

Q3. Do you think that the policies and proposals of the LDF should consider not only current needs, but also needs of future generations ?

No.	Respondent	Response
1.	Kirby Muxloe Parish Council	Yes
2.	Natural Life Leicestershire County Council	No answer.
3.	National Playing Fields Association,	No answer
4.	The Gypsy Council	No answer
5.	LE9 2LT	Yes
6.	Health & Safety Executive	No answer
7.	Grove Park Commercial Centre Ltd	Yes
8.	Alliance & Leicester Plc	Yes
9.	LE3 2JP	Yes, as we live in a very different era now and what the future generation wants is crucial.
10.	LE9 2DF	Yes
11.	LE19 3ET	Yes
12.	Transport 2000 (Leicestershire)	Yes
13.	LE3 8AE	Very much so – we need to preserve communities by protecting the green divides
14.	Architectural Liaison Officer. Leicestershire Constabulary	No answer
15.	Jelson Limited	No answer
16.	LE18 3TH	Yes
17.	A J Granger	Yes
18.	Cllr E A Webster-Williams	The LDF should put more into the needs of future generations than in the present
19.	LE9 3GB	Yes
20.	LE3 2XH	Yes
21.	LE19 3LY	Yes

22.	LE3 3AB (Anon)	Most definitely – we do not want another planning disaster like Thorpe Astley – short term thinking for which we're all paying the price!
23.	LE2 9JQ	Both
24.	LE8 4DN	Yes
25.	LE3 8PU	Yes
26.	LE8 5RH	Yes, a good balance must be found between current and future needs
27.	Leicester Forest East Parish Council	No answer.
28.	Anon LE3 3LY	Yes of course
29.	LE9 Anon	Any decisions made will impact on future generations and so yes they need to be considered
30.	LE8 6LT	Yes
31.	LE8 5RD	Yes definitely.
32.	LE19 3ET	Of course but its shutting the gate after the horse has bolted. Plans and policies are useless unless they are carried out. Think and act.
33.	LE9 1SX	Of course.
34.	Cllr Dilks	Strongly agree – sustainability and global warming should be taken into account.
35.	LE9 3GG	Yes
36.	LE9 3BA	Yes but surely this would mean gazing into a crystal ball.
37.	A T	No answer.
38.	LE8 5YJ	Yes.
39.	Anon	Yes
40.	Stoney Stanton WI	Yes
41.	Stepping Stones Countryside Management Project	No answer
42.	LE3 8EH	Yes
43.	Cllr Alan Tanner	Yes
44.	Ford & Slater	No answer

	Limited	
45.	BT Group Plc	Current and future needs.
46.	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Ltd	Yes, isn't that what an LDF's designed for?
47.	Leicestershire County Council (Structure Plans)	Yes
48.	Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management Leicestershire County Council	The need for development to be sustainable is accepted.
49.	Cllr John Kenney	Where possible and appropriate.
50.	Blaby Parish Council	Yes
51.	Strategic Planning - SRA	
52.	Local Strategic Partnership	As environmental sustainability is one of the priority themes of the LSP. The LSP would hope that this should be taken into account in LDF planning.
53.	Woodland Trust	The Woodland Trust believes it is crucial that sustainability is central to the LDF. Not only is this a key theme in government policy, it is the only way to ensure quality of life and environmental enhancement into the future.
54.	Glenfield Parish Council	This is a definite yes.
55.	Sapcote Parish Council	No answer
56.	LE3 8SD	Future needs also especially transport.
57.	Aston Flamville Parish Meeting	Of course.
58.	Leicester & Rutland Society of Architects	Yes

59.	Cattrell Associates	No answer
60.	LE19 4WE	Yes – especially future traffic congestion based on “dated” local road systems.
61.	The National Trust	Yes
62.	Billington Road West Elmesthorpe	No answer
63.	LE2 9HJ	I definitely think that future needs should be considered as well as present ones.
64.	LE8 4GD	This cannot be answered in a few words. The authority can mis-use the answers to drive its own agenda.
65.	Rutland Country Homes	Definitely.
66.	LE9 9FW	Yes
67.	LE2 9JA	Yes
68.	Braunstone Town Council	No answer.
69.	Leicestershire County Council (Chief Executive’s Department)	No answer.
70.	Network Rail	No answer.
71.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	No answer.
72.	LE19 2JJ (1)	Yes but to good standards of layout, access, design and build.
73.	Thurlaston Parish Council	Most definitely – need to conserve and actively promote environmental projects. Need to provide a future for village communities.
74.	Countesthorpe WI	Yes.
75.	LE19 2JJ (2)	Yes.
76.	Leicester City Council	No answer.

	(Regeneration and Culture)	
77.	Leicester City Council Investment and Development	No answer.
78.	Next plc (CgMs)	No answer.
79.	LE19 2JJ (3)	Yes it is important but you do need to adopt good standards.
80.	House Builders Federation	No answer.
81.	LE9 9SU	Yes.
82.	Highways Agency	Yes preferably any new development should occur on previously developed land before developing any Greenfield sites. Policies and proposals need to consider sustainability issues such as the encouragement of sustainable transport to provide access for all, reduce the reliance on the private car and in turn reduce congestion.
83.	LE9 3HD	yes, within reason
84.	English Nature Eastern area Team	No answer.
85.	LE3 8AT	Yes.
86.	LE8 4AQ	Yes.
87.	Anon	No
88.	LE19 2 JH	I would consider it irresponsible not to do so.
89.	LE2 3TJ	Yes this is sensible
90.	LE9 3EJ	Yes it should evolve and adapt.
91.	LE19 5HG	Yes but to good standards of layout, access, design and build.
92.	Housing Corporation	No answer.
93.	Development Plans Group Leicester City Council	No answer.
94.	Nottingham East	No answer.

	Midlands Airport	
95.	Powers Estate	No answer.
96.	Thorpe Astley community Association	No answer.
97.	Blaby W.I	Yes
98.	Leicester and Leicestershire Motorcycle forum Transport Strategy Team Leicester City Council	No answer.
99.	Pegasus Planning Group	It is considered that the policies and proposals of the LDF should consider the needs of future generations and particularly the needs of the economic requirements for the Borough Council Area and the need to meet housing needs both in relation to private sector requirements and also in respect of affordable housing requirements.
100.	LE9 3BA	Most certainly and not only the need of young people but within age groups 30-40,40-50, over 50.
101.	British Waterways	No answer.
102.	The Square, Littlethorpe, Leicester	Yes
103.	Leics & Rutland Federation of Women's Institutes	Yes – In 1997 a resolution was passed at the national AGM supporting Agenda 21.
104.	LE9 7SE	More emphasis should be placed on needs of future generations otherwise proposals are out of date by the time they are implemented.
105.	LE2 4QX	Yes – definitely
106.	Glen Parva Environment Group	Yes and in particular traffic problems should be addressed.
107.	J S Bloor (Services) Ltd	No answer.
108.	English Heritage	No answer.
109.	Croft Parish Plan Group	No answer.
110.	Wheatcroft & Son	No answer.
111.	Taylor Woodrow	No answer.

	Strategic Developments.	
112.	Campaign for Dark Skies	No answer.
113.	Gordon Smith Associates	Yes this is sensible.
114.	Revelan Group (Gough Planning Services).	<p>Clearly, the LDF cannot reasonably consider the need of future generations as such needs are presently unknown. This notwithstanding, it is considered that the LDF strategy should be firmly grounded in sustainable development principles. In order to do so, four considerations should inform the LDF:-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1. Certainty</p> <p>In order for investment decisions to be taken by the public and private sectors, and individuals, as much certainty as possible should be provided by the LDF. This can be achieved in two ways:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) By advancing an LDF which covers as long a time frame as possible; 2) By ensuring that the policies, proposals and designations in the LDF will not need to be altered at the end of the Plan period. <p style="text-align: center;">2. Resource safeguarding</p> <p>Physical and environmental resources can be assigned different values or degrees of importance. It is considered fundamental to the achievement of sustainability, that such resources judged to be of prime importance are safeguarded. The principle being that such safeguarding will be maintained throughout and beyond the Plan period. In effect, the non-negotiable environmental capital of the District should be identified.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3. Meeting Needs</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4. Cohesion</p> <p>The LDF should properly advance policies and proposals which ensure that the present needs of the population, and those expected to arise within the Plan period, are met. Allowance should also be made for those</p>

		<p>which may arise beyond it. Cohesion</p> <p>The above three matters should be cohesively brought together to ensure that development requirements are met in a manner which properly protects the non-negotiable environmental capital of the District.</p>
--	--	---

Summary

Responses strongly supported the approach of the issues paper that the needs of future generations and not just present day needs should be considered. The concept of 'sustainability' was seen as key to the process by some respondents.

Q4. Do you think that new development in the District should take place on brownfield land before greenfield sites are developed?

No.	Respondent	Response
1.	Kirby Muxloe Parish Council	Yes
2.	Natural Life Leicestershire County Council	N/C
3.	National Playing Fields Association,	Yes
4.	The Gypsy Council	N/C
5.	LE9 2LT	Yes but allied with using common sense i.e. avoid being totally rigid
6.	Health & Safety Executive	N/C
7.	Grove Park Commercial Centre Ltd	Not necessarily – should be developed together
8.	Alliance & Leicester Plc	Yes
9.	LE3 2JP	Yes
10.	LE9 2DF	Yes
11.	LE19 3ET	Brownfield initially with take-up of facilities before take-up of Greenfield, e.g. Grove Park still has unoccupied offices but Carlton Park is being developed
12.	Transport 2000 (Leicestershire)	Yes
13.	LE3 8AE	Definitely
14.	Architectural Liaison Officer. Leicestershire Constabulary	N/C
15.	Jelson Limited	Jelson is minded that, as far as possible, new development should occur in sustainable patterns. It notes also the Government's preference for new development to be directed to previously developed land before Greenfield sites. However, the Government does not place an embargo on Greenfield development, envisaging instead a balanced approach to growth with development occurring in brownfield and Greenfield locations. The District Council's Urban Capacity Study will indicate how much new development can be accommodated on previously developed land in this instance. The DPDs produced by the District Council should

		prioritise the use of previously developed land where it is sustainable to do so, and where previously developed sites can deliver new development within reasonable timescales, but relevant policies should be flexible enough to allow sustainable Greenfield development in appropriate circumstances.
16.	LE18 3TH	Yes
17.	A J Granger	Where possible but not at the expense of potential commercial development
18.	Cllr E A Webster-Williams	Always brownfield
19.	LE9 3GB	Brownfield
20.	LE3 2XH	Yes
21.	LE19 3LY	Yes
22.	LE3 3AB (Anon)	Yes
23.	LE2 9JQ	Brownfield first definitely
24.	LE8 4DN	Yes
25.	LE3 8PU	Yes – absolutely
26.	LE8 5RH	Yes
27.	Leicester Forest East Parish Council	That the development of land for housing should be kept, where possible and relevant, to brownfield sites rather than Greenfield development.
28.	Anon LE3 3LY	Yes
29.	LE9 Anon	Most definitely, Greenfield land should be considered precious and treated accordingly, once it's gone it cannot be regained.
30.	LE8 6LT	Where possible – depends on type of development and location
31.	LE8 5RD	It depends on where the Greenfield sites are in relation to brownfield sites. If one is on the wrong side of the other, then Greenfield has to be developed first before brownfield
32.	LE19 3ET	Only on brownfield land. Problems will increase if the spread goes further and no hope of replacing the car. Will be heading for “slum” areas.
33.	LE9 1SX	Yes definitely.
34.	Cllr Dilks	Yes but brownfield sites should not be overdeveloped or given over entirely to housing.
35.	LE9 3GG	Obviously.
36.	LE9 3BA	Too much development has already occurred on Greenfield sites.

37.	A T	No answer
38.	LE8 5YJ	Brownfield would be more preferable.
39.	Anon	Depends on definition of brownfield!
40.	Stoney Stanton WI	Yes
41.	Stepping Stones Countryside Management Project	<p>Blaby District Council should consider looking at the distribution of open spaces and the connectivity of these spaces across the district as a whole, whether they are brownfield or Greenfield sites. Then having got an overall picture of these areas look at the placement of these open spaces within or adjacent to or separating settlements. Then having obtained an overall picture of the District consider which of these sites are more appropriate for developing as housing or other forms of built development and which are important sites to be developed for wildlife, informal recreation open spaces and green corridors.</p> <p>Consider whether these open spaces are important for local informal recreation such as walking or whether these areas could be developed for enhanced green space providing a much needed pocket of countryside for the enjoyment of local people (whether they are living or working in this area). Consider whether these pockets of countryside can be developed for providing cycling, walking or equestrian use in order to provide a series of green corridors from one settlement to another thus promoting more sustainable forms of travel within the district.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in themselves can be important wildlife habitats and the potential of developing these sites, as much needed pockets of countryside in areas of built developments should be explored before assuming that they are only suitable for built development. This would help ensure that there is a good level of green space intertwined with built development will ensure that there is a good level of green space intertwined with built development will ensure that everyone can work or live within walking distance of green space.</p> <p>Having said that it is also felt that Greenfield</p>

		sites within designated Green Wedge areas should continue to be protected from the effects of built development. In particular, the two main Green Wedges which the Stepping Stones Project has been involved in – Semi Rural West Green Wedge and Sence and Soar Valley Green Wedges – consideration should be given to the Landscape characters of these areas as outlined in the long term management strategies for these Green Wedges before approval is given for built development.
42.	LE3 8EH	Yes – <u>but</u> brownfield sites should be assessed for their nature conservation value or recreational potential. Green spaces within the urban area can be very valuable in their own right.
43.	Cllr Alan Tanner	Yes
44.	Ford & Slater Limited	No answer
45.	BT Group Plc	In line with PPG 3, development should have priority on brownfield sites.
46.	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) Ltd	Yes and no. All potential new sites should be considered equally.
47.	Leicestershire County Council (Structure Plans)	Redevelopment of brownfield land should be prioritised over development for Greenfield land, in accordance with Strategy Policy 2 and Housing Policy 3 of the Structure Plan. Brownfield sites very often already have the infrastructure required such as walking, cycling and public transport routes.
48.	Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management Leicestershire County Council	The effective development of brownfield sites particularly requires detailed consideration and early discussion and agreement with the Highway Authority.
49.	Cllr John Kenney	Where appropriate, but only if the new development blends with the surrounding area.
50.	Blaby Parish Council	Yes
51.	Strategic Planning - SRA	No answer
52.	Local Strategic Partnership	The Local Strategic Partnership recognises that brownfield land is preferable to greenfield sites where appropriate. Concern was expressed, however, that undue development should not

		occur in one area and that rural sustainability could be affected by this policy.
53.	Woodland Trust	No answer
54.	Glenfield Parish Council	Yes, brownfield is always preferable to the use of Greenfield sites. Separation zones/Greenfield should be maintained.
55.	Sapcote Parish Council	Sequential Development - The approach to the siting and provision of new development on brownfield sites or close to existing major services and infrastructure is supported in preference to the development of Greenfield sites. This approach should apply equally to housing, wherever possible.
56.	LE3 8SD	Yes – leave greenfields well alone.
57.	Aston Flamville Parish Meeting	No, a balance is always required, bits of both.
58.	Leicester & Rutland Society of Architects	Yes
59.	Cattrell Associates	The breadth of your study is considered to be extremely wide and I would restrict my comments at this stage of your consultation process. High store is held in your document with regard to the issues of sustainability and the preference for the development of brownfield sites. In the context of allocating sites for future development I believe that greater emphasis should be placed on matters relating to deliverability as brownfield sites are notoriously difficult to bring forward for development particularly when the public sector places such a high emphasis on sustainability issues. It is important to address the issue of deliverability in order to fulfil the immediate and apparent requirement for housing in order to stabilise market conditions with a view to providing affordable housing for, in particular, first time buyers. This will in my view require a more realistic appraisal of the requirement to develop on suitable Greenfield sites which are in close proximity to established services and amenities. The Council should therefore adopt a policy which will allow the promotion of suitable Greenfield sites rather than blindly endeavouring

		to secure development on brownfield sites where industrial inertia will not permit development in a timescale suitable to fulfil current market needs driven by first time buyers who are currently out priced.
60.	LE19 4WE	I could not comment as my knowledge of such sites is very limited but industrial/business development should be kept away from village/town centres, e.g. Grove Park.
61.	The National Trust	Generally yes.
62.	Billington Road West Elmesthorpe	All new development, whether homes or commercial, should be built on brownfield sites wherever possible. Homes in particular should be built so that they have access to existing amenities.
63.	LE2 9HJ	Where possible I think that brownfield sites should be developed but obviously it is inevitable that some development will have to be on Greenfield sites.
64.	LE8 4GD	Yes
65.	Rutland Country Homes	Possibly – but not necessarily. The sustainability of each site should be considered.
66.	LE9 9FW	No, anywhere that is practical.
67.	LE2 9JA	Yes
68.	Braunstone Town Council	No answer.
69.	Leicestershire County Council (Chief Executive's Department)	No answer.
70.	Network Rail	We would support the development of brownfield, previously developed sites ahead of Greenfield sites in line with Government guidance
71.	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	No answer.
72.	LE19 2JJ (1)	Not necessarily. Some brownfield sites (existing industrial/commercial land) should be retained and maintained for possible future suitable

		commercial and non residential uses as and when needs arise to serve local communities close to home. Brownfield sites should include unwanted and underused garden areas.
73.	Thurlaston Parish Council	Brownfield sites, particularly infilling of villages but with highway and traffic considerations.
74.	Countesthorpe WI	Yes.
75.	LE19 2JJ (2)	Infill sites first.
76.	Leicester City Council (Regeneration and Culture)	No answer.
77.	Leicester City Council Investment and Development	No answer.
78.	Next plc (CgMs)	<p>As referred to above, it is pertinent that the needs of existing and future large scale employment operations are provided for. In this respect National Government Guidance – a material consideration when formulating development plan policies – states that it is more appropriate to locate such facilities out with existing settlements, perhaps on their periphery in order to avoid a conflict of land uses.</p> <p>As such, it is necessary to emphasise within the LDF document that large scale employment operations and their associated uses are required to be located on “Greenfield” land, however that, the majority of other land uses, including small scale employment uses, and particularly retail, residential and other commercial developments be subject to a “sequential test” whereby the preferred location for such development will be within previously developed “Brownfield” sites within the existing built up area in accessible locations.</p>
79.	LE19 2JJ (3)	Not necessarily (see 3 above).
80.	House Builders Federation	No answer.
81.	LE9 9SU	No, anywhere that is practical.
82.	Highways Agency	Yes ideally development should occur on previously developed land, Any release of Greenfield sites should be minimised wherever

		possible and the impact on the trunk road network considered. In all circumstances development should not be permitted in unsustainable locations, which are remote or peripheral in relation to existing settlements.
83.	LE9 3HD	Yes
84.	English Nature Eastern area Team	<p>Many biodiversity-rich sites have been previously developed. PPG3 housing annex C states that the definition of Brownfield land excludes..... land that was previously developed but where the remains of any structure of activity have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings), and where there is a clear reason that could outweigh the re-use of the site - such as its contribution to nature conservation – or it has subsequently been put to an amenity use and cannot be regarded as requiring development.</p> <p>Within Blaby, sites that make a valuable contribution to local and county biodiversity should not be regarded as Brownfield sites and therefore should not be a high priority for development.</p>
85.	LE3 8AT	The women’s Institute have a mandate asking for brownfield sites to be assessed and used in preference to Greenfield, but a lot depends on village requirements and sensitive use of all areas.
86.	LE8 4AQ	Yes
87.	Anon	Yes
88.	LE19 2 JH	Definitely, but I do not think “back gardens” should be classed as Brownfield Land as appears to be the case.
89.	LE2 3TJ	In general yes, if it is considered that the building is likely to be used again.
90.	LE9 3EJ	In most cases yes. But depends on what type of development and its impact it will have.
91.	LE19 5HG	Not necessarily some Brownfield sites should be retained and serve local communities. Brownfield sites should include unwanted and underused garden areas.
92.	Housing Corporation	No answer.
93.	Development Plans Group	No answer.

	Leicester City Council	
94.	Nottingham East Midlands Airport	No answer.
95.	Powers Estate	No answer.
96.	Thorpe Astley community Association	No answer.
97.	Blaby W.I	Yes
98.	Leicester and Leicestershire Motorcycle forum Transport Strategy Team Leicester City Council	No answer.
99.	Pegasus Planning Group	<p>Inevitably it is always a good thing for new development to take place on Brownfield land prior to Greenfield sites being developed. The problem arises however, that there are insufficient Brownfield sites within the District in order to cater for both housing and employment needs. There is therefore a need to also take into account Greenfield sites for development.</p> <p>In developing Greenfield sites it is not correct that Brownfield sites should always be developed prior to Greenfield sites. It is important to take note that there are strategic sites, such as the need for a large scale strategic employment site which is important to the economy of the area as a whole, and indeed to the region, and therefore development will need to take place prior to development on other Brownfield sites.</p>
100.	LE9 3BA	There is a need to develop Brownfield land to a much greater extent, open countryside; leisure land is part of our protected heritage. Once covered with concrete it is lost forever.
101.	British Waterways	No answer.
102.	The Square, Littlethorpe, Leicester	Yes
103.	Leics & Rutland Federation of Women's	Yes – Resolutions on brownfield development being a priority have been passed in 1953 and 1998. However other resolutions cover nature

	Institutes	conservation issues such as the loss of wild flowers.
104.	LE9 7SE	No. This would impose considerable restraint on imaginative and forward looking ideas.
105.	LE2 4QX	Development should be on either if the situation is in keeping with present facilities.
106.	Glen Parva Environment Group	Yes
107.	J S Bloor (Services) Ltd	No answer.
108.	English Heritage	No answer.
109.	Croft Parish Plan Group	No answer.
110.	Wheatcroft & Son	No answer.
111.	Taylor Woodrow Strategic Developments.	<u>Context for the Plan</u> The Local Development Framework (LDF) should promote a sustainable form of development following the sequential approach set out in National Planning Policy Guidance, RPG8 Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands and the emerging Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan 1996 – 2016. The Company supports the identification of the Central Leicestershire Policy Area and the clear requirement for a large proportion of the District Council's housing requirement to be provided within it.
112.	Campaign for Dark Skies	No answer.
113.	Gordon Smith Associates	In general yes – if it is considered that the building is unlikely to be used again for its current purpose in the foreseeable future but should not preclude Greenfield especially adjacent to the built area.
114.	Revelan Group (Gough Planning Services).	As a general principle, previously developed land should be redeveloped to provide for development needs, before greenfield land is used. However, only land in sustainable locations, such as urban areas, should be afforded such priority.

Summary

Some 112 responses were made to this question. The majority of respondents (some 80%) who expressed an opinion considered that brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield sites. This approach generally accords with the policy approach of Central Government and that contained in the

Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan. Some respondents (including developer and business representatives) argued that a more balanced approach should be pursued to the provision of new development, although it is generally recognised that previously developed land should be prioritised where it is sustainable to do so. A number of respondents highlighted the potential nature conservation and recreation value of brownfield sites.