

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

**RESPONSES TO PROPOSED POLICIES**

<b>CHAPTER: 5   POLICY NUMBER: AP1   POLICY NAME: DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENT</b>				
<b>MAIN ISSUES RAISED</b>	<b>COUNCIL RESPONSE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>RESPONDENT ID</b>	<b>RESPONDENT NAME</b>
<b>Principle of Policy</b>				
Support in principle and/or reserve the right to comment at Regulation 19 stage	Noted	No action required at present.	92; 150; 161; 183; 184; 185; 186; 214; 226; 234	Ashby Town Council; Savills (David Wilson Homes East Midlands); Mather Jamie (The Trustees of the Whatton Estate)' Turley (Clowes Developments, Redrow and Wilson Estates); Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management); Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments); Stantec UK (Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey); Oxalis Planning and Pegasus Group (Harworth Estates and

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

				Caesarea); Turley (IM Properties)
Supports AP1 – Design of new development supporting the health and wellbeing of public, and reducing the need to travel or to travel actively (walking or cycling).	Noted	No action required at present.	45	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board (ICB)
The proposed approach to streamline the design policy in favour of more detailed guidance in an SPD is supported in principle.	Noted	Include a requirement in Policy AP1 for development proposals to be in accordance with the Council’s Design Guide.	184; 193; 211; 216; 235	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management); Pegasus Group (Davidsons); Pegasus Group (Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)
<b>Principle of Design Codes and Design Guides</b>				
It is agreed in principle that District Wide Design Codes/Design Guides to guide development are appropriate.	Noted	Include a requirement in Policy AP1 for development proposals to be in accordance with the Council’s Design Guide.	184; 185; 186; 193	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management); Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments)
[Any District Design Code needs to acknowledge that site-specific / local circumstances are a key consideration and therefore be flexible e.g. ‘where possible’ rather	In order to clearly set out the Council’s design expectations, the Design Guide uses a range of mandatory,	Include a requirement in Policy AP1 for development proposals to be in accordance with the	150; 161; 188	Savills (David Wilson Homes East Midlands); Mather Jamie (The Trustees of the Whatton Estate); C

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

than applying unrealistic blanket restrictions to all development. This is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 16: ‘plans should be prepared positively in a way that it is aspirational but deliverable’.]	advisory and suggested requirements.	Council’s Design Guide.		Green Planning (Cadwallader Family)
[Design codes should be flexible to allow creativity and bespoke solutions to individual sites within a wider framework].			184; 193	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management)
[The provision of Design Codes should reflect local design criteria and issues and not simply duplicate national design guidance.]	The Design Guide reflects the Council’s interpretation of good design.	Include a requirement in Policy AP1 for development proposals to be in accordance with the Council’s Design Guide.	184; 185; 186; 193	Pegasus Group (Hallam Land Management); Pegasus Group (Clowes Developments); Pegasus Group (Wilson Bowden Developments)
There is potential for design codes to stifle good design rather than encourage it, create uniformity and formulaic developments. North West Leicestershire have a successful approach to design which the proposed Supplementary Planning Document approach can further support.	Noted	Include a requirement in Policy AP1 for development proposals to be in accordance with the Council’s Design Guide.	211; 216; 235	Pegasus Group (Davidsons); Pegasus Group (Westernrange); Pegasus Group (Davidsons & Westernrange)
There would be an expectation that design would conform to National	It is officers’ view that the Council’s Design	No change	341	Leicestershire County Council (as landowner)

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

<p>Design Guide requirements with developments maximising their potential to meet Building for Heathy Life standards. Further, it is anticipated that the policy will take full account of the advice given in NPPF Section 12.</p>	<p>Guide is the primary source for what constitutes good design and Policy AP1 does not need to refer to the BfHL document.</p>			
<p><b>Specific Issues</b></p>				
<p>[There is increased development pressure on sites intersected by National Gas and National Grid Electricity Transmission infrastructure. To ensure AP1 is consistent with national policy, the following requirement should be included: “x. <i>taking a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites.</i>”]</p>	<p>Noted, however there are numerous factors as well as utilities that need to be considered as part of a site constraints and opportunities exercise. It would not make sense to list every potential factor in the policy itself. Part (3) requires applicants to undertake a opportunities and constraints assessment,</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>61; 62</p>	<p>Avison Young (National Gas); Avison Young (National Grid)</p>
<p>[Concerned that the wording of the policy could preclude Ashby Town Council from including its own local Design Code into our Neighbourhood Plan.]</p>	<p>The Ashby Neighbourhood Plan Review was made in November 2025 and includes a Design Guidance and Codes document.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>92</p>	<p>Ashby Town Council</p>

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

[Highlights several design considerations that would contribute towards safer streets]	Noted and responded to as part of the Design Guide consultation	No change to Policy AP1.	205	Leicestershire Police
<p>[Design codes would be appropriate if they covered measures relating to climate change, carbon capture, biodiversity and nature recovery, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring new developments to fit appropriate features, such as roof top solar panels, from the start rather than retrofitting them in years to come.</li> <li>• Designing the layout of developments to aid the reduction of emissions and increase climate resilience as well as promoting active travel by walking and cycling routes and accessibility to sustainable transport such as bus services.</li> <li>• Requiring increased tree coverage in urban landscapes that can directly reduce temperatures at street level and reduce air-borne pollution in these denser environments.]</li> </ul>	Noted; these themes are addressed in the Design Guide.	No change to Policy AP1	220	CPRE Leicestershire
...reference should be made within this policy to the Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and	There is a section on green infrastructure in the Design Guide and a	No change	223	Natural England

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

<p>Design Guide 2023 which provides evidence based practical guidance on how to plan and design good green infrastructure. It complements the National Model Design Code and National Design Guide and can be used to help planners and designers develop local design guides and codes with multifunctional green infrastructure at the heart. This will help to inspire the creation of healthier, nature-rich, climate resilient and thriving places to live, learn, work and play. We suggest that the GI design guide should be included in the list of supporting evidence.</p>	<p>separate policy on green and blue infrastructure (IF3).</p>			
<p>[Any design principles established should be flexible and not inadvertently stifle innovation or the evolution of building design. This is particularly important when considering the proposed new settlement of Isley Woodhouse where delivery is anticipated to extend beyond the plan period. Building design principles will undoubtedly change over this time and it is vital to the success of long term schemes that they are able to change with the times and meet evolving building standards.]</p>	<p>Noted; the Council’s planning documents will be reviewed regularly.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>226</p>	<p>Oxalis Planning and Pegasus Group (Harworth Estates and Caesarea)</p>

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

<p>[It is important that any future SPD recognises the specific functional and operational requirements of industrial and logistics developments]</p>	<p>Noted – this has been done in the Design Guide</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>234</p>	<p>Turley (IM Properties)</p>
<p>[It is suggested that this policy refers to the need for subsequent maintenance/ upkeep to be considered in the design process to ensure that new developments/places remain “beautiful and safe” over the long-term.]</p>	<p>Noted – we are now proposing a separate policy on stewardship which will be reported to LPC.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>We would like to see new schools located at the heart of their communities with good transport and facility access. School design and the aesthetic should complement the design of the surrounding community. Schools are inclusive and need to ensure the communities they serve support people with protected characteristics.</p>	<p>Schools are dealt with in the design guide.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>341</p>	<p>Leicestershire County Council</p>
<p>[Queries whether the terms ‘beauty/beautiful’ and ‘well-designed’ are appropriate and whether recent housebuilding in the district can be described in these</p>	<p>‘Beautiful’ and ‘well-designed’ are terms used in the National Planning Policy Framework. The</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>352</p>	<p>Jeffrey Guy</p>

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

<p>terms. The NBS website has two “widely-accepted definitions of what constitutes sustainable development”: The first “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. The second provides “a better quality of life for everyone, now and for generations to come”. Do either of these cover the intent of “sustainable buildings and places”?]</p>	<p>purpose of having a design guide is to make clear what these terms mean to North West Leicestershire District Council.</p>			
<p>I see the NPPF doesn’t help here as the term beautiful is somewhat highlighted – beauty is in the eye of the beholder.</p>			396	Siobhan Dillon
<p>Tree lined streets are a lovely aspiration if the streets are wide enough, the trees are well chosen, and their management considered with respect to the lifespan of a tree outliving the lifespan of most policies. Greenspace planting should be encouraged – shrubs, bushes and hedges can meet many of the ecological enhancements of trees. Trees are good but they are not the only planting options that should be considered</p>	Noted	Noted	396	Siobhan Dillon

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

<b>Comments on the design of existing developments</b>				
<p>The recent development on the Castle Donington bypass already has insufficient parking because the parking allowance per property is insufficient. This needs review. Most families have a minimum of two cars now days, one of which maybe electric. See my note below regarding charging points under 5.33.</p>	<p>Parking provision is dealt with in the Design Guide.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>255</p>	<p>Johnathan Aust</p>
<p>To make properties attractive they need more space around them and woodland areas for children to play and adults to walk. A walk around the housing estate and warehouse has no appeal in comparison.</p>	<p>Open space requirements are dealt with as part of Policy IF4.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>255</p>	<p>Johnathan Aust</p>
<p>AP1 Talks about creating "beautiful and safe places". This is something we can all agree with, however the practice is less successful: it has failed in Grange Road developments in terms of beauty, trees, sustainable transport, pollution of water courses: sewage discharges into River Sence has increased since the development. Excess traffic affecting existing residents, also problems with access to schools (insufficient places) and doctors. Light pollution</p>	<p>Aside from the fact that the Grange Road development is still under construction, Policy AP1, in conjunction with the Council's Good Design Guide seeks to ensure that good design is achieved.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>487</p>	<p>Mary Lorimer</p>

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

from Ellistown industrial units is intrusive and detrimental to sleep and to wildlife due to poorly adjusted lights and excess brightness.				
--	--	--	--	--

## APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)

### **Draft Policy AP1 D1 – Design of New Development**

- (1) **All new development must be of high-quality design.** The Council will support ~~proposed developments~~ **development proposals** that are well-designed and as a minimum, offer a good standard of design and **makes a positive contribution to the character of the local area and its natural and built form.** **Proposals should draw on appropriate place-based reference points and demonstrate meaningful engagement with the local community to ensure development responds positively to its context.**
- (2) **All development proposals must be in accordance with the North West Leicestershire Good Design Guide.**
- (3) **All development proposals must be based upon a robust evidence- based opportunities and constraints assessment and be informed by a comprehensive site and contextual appraisal;**
- ~~(4)–New non-residential developments must positively address our Place Making principles:~~
  - ~~a)–A National Forest or locally inspired identity;~~
  - ~~b)–Streets and Spaces shaped by buildings;~~
  - ~~c)–A greener footprint;~~
  - ~~d)–Vibrant, communities;~~
  - ~~e)–Responsive to their context;~~
  - ~~f)–Connected places;~~
  - ~~g)–Easy to get around;~~
  - ~~h)–Well designed and well managed public spaces~~
  - ~~i)–Architectural quality.~~
- ~~(5)–For Residential developments Building for Life 12 will be used instead of the Place Making Principles. New residential development will need to perform positively against Building for Life 12;~~
- ~~(6)–Existing neighbour amenity should be safeguarded in accordance with Local Plan Policy D2;~~
- (4) **Where landscape features are present, such as trees and hedgerows, proposals should demonstrate how they will be retained and incorporated within the design of the development.**

**APPENDIX E – POLICY AP1: DESIGN OF DEVELOPMENT (SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS AND DRAFT POLICY)**

- (5) New development should have regard to sustainable design and construction methods, **where appropriate incorporating measures to reduce emissions and improve energy efficiency in accordance with Local Plan Policies AP3 and AP4.**
- (6) New development ~~designed in accordance with the above principles should be able to demonstrate that they have been~~ **should** be designed to reduce anti-social behaviour and the risk of crime, **to support the delivery of safe and inclusive places.**
- (7) **The District Council will require all new housing development to be in accordance with Nationally Described Space Standards at a density that respects the character and appearance of the locality and makes the most effective use of land, unless it can be demonstrated that there are significant constraints to development, or where the circumstances provide the opportunity to improve the character of the area through development that is at a density that differs from existing development.**
- (8) **For strategic or sensitive development proposals, the Council encourages the use of independent design review to support high-quality, context-responsive design. The requirement for design review will be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking account of the scale of development and the sensitivity of its location. Where a design review is required by the Council, the applicant is expected to undertake and fund this independently.**