policy AP6 in relation to Health Impact Assessments. There may be unnecessary duplication with that policy (though currently not adopted) | No action required | LCC Public Health |
| 15 | 7 | | Strong links to nature for health and wellbeing and the importance of views. Links are welcome and could be made more explicit in relation to both physical and mental health and wellbeing outcomes. | Noted. | No action required | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| 16 | 5 | | Checklist approach a significant strength that will enable planning officers to quickly and visually identify non compliance and impacts | Response welcomed | n/a |
| 17 | 6 | | Consistent use of 'must' is positive, with a higher proportion of 'must' than 'should'. | Response welcomed | n/a |
| 18 | 7 | | Use of case studies is valuable and will help ensure compliance, and will encourage developers to go beyond minimum standards | Response welcomed | n/a |

CHAPTER 2 Rationale and Vision

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 19 | 8 | General | Section provides a really good variety of design and street hierarchy....giving a strong flavour of different design approaches. | Response welcomed | n/a | Davidsons |
| 20 | 9 | Vision elements | Supported | Response welcomed | n/a | Environment Agency |
| 21 | 5 | Case study | Breedon case study. Development has private roads, and this is not necessarily clear to those who do not know the scheme. | Agreed | Change to: Add reference to the nature of the road within this development. | LCC Highways |

CHAPTER 3 Assessment

| SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|
| No comments received | | | | |

CHAPTER 4 Responds to Context

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 22 | 10 | Views | Strong commentary on protecting views. This is a key concern for existing residents and contribute to wellbeing | Response welcomed | n/a | LCC Public Health |
| 23 | 6 | Character | Characteristics focus on physical features of land and could also mention health profile of the area and social issues. | Agree | Change to: Add new layout to Character study section that sets out the various components of character. Include uses as part of that. | |
| 24 | 8 | | Character assessment needs to consider the surrounding area, not solely the red line boundary. | The introductory text to the character section refer to <i>both the site and its immediate and wider context.</i> The second paragraph also refers to building 'a detailed appreciation of the site and its surroundings' | No action needed | |
| 25 | 7 | National Forest | Removal of reference to Sustainable Design Guide in introduction as the document focuses on tourism proposals. | Agreed. | Remove reference. | National Forest Company |
| 26 | 8 | | Suggested revised wording: 01. National Forest planting guidelines relate to development which exceeds 0.5ha and requires between 20-30% Forest-related green infrastructure. Details of planting options are contained in the National Forest Guide for Developers and Planners (link opposite). Development below 0.5ha will be expected to incorporate normal landscaping appropriate to the site's National Forest setting. | Agreed | Change to: 01. National Forest planting guidelines relate to development which exceeds 0.5ha and requires between 20-30% Forest-related green infrastructure. Details of planting options are contained in the National Forest Guide for Developers and Planners (link opposite). | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 27 | 9 | | <p>Suggested revised wording:</p> <p>0.2 Where planting and landscaping cannot be accommodated within or close to a development, 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.</p> <p>To align with policy En3</p> | Agreed | <p>Change to :</p> <p>0.2 Where planting and landscaping cannot be accommodated within or close to a development, 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.</p> | |
| 28 | 10 | | <p>Suggested revised wording:</p> <p>03. Not all tree planting and landscaping will contribute to the National Forest planting requirement, but all planting has the potential to reinforce the character and identity of the National Forest, as well as contributing to legibility and wayfinding.</p> <p>Street trees for example do not form part of the National Forest planting requirements set out above but will create character and identity.</p> | Agreed | <p>Change to:</p> <p>03. Not all tree planting and landscaping will contribute to the National Forest planting requirement, but all planting has the potential to reinforce the character and identity of the National Forest, as well as contributing to legibility and wayfinding.</p> <p>Street trees do not, for example, form part of the National Forest planting requirements set out above, although they do create character and identity.</p> | |
| 29 | 11 | | <p>Section on 'use of timber'</p> <p>Suggest the use of better images that can match wording</p> | Agreed. | Images updated | |
| 30 | 12 | National Forest | <p>Suggested additional wording regarding Sustainable performance:</p> <p>Design and build significantly above the 'ordinary' and use the forest as a location to encourage and trial 'green' construction technology and building techniques.</p> <p>Design for low energy and efficiency.</p> <p>Adopt low carbon construction.</p> <p>Source materials sustainability.</p> <p>Design for water efficiency, including rainwater harvesting systems and grey water recycling.</p> | Agreed | <p>Change to:</p> <p>Propose splitting the National Forest pages so that they cover planting and construction.</p> <p>The comments have been included but split over the two spreads.</p> | |
| 31 | 13 | | <p>Add suggested wording on the Tourism Accommodation Guide, as follows:</p> <p>The Sustainable Tourism Accommodation Design Guide sets out rationale for encouraging new and retrofitted tourist</p> | Agreed | As comment directly above | |
| | | | | | | National Forest Company |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------|--|
| | | | accommodation development that helps create a distinctive National Forest character and sense of place and makes a case for investing in the National Forest as a sustainable tourism destination. | | | |
| 32 | 14 | | Suggested changes to photos used that better demonstrate National Forest character and planting and the use of trees. | Agreed. | Images updated | |
| 33 | 15 | | Change order of reference links to National Forest documents | Agreed | Order changed | |
| 34 | 16 | Checklist | Bookend photos should be changed to reflect National Forest planting and National Forest character | Agreed | Images updated | |
| 35 | 17 | | Checklist in appendix Should read : Have National Forest planting requirements been followed? | Agreed | Changed wording. | |

CHAPTER 5

Movement

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 36 | 18 | Intro | Include a reference to the need for a transport vision and reduce the need to travel by the location of land uses | Agreed | Add to introduction Good design is about making sure that development is in the right place to reduce the need to travel, and in creating a strong framework of streets and spaces that provides choices about how people can move about, particularly pedestrians and cyclists. | LCC Highways |
| 37 | 11 | Street Network | Support the addition of criteria relating to the future proofing of land. | Response welcomed | n/a | Ashby de le Zouch Town Council |
| 38 | 9 | | Pedestrian and cycle links not adjacent to the adoptable highway are unlikely to be adopted. | For information. Noted | None proposed | LCC Highways |
| 39 | 10 | | Image showing footpath adjacent to private drive. LCC unlikely to adopt. | For information. Noted. This is a key issue for the council in achieving | None proposed | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | connectivity across areas that are not linked – e.g disconnected private drives. | | |
| 40 | 19 | | Image showing planting. This would not be acceptable on adopted development roads. | Noted | Image changed. | |
| 41 | 11 | | SN1 Requesting the addition of ' <i>away from major road networks/busy streets</i> '... So that pedestrians are not pushed onto major roads that may not be safer. | The Code already states 'This should preferably be away from major road networks and busy streets.' | None proposed. | Ashby de le Zouch Town Council |
| 42 | 12 | | Image showing footpath adjacent to private drive. LCC unlikely to consider adoption. | For information. Noted | None proposed. | LCC Highways |
| 43 | 20 | Street hierarchy | The Primary Street Section indicates 3m cycleway and 2m pavement (5m in total). Is this what will now be required on every Primary Street? | The LCC Highways Design Guide provides options within the street hierarchy. | Change to: Provide some alternative street sections to offer flexibility and greater legibility. | Davidsons |
| 44 | 21 | | Include a reference under <i>Secondary Streets</i> to require a 6m width if a bus service is proposed. | Agreed | Change to: Secondary Streets require a 6m width if a bus service is proposed. | LCC Highways |
| 45 | 22 | | Tertiary Streets needs to include (Shared surface Residential Access) | Agreed | Change to: Additional wording to title included (Shared surface Residential Access) | |
| 46 | 23 | | Edge Lanes are referred to in a street section, but this is not mentioned earlier. | It may be that we can amalgamate 'Edge Lanes' with Tertiary Streets as they will perform the same function. In reality 'Edge Lanes' are single sided Tertiary Streets. | Change to: Propose to retain the Edge Lane diagram but clarify the point that these are single sided Tertiary Streets. | |
| 47 | 24 | Walking | Include reference to NWL Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) | Agreed | Additional wording included | |
| 48 | 12 | Walking and cycling | This is well written and walking and cycling priority comes through well. This will be useful when responding to applications. | Support welcomed | n/a | NWLDC Health and wellbeing |
| 49 | 13 | Walking | Walking routes not adjacent to adoptable highway unlikely to be adopted | For information. Noted | None proposed. | LCC Highways |
| 50 | 25 | Cycling | Include reference to NWL Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) | Agreed | Additional wording included | LCC Highways |
| 51 | 26 | | Refer to minimum cycling standards in LHDG | Agreed | Additional wording included | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 52 | 27 | | Long stay cycle parking should be covered. | Agreed | Add Code: "long stay cycle parking should be covered" | |
| 53 | 28 | Materials | LHDG incorrectly referred to. Higher quality materials will cost more to maintain. This will increase the cost of any commuted sum that will be attached to the areas of adopted highway and the associated public realm. | Agreed. The point about costs should be added. | Document now correctly referred to. Change to: The LHDG sets out two palette types for development: a 'standard' palette and an 'enhanced' palette of higher quality materials. The enhanced palette will cost more to maintain and will result in an increased commuted sum to areas of adopted highway and associated public realm. | LCC Highways |
| 54 | 29 | Junctions and crossings | 'Copenhagen crossings will be unlikely to be considered for adoption | Accepted | Image changed. | |
| 55 | 14 | Parking | A parking space of 2.4x5.5m is recommended. Is this still correct? | Yes. This is the requirement set out within the recent LCC Highways Design Guide | No change needed. | Davidsons |
| 56 | 30 | | Refer to increasing need to provide EV charging facilities | Agreed | Reference to EV charging added | LCC Highways |
| 57 | 15 | | 50:50 rule and its difficulty in relation to affordable housing. Concern to avoid displaced parking. | Noted. | | NWLDC Strategic Housing |
| 58 | 31 | Parking approach | Clarify diagram re parking drawing to make it less confusing | Agreed | Amendment made | LCC Highways |
| 59 | 32 | | Include space dimensions in diagrams | Agreed | Amendment made | |
| 60 | 16 | | Query re image relating to street trees and vehicle movement | Noted Image is indicative only | No change proposed | |
| 61 | 33 | | Query re image showing garages close to the road | Agreed The image is NOT focussing on the garages, but recognise that this is a misleading element. | Image changed | |
| 62 | 34 | | Reference should be made to the requirement for 0.25 visitor spaces per dwelling. | Visitor parking is important but can depend greatly on the required destination and may not always be where it is needed. LCC has indicated that in some cases provision may be | Add text re Visitor Parking Road layouts should anticipate visitor parking, which is usually linked to the destination. Where formal visitor spaces are required these need to be carefully designed and located to respond to need and minimise loss of open space. | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | on street, but particular provision may be necessary where road layouts make this problematic and highway safety risk. | <p>Code</p> <p>PA.5 Where needed, visitor spaces should be well positioned and designed to minimise loss of open space.</p> <p>PA.6 Formal visitor spaces should be in clearly marked parking bays, which need to be designed in consultation with the Highways Authority.</p> <p>PA.7 Formal visitor spaces should be surfaced in block paving, with a contrasting colour used to delineate them and offer any agreed markings.</p> | |
| 63 | 35 | | Minimum internal dimensions for a double garage should be added. | Agreed | Dimensions added | |
| 64 | 36 | Parking Courtyards | Suggest residents make little or no use of parking courtyards. LCC may resist a reduction of in-curtilage parking provision and may not treat parking courtyards as counting to parking numbers. | Agreed that wording needs stiffening to avoid non-use. Well designed parking courtyards can still provide a viable parking solution, but strict guidelines need to be met. | <p>Change to:</p> <p>Parking courtyards have the potential to provide a parking solution, but the reluctance to use good quality materials and poor design decisions can make them unpleasant and unsafe environments where residents opt to park elsewhere. Specific design criteria are set out here that must be addressed for parking courtyards to be considered appropriate. Additional costs relating to these criteria need to be factored in by applicants prior to committing legally to a land purchase, particularly where it is intended to provide parking for affordable housing.</p> | |
| 65 | 37 | Parking courtyards | These should apply equally to affordable and market housing to be tenure blind. | Agreed | <p>Change to:</p> <p>Design requirements for parking courtyards apply irrespective of tenure.</p> | NWLDC Strategic Housing |
| 66 | 13 | Surface parking | Support section on surface parking | Response welcomed | n/a | Environment Agency |
| 67 | 38 | | Reference could be made to the required space and aisle dimensions within the LHDG | Link doesn't exist. Clarification being sought but can be added. | <p>Change to:</p> <p>Updated link.</p> | LCC Highways |
| 68 | 17 | Services & Utilities | Would prefer to see 'ginnels rather than foreshortening gardens. Current approach has a lack of overlooking over access ways. | Noted | No change proposed. | NWLDC Strategic Housing |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 69 | 39 | Services & Utilities | Revised dimensions for new recycling container system. Should be 4.13 sq/m | Agreed | Change to: 4.13 sq/m | NWLDC Waste Services |
| 70 | 40 | | Revised dimensions for height of enclosed stores. Should be 1670mm | Agreed | Change to: 1670mm | |
| 71 | 41 | | Revised requirements for collection points. Should be 2.10sq/m per unit | Agreed | Change to: 2.10sq/m | |
| 72 | 42 | | Para 2 should be 'containers' not 'crates' | Agreed | Change to: "..bins and recycling containers dominating.." | |
| 73 | 43 | | For any private driveways or edge lanes constructed to an adoptable standard, which the Highways Authority won't adopt and there's no bin collection point(s), for the council's waste collection vehicles to traverse them it would require indemnification against any damage to these roads as a result of waste collection vehicles gaining access and egress to empty waste and recycling receptacles. This would need to be secured via a separate legal agreement between the council and the applicant and/or the management company responsible for the roads. The council will not traverse with the waste collection vehicles any roads which are not constructed to an adoptable standard. | Agreed | Change to: Roads must be constructed to an adoptable standard for waste collection vehicles to be able to traverse them. Indemnity against damage must be provided to allow waste collection vehicles to use unadopted roads. This must be secured via a separate legal agreement between the Council and the applicant and/or management company. | |
| 74 | 14 | Waste | Good reference to safety when performing tasks, particularly bin storage and short drag distances | Response welcomed | n/a | LCC public health |

CHAPTER 6 Embraces Nature

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME |
|----|---------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| 75 | 15 | General | Support for the section | Response welcomed | n/a |
| 76 | 44 | Network of spaces | National Forest images to be used | Agreed | Images updated |
| | | | | | Environment Agency |
| | | | | | National Forest Company |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 77 | 45 | Open space design | Reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles and Standards should be included. Suggest incorporating the FIVE headline standards: S1 Green Infrastructure Strategy Standard; S2 Accessible Greenspace Standard; S3 Urban Nature Recovery Standard; S4 Urban Greening Factor Standard; S5 Urban Tree Canopy Cover Standard. These could be used as an output measure for developers. https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Home.aspx | Agreed The Council has an emerging policy on Green and Blue Infrastructure. There is a Green and Blue Infrastructure dated June 2022 that sets out recommendations, which offers a locally distinctive response. | Change to: Designs need to respond to the findings of the Green and Blue Infrastructure Study, as well as the Fields in Trust Standards. | Natural England |
| 78 | 18 | | Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide 2023 was highlighted. | Noted The Council is using the Fields in Trust standards, which provides a comparable benchmark. | No action | |
| 79 | 16 | Green Infrastructure | Support for the inclusion of a definition | Response welcomed | n/a | Environment Agency |
| 80 | 46 | Open Space design | Use of photos needs amending to reflect National Forest | Agreed | Images updated | National Forest Company |
| 81 | 17 | Sustainable drainage | Support for wording | Response welcomed | n/a | Environment Agency |
| 82 | 18 | | Section supported. | Response welcomed | n/a | Natural England |
| 83 | 47 | | Suggested wording: SuDs can contribute to National Forest planting, but only if they are: - Ecologically designed; - Either permanently or seasonably wet; - Surrounded by extensive tree planting; Ponds are more likely to contribute to National Forest planting where they are located adjacent to existing or proposed woodland due to the potential for habitat connectivity. | Agree | Change to: SuDs can contribute to National Forest planting, but only if they are: - Ecologically designed; - Either permanently or seasonably wet; - Surrounded by extensive tree planting; Ponds are more likely to contribute to National Forest planting where they are located adjacent to existing or proposed woodland due to the potential for habitat connectivity. | National Forest Company |
| 84 | 48 | Sustainable drainage | 'Must be considered' should be changed to make it more robust. | Agree | Change to: | Ashby de le Zouch Town Council |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | 'Sustainable drainage (SuDS) must be included... | |
| 85 | 19 | Street trees | Photo 3 is in a constrained location that is unlikely to survive. | The image is illustrative and the health of a tree in this location would depend on the tree pit. | No action. | LCC Highways |
| 86 | 19 | | Wording welcomed | Response welcomed | n/a | Environment Agency |
| 87 | 20 | | Section welcomed. Trees and other planting in new and existing areas should be diverse to increase biodiversity and resilience, with more use of native species and non-native species with documented value for wildlife. | Response welcomed | n/a | Natural England |
| 88 | 49 | | Street trees. Request for an addition that stipulates that trees must be replaced, with a time limit. Trees are removed and not replaced, and this needs to be avoided. | Agree. | Change to: ST9 Dead, failing or vandalised trees must be replaced within the first available growing season. | Ashby de Zouch Town Council |
| 89 | 50 | | Use of more local examples | Agree | Images changed | National Forest Company |

CHAPTER 7 Makes Best Use of Land

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 90 | 21 | Seperators and Integrators | This is particularly effective. Explanation of green space acting both as a separator and integrator when adding amenity value is clear and helpful. | Response welcomed | n/a | LCC public health |
| 91 | 20 | Back to Back distance | Is the <i>Back to Back distance</i> diagram illustrative or will planting be required? | The image is illustrative | No action | Davidsons |

CHAPTER 8 Enjoys a Strong sense of place

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 92 | 51 | Building design | Document needs to state that it applies to all tenures | Agreed | <p>Change to:</p> <p>Add in principles section</p> <p>05 Design quality will be expected, regardless of tenure.</p> <p>Code Approach must be introduced and followed through regardless of tenure.</p> | NWLDC Strategic Housing |

CHAPTER 9 Has attractive public spaces

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 93 | 52 | Meeting places | The section reads ' <i>front doors could be grouped to promote social interaction</i> '. This needs to also include clearly defined boundaries to create defensible space and reduce disputes. | Noted. The guidance suggests the potential for grouping doors, but this needs to also include definition of space. | <p>Change to:</p> <p>06. Grouping front doors, together with appropriate definition of territory, can also promote interaction between neighbours on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>SI.7 Front doors could be grouped to promote social interaction, subject to appropriate definition of territory.</p> | Leicestershire Police |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 94 | 53 | | <p>Seating orientation and placement, particularly in relation to views is strong. Additional guidance could be included on seating design for different groups and ages.</p> <p>Benches are multifunctional, providing physical rest, opportunities to be still and connect with nature, and social interaction.</p> | <p>Agree Additional wording introduced to provide guidance on these issues.</p> | <p>Change to:</p> <p>04 The design of seating should be informed by the different needs of users, so as to encourage use.</p> <p>A range of seating must be designed to cater for different age groups and users and respond to the needs and scale of space.</p> | LCC public health |
|----|----|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|

CHAPTER 10 Has a mix of uses

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 95 | 21 | Retail and active frontage | <p>Additional wording is suggested in relation to retail properties discouraging recessed doorways. This is to prevent opportunities for anti-social behaviour.</p> | <p>Recessed doorways and shopfronts may form part of the essential character of a place. A wide range of compensatory issues e.g lighting that are also required within the guidance.</p> | No action proposed | Leicestershire Police |
| 96 | 22 | Local facilities | <p>Recreation, sports pitches and facilities isn't really covered.</p> | <p>The range of facilities provided will be covered in other documents.</p> | No action proposed | NWLDC Health and wellbeing |

CHAPTER 11 Has great homes to live in

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|----|---------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 97 | 54 | Space standards | Ambiguity as the checklist says ' must ' whereas the main text says should . | Agree. Clarification and ambiguity removed. | Change to: 01 Buildings need to be able to accommodate change. | LCC public health |
| 98 | 55 | Gardens and balconies | Section refers to a 1.8m wall against the public realm. This should be amplified by a buffer, such as hedging or foliage, to prevent anti-social behaviour (e.g graffiti) | Agreed | Change to: GB4 Opportunities should be taken to soften walls with hedging, planting or foliage. | Leicestershire Police |
| 99 | 56 | | Front doors must be provided for ground floor properties. This is needed to enliven the street scene. | Agreed | Change to: GB8 Front doors must be <i>provided</i> for ground floor apartments. | NWLDC Strategic Housing |

CHAPTER 12 Looks to the future

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|-----|---------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 100 | 22 | General | Support | Response welcomed | n/a | Environment Agency |
| 101 | 57 | Energy efficiency | Include reference to <i>Ground Source Heat Pumps</i> as part of the Governments Future Homes Standard requirement. Need to consider position and orientation. | Agreed | Change to: Heat pumps must be located and oriented to minimise visual impact. | NWLDC Strategic Housing |

CHAPTER 13 Is well looked after

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|-----|---------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 102 | 23 | Stewardship | Concern about the possible lack of accountability for management companies | Noted | No action proposed | NWLDC Strategic Housing |
| 103 | 58 | | Highways need to be designed to adoptable standards | Agreed | Change to: Add Highways need to be designed to adoptable standards. | LCC Highways |

CHAPTER 14 Householders

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME | |
|-----|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 104 | 59 | 45 degree rule | Suggest that must not is replaced by should not | Agreed | Change to: <i>Should not</i> | NWLDC Planning Department |
| 105 | 60 | | Request a definition of ' habitable room ' | Agreed | Change to: Definition of habitable room added | |
| 106 | 61 | | 'Must not' should be replaced with ' should not normally ' | Agreed | Change to: <i>Should not</i> | JJM Planning |
| 107 | 24 | Should not apply to ground floor extensions given what can be done under Permitted Development (PD). | This covers buildings larger than those covered under PD. | No action proposed. | | |
| 108 | 25 | Separation distances | Needs to be made clear that this is guidance only and other considerations need to be taken into account. | This is already covered in the introduction to the section. | No action proposed. | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------|--|
| 109 | 62 | Extensions | Amended wording so that 'generally is included in relation to roof height for extensions. | Agreed | Change to: Add the word <i>generally</i> | |
|-----|----|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------|--|

Appendix Checklist

| | SECTION | MAIN ISSUES RAISED | COUNCIL RESPONSE | ACTION | RESPONDENT NAME |
|-----|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 110 | 63 | Checklist in appendix Should read : Have National Forest planting requirements been followed? | Agreed | Change to: Have National Forest planting requirements been followed? | National Forest Company |