

MINERALS - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES

Key Issue – General:

Whether there are clear and appropriate development control policies that, amongst other things, accord with and do not repeat or reformulate national policy and regional policy. (National Policy: PPS 12, Paras 4.30 and 5.2; Planning and Minerals Practice Guide, Para 21)

Specific Issues and Matters for Discussion:

Whether there would be inappropriate repetition or reformulation of national policies.

1. *Having regard to MPS 1, are elements of national policy repeated in Policies CS11, DC1, DC3, DC5, DC7, DC10, DC11, DC12, DC13, DC15 and DC16? If so, what amendments would be appropriate? [GOEM; Lafarge; UK Coal]*

The Council considers that the inclusion of these policies accord with the advice given in MPS1 (MCD 2) and the Planning and Minerals: Practice Guide (MCD 3). MPS1 indicates that, in carrying out their functions in relation to the preparation of plans, MPAs should 'state the criteria to be used in assessing mineral proposals and in formulating planning conditions, to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment or human health' (para.17 5th bullet point). The Guide states (para.21): 'LDDs for minerals should provide a clear guide to mineral operators and the public about the locations where mineral extraction may take place. They should set out clear and appropriate development control policies, which should include the safeguarding both of sensitive environmental features and of mineral resources with potential for future extraction. They should cover all aspects of environmental and resource protection including restoration.' Para.29 states that 'LDDs should set out the criteria against which applications for minerals development or the framing of conditions to be attached to planning permissions will be assessed. Development control policies should be expressed precisely and unambiguously.'

It is worthy of note that the inclusion of such policies have been welcomed by Ibstock Brick, who state that 'the DC policies provide an insight into the final means of future development control in the County and is a welcome milestone emerging out of the long development of the documents.'

The Council considers that it is important to include Policy CS11 in the Core Strategy, setting out as it does the Council's approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment of Leicestershire. The inclusion of this policy is supported by English Heritage and Natural England.

The Council considers that it is appropriate for a section and policy on sustainable mineral development (DC1) to be included. The Council sees the inclusion of Policy DC1 as being important in assisting in the delivery of the Government's objectives for sustainable minerals development. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 1).

In respect of Policy DC3 (Sites of National Historic Importance), MPS1 states that MPAs should 'adopt a presumption in favour of the preservation of listed buildings, nationally important archaeological remains (including scheduled ancient monuments) in situ, and their settings, if mineral proposals would cause damage or have a significant impact on them, unless there are overriding reasons of national importance for the development to proceed' (para.14 -7th bullet point). The inclusion of Policy DC3 is welcomed by English Heritage. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 24).

In respect of Policy DC5 (Countryside), MPS1 (para.14 – 11th bullet point) merely states that the value of the wider countryside and landscape should be taken into account. The Council consider that it is appropriate to include a development control policy that indicates that proposals would not be acceptable where they have an adverse impact on the countryside and landscape. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 27).

DC7 (Archaeology) indicates the steps that would be necessary to make a proposal acceptable where it is likely to affect important archaeological remains. This is not addressed in MPS1 – para.14 5th bullet point advocates careful consideration of proposals likely to affect cultural heritage; 7th bullet point refers to the preservation of important remains in situ. PPG16 (para.15) (MCD 30) states that Development plans should reconcile the need for development with the interests of conservation including archaeology and should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their settings. The inclusion of Policy DC7 is supported by English Heritage. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 26).

In respect of Policy DC10 (Agricultural Land), MPS1 (para.14 – 10th bullet point) only seeks the use of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality. Paragraph 29 of PPS7 (MCD 27) states that local planning authorities may wish to include policies in their LDDs to protect specific areas of best and most versatile agricultural land from speculative development. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 28).

The Council has no objection to change to the wording of Policy DC10 suggested by UK Coal. Paragraph 28 of PPS7 uses the phrase 'Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable'... The Council accordingly proposes that Policy DC10 be amended to read: ...'result in the *significant* loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land'...

In respect of Policy DC11 (The Water Environment), MPS1 (para.17 –8th bullet point) only states that the effect on surface and groundwater should be considered. DC11 aims to ensure that proposals do not have a significant adverse impact on flood flows in accordance with MPS1 (para.17 – 9th bullet point). The Environment Agency fully supported the statement made in para.9.18 of the Preferred Options document that development within the floodplain or on land at high risk of flooding, leading to a loss of floodplain storage or obstruction to flood flows, is unacceptable and commented that Policy 34 succinctly addressed the Agency's concerns. Paragraph 5.33 and Policy DC11 of the Submission draft repeat those parts of the Preferred Options document. GOEM made

no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 34).

UK Coal suggest that Para 5.33 and Policy DC11 should recognise that surface mine development can provide flood alleviation in areas of flood risk that could reduce the areas prone to flooding. DC11 is aimed at protecting the water environment. CS12 (Strategic River Corridors) refers to the enhancement of their capacity to function as natural floodplains. The Council has no objection to the inclusion of wording in the supporting text (Para 5.33) regarding the potential for the restoration of mineral sites to provide flood attenuation and storage areas but does not consider that it is necessary to amend the policy.

In respect of DC12 (Health and Amenity), MPS1 advises MPAs to 'state the criteria to be used in assessing mineral proposals to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment or human health' (para.17 5th bullet point). GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 29).

In respect of DC13 (Cumulative Impact), MPS1 merely states that the cumulative effects of local developments should be 'considered' (para.14 11th bullet point). The inclusion of DC13 is supported by English Heritage. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 36)

In respect of DC15 (Public Rights of Way), MPS 1 refers, in the context of restoration) to maintaining or improving the Public Right of Way network around restored mineral sites as far as practicable (para.19 6th bullet point). DC15 also addresses the impact during operations. GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 33).

In respect of DC16 (Air Safeguarding), MPS1 merely states that 'where restoration of mineral workings is through landfill or to a wetland habitat, consult the owner or operator of civil and military aerodromes within 13km, in order to assess the likelihood of increasing the bird strike hazard'(para.19 8th bullet point). GOEM made no comment about the inclusion of the equivalent policy in the Preferred Options document (Policy 35).

2. *Having regard to the contents of Circulars 02/08, 11/95 and 05/05, how appropriate is the inclusion of Policies DC17, DC18 and DC19? Do they present policy that should be the starting point for the consideration of planning applications? [GOEM]*

The Council considers that the inclusion of these policies accord with the advice given in MPS1 (MCD 2) and the Planning and Minerals: Practice Guide (MCD 3). MPS1 indicates that, in carrying out their functions in relation to the preparation of plans, MPAs should 'state the criteria to be used in assessing mineral proposals and in formulating planning conditions, to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment or human health' (para.17 5th bullet point). The Guide states (para.29) that 'LDDs should set out the criteria against which applications for minerals development or the framing of conditions to be attached to planning permissions will be assessed.'

Policy DC17 and Box 3 set out information that may be necessary in support of an application and is thus the starting point for the assessment of proposals. Planning applications may be refused on the grounds of insufficient information. The MPA is entitled to request appropriate information to assist in the determination of planning applications. Box 3 sets out the scope of information which is considered could be material to mineral development applications. It informs and assists applicants and the public and thus serves a useful practical purpose.

Policy DC18 and Box 4 set out matters to be covered by conditions in order to control the effect of the development, thereby delivering in part Core Strategy objective 5. Policy DC19 and Box 5 set out matters to be covered by obligations in order to control and mitigate/compensate for the effect of the development, thereby delivering in part Core Strategy objectives 5 and 7.

Whether the provisions in respect of sustainable mineral development and design are clear and appropriate

3. *In Policy DC1, to what is the phrase “no significant loss in other sustainability objectives” alluding? Would the DPD benefit from further explanatory text in this regard? Should there be specific reference to the historic environment? [EH]*

The Government’s objectives for sustainable minerals development referred to in Policy DC1 are set out in Para 5.2. ‘Other sustainability objectives’ encompass social and economic considerations which are not explicit in the Government’s objectives for sustainable minerals. They relate to other aspects of sustainability as set out in the Government’s Sustainable Development Strategy (referred to in Para 5.1) (MCD 31) and the Regional Spatial Strategy (referred to in Para 5.3).

The Council does not consider that it is necessary or appropriate to list all the objectives of sustainable minerals development in Policy DC1. One of the Government’s aims for sustainable development is ‘the protection and enhancement of the physical and natural environment’. The Council considers that this encompasses the historic environment and does not therefore consider that specific reference should be made to this in the policy.

4. *If Policy DC2 and the supporting text were headed “Sustainable Design”, would this better reflect the policy intentions?*

The Council agrees that the heading ‘Sustainable Design’ would better reflect the intentions of Policy DC2 and the supporting text.

Whether the provisions in respect of the natural and historic environment are clear and appropriate

5. *In Policy DC2, how realistic is a criterion requiring enhancement? Would an alternative be to require development to contribute positively?*

The Council considers that the criterion requiring enhancement in Policy DC2 accord with the Government’s Sustainability Strategy and advice given in PPS1 (MCD 26), PPS9 (MCD 28) and MPS1 (MCD 2).

The Government's UK strategy for sustainable development, *Securing the Future*, (MCD 31) sets out how the goal of sustainable development should be pursued to provide, inter alia, the protection and *enhancement* of the physical and natural environment.

PPS1 states that 'planning policies should seek to protect and *enhance* the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside and urban areas as a whole' (Para 17); that 'planning authorities should seek to *enhance* the environment as part of development proposals' (Para 19); that development plan policies should take account of environmental issues such as 'the conservation and *enhancement* of wildlife species and habitats and the promotion of biodiversity; the need to improve the built and natural environment in and around urban areas and rural settlements; and the preservation and *enhancement* of built and archaeological heritage' (Para 20); and that 'in preparing development plans, planning authorities should seek to *enhance* as well as protect biodiversity, natural habitats, the historic environment and landscape and townscape character (Para 29)

One of the national objectives for minerals planning, as set out in Para 9 of MPS1, is 'to protect and seek to *enhance* the overall quality of the environment once extraction has ceased'. MPS1 goes on to indicate that, in carrying out their functions in relation to the preparation of plans, MPAs should 'seek to protect and *enhance* the character of surrounding rural and urban areas by careful planning and design of any proposals for minerals development (para.17 1st bullet point).

6. *Should Para 5.8 refer to the historic environment? [EN]*

The Council has no objection to a change to the wording of Para 5.8 suggested by English Heritage. The Council accordingly proposes that Para 5.8 is amended to read: ...'Important features relating to landscape, *the historic environment* and nature conservation have become protected by statute...'

7. *Is it necessary to include listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments within Policy DC3 given their statutory protection?*

The Council considers that Policy DC3 accords with advice contained in MPS1 (MCD 2). This states that MPAs should 'adopt a presumption in favour of the preservation of listed buildings, nationally important archaeological remains (including scheduled ancient monuments) in situ, and their settings, if mineral proposals would cause damage or have a significant impact on them, unless there are overriding reasons of national importance for the development to proceed' (para14 -7th bullet point). The inclusion of Policy DC3 is welcomed by English Heritage.

8. *In relation to Policy DC3 should there be a distinction between direct and indirect effects; also to the effect that any overriding reasons should be of national importance? [EH]*

The Council has no objection to changes to the wording of Policy DC3 suggested by English Heritage. MPS1 (MCD 2) states that MPAs should 'adopt a presumption in favour of the preservation of listed buildings, nationally important archaeological remains (including scheduled ancient monuments) in situ, and their settings, if mineral proposals would cause damage or have a significant impact on them, *unless there are overriding*

reasons of national importance for the development to proceed (para14 - 7th bullet point).

The Council accordingly proposes that Policy DC3 is amended to read:
 `Planning permission will not be granted for minerals development that would have *significant adverse direct effects* on sites of national historic importance or on their character, appearance or setting, including...` *...unless there are overriding reasons of national importance for development* in that location that clearly outweigh the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of interest.'

9. *Should Paragraph 5.17 recognise that some Conservation Areas may be of national importance?*

Para 5.18 recognises that the significance of conservation areas can vary, and that some are of national importance.

10. *Policy DC4 refers to special landscape areas and landscape feature of importance (such as open space in built-up areas). Are these specific designations? Do the landscape areas accord with PPS 7 Paras 24 and 25?*

Para 5.17 indicates that special landscape areas would include areas such as Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside. Such areas are identified in existing Local Plans prepared by District Councils and will be identified through the preparation of District Council LDFs. The Council considers that reference to such areas in Policy DC4 is appropriate and would accord with the local landscape designations specified in PPS7 Paras.24 and 25 (MCD 27).

11. *Should Policy DC5 be re-phrased so as to give greater credibility and weight to countryside matters? Should emphasis be given to safeguarding the general appearance and character of the landscape and the countryside? [NE]*

Natural England supports the overall aim of this policy, but has concerns about the way in which it is written and phrased. The Council considers that implementation of Policy DC5 will safeguard the general appearance and character of the landscape and the countryside. The Council does not consider that the policy needs rewording. MPS1 (MCD 2) (para.14 – 11th bullet point) states that the value of the wider countryside and landscape should be taken into account. Policy DC5 gives guidance as to the circumstances where permission will not be granted. The MPA must balance need against environmental impact. 'Overriding need' is therefore a judgement to be made by the MPA. It is not a 'get out' clause for the applicant.

12. *Is Policy DC5 locally distinctive? Should the policy refer to the countryside or the open countryside? [BDC]*

The Council considers that Policy DC5 is locally distinctive in referring to the countryside. Areas designated as 'countryside' have been identified in Local Plans prepared by District Councils, including the Blaby District Local Plan (MCD 20). This reflects the approach advocated in Strategy Policy 8 (Development in the Countryside) of the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan 1996-2016 (MCD 32), which designated land beyond the existing and planned limits to the built-up areas of settlements which is not land comprising a Green Wedge as Countryside and stated

that development in the Countryside will only be acceptable if the general appearance and character of the landscape and the countryside is safeguarded or enhanced.

Blaby District Council has objected to Policy DC5 of the Waste Development Control Policies but have not commented on Policy DC5 of the Minerals Development Control Policies. Waste Policy DC5 refers to 'open countryside' in the heading, but 'countryside' in the policy itself. Policy DC5 in the Minerals Plan only refers to 'countryside'. The Council considers that the Minerals Plan is correct in that it reflects the approach taken in the Structure Plan and does not require amendment.

13. *Is the wording of Policy DC5 too restrictive? [Ibstock]*

The Council does not consider the wording of DC5 is too restrictive. The last sentence of Para 5.20 makes it clear that the assessment of any impacts will include consideration of mitigation and/or compensatory measures.

14. *Should Policy DC6 make clear that woodland planting should have regard to Landscape Character Areas? What is the source document in this regard? Should there be greater emphasis on planting in the National Forest area?*

The Council does not consider that reference to landscape character areas or planting within the National Forest is necessary in Policy DC6.

Paragraph 5.22 indicates that woodland planting should respect the local landscape character and local biodiversity. Policy CS11 (environmental protection) states that minerals development should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and quality of the landscape and Policy CS17 (reclamation) states that restoration should be in keeping with the local area. As mentioned in Para 4.114, Landscape Character Areas are identified in the County Landscape and Woodland Strategy. Woodland planting in the National Forest area is promoted in Policy CS14 (National Forest) and CS17 (Reclamation).

15. *Does Policy DC7 add anything to the content of PPG 16? If not, what amendments would be appropriate? How are "important archaeological remains" to be defined and where could developers find details?*

DC7 (Archaeology) indicates the steps that would be necessary to make a proposal acceptable where it is likely to affect important archaeological remains. This is not addressed in MPS1 (MCD 2) – para.14 5th bullet point advocates careful consideration of proposals likely to affect cultural heritage; 7th bullet point refers to the preservation of important remains in situ. PPG16 (para.15) (MCD 30) states that Development plans should reconcile the need for development with the interests of conservation including archaeology and should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their settings. The inclusion of Policy DC7 is supported by English Heritage.

The Council's Sites and Monuments Record provides a full list of archaeological sites and contains information on the known and reported archaeology. The County Historic Landscape Characterisation will also contribute to the understanding of the character of the landscapes of

Leicestershire and the survival of historic landscapes and can allow the prediction of hitherto unrecorded components of the historic landscape, including above-ground and buried archaeological remains. Developers should however look to the Council's archaeological curator to identify those areas that have archaeological potential and in turn to recommend how that potential should be assessed.

Whether the provisions in respect of the protection of natural resources are clear and appropriate

16. *In Policy DC8, would it be better to avoid the phrase "to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority"?*

This wording accords with the development control policy suggested in 'A guide to mineral safeguarding in England' (BGS – December 2007) (page 10) (MCD 18).

17. *In respect of the water environment, and in areas without a strategic flood risk assessment, should there be a requirement for site specific flood risk assessments for waste development in Zones 2 or 3? [EA]*

Item 24 in Box 3 (Policy DC17) indicates that a flood risk assessment should be provided in appropriate cases. Annexes D and E of PPS25 (MCD 29) on Development and Flood Risk indicates when and what is required within Flood Zones 1 to 3. Minimum requirements for all levels of flood risk assessment are given in Annex E. Para E9 of this Annex states that planning applications for development proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals for new development located in Flood Zones 2 and 3 should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. The Council does not consider that it is necessary to repeat this guidance in the DPD.

Whether the provisions in respect of community and environmental protection are clear and appropriate

18. *Should Policy DC12 refer to "unacceptable impacts"?*

The Council accepts that DC12 should refer to 'unacceptable impacts'. This would accord with MPS1 (MCD 2), which advises MPAs to 'state the criteria to be used in assessing mineral proposals to ensure that permitted operations do not have *unacceptable adverse impacts* on the environment or human health' (para.17 5th bullet point). The Council proposes that Policy DC12 be amended accordingly.

19. *What is the value of Policy DC13? Are there areas that are vulnerable to cumulative effects? How will cumulative effects be assessed? [GOEM; Lafarge; UK Coal; Ibstock]*

The Council considers that Policy DC13 is an appropriate development control policy and that its inclusion accords with the advice given in MPS1 (MCD 2) and the Planning and Minerals: Practice Guide (MCD 3) (see response to Question 1 above). MPS1 states that MPAs should consider the cumulative effects of local developments (para.14 11th bullet point), and MPS2 (MCD 4) that MPAs should have regard where relevant to cumulative impacts of simultaneous and/or successive working of a number of sites in a wider area of commercially-viable deposits (Para 12). Policy DC13 indicates that, having had regard to the cumulative impact, permission will

not be granted where these are unacceptable. The inclusion of DC13 is supported by English Heritage.

Particular areas of the County where mineral workings have had a significant effect are identified in Para 4.89. Concentrations of present and former workings particularly exist in the Soar river corridor north of Leicester and in the north western part of County.

The Council acknowledges that there cannot and should not be an automatic conclusion that there is a cumulative effect simply because features arise in relation to more than one different potential environmental impact, hence the need for a 'proper assessment' referred to in Para 12 of MPS2. The County Council will expect planning applications for minerals development which require Environmental Impact Assessment to be accompanied by an assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposal. This should include information as to how the proposal relates to existing minerals development and how cumulative impacts can be mitigated through phasing, design and operation. 'Environmental Impact Assessment: A guide to good practice and procedures', a consultation paper published by DCLG in June 2006 (MCD 24), includes some advice on the assessment of cumulative effects.

Whether the provisions in respect of transport are clear and appropriate

20. *Would Policy DC14 be better expressed in positive terms? For example, developers could be required to examine and pursue alternatives to road transport where such opportunities are presented by the location and site.*

The Council considers that, as a development control policy, Policy DC14 is best expressed in negative terms. This approach would appear to have the support of the Highways Agency, who have supported the statement in Policy DC14 that planning permission for minerals development involving road transport would not be granted unless the highway network is able to accommodate the increase in traffic generated by the production of minerals. Policy CS16, which sets out the strategy for the transportation of minerals, promotes the location of new mineral working where rail/water transport could be secured.

21. *In the policies referring to transport impacts, should there be reference to minimising adverse effects?*

The Council does not consider that it is necessary to refer to minimising adverse effects in Policy DC14. The policy indicates that planning permission would not be granted where the impact of traffic would be unacceptable. Para 5.40 indicates that the effects of road transportation can be reduced by various measures. The assessment of any impacts will include consideration of such measures

Whether the provisions in respect of controlling minerals workings and the reclamation of mineral sites are clear and appropriate

22. *Is the wording of Policy DC16 (Air safeguarding) sufficiently precise? [Ibstock; Midland Quarry Products; Quarry Products Association; Tarmac]*

The Council considers that the policy accords with ODPM Circular 01/03 (MCD 33), which states (Annex 2 para.8) that the primary aim of aerodrome safeguarding is to guard against new or increased hazards

caused by development. Mitigation measures will be taken into account in assessing whether the development is likely to give rise to new or increased hazards. Policy DC16 is supported by East Midlands Airport.

Bird strike hazards are not confined to areas in close proximity to aerodromes. In order to protect aerodromes against such hazards, safeguarding maps include a dotted circle, with a 13 kilometre radius in the case of civil aerodromes and an eight mile (about 12.87 kilometre) radius in the case of military aerodromes, centred on the safeguarded aerodrome reference point to indicate the area within which developments likely to attract birds require consultation with the appropriate authorities.

23. *Should Box 3 (Policy DC17) refer to the need for Appropriate Assessment for any development having an impact on the River Mease SAC?*

Para 5.9 refers to the need for an Appropriate Assessment for any development proposal that is likely to have a significant effect on the River Mease SAC. Box 3 (Policy DC17) refers to the provision of an assessment of the ecological impact of the proposed development (item 20) and an assessment of the impact on sites of biodiversity (item 21), but the Council has no objection to the inclusion of reference to the need for Appropriate Assessment for any development having an impact on the River Mease SAC.

24. *Should Box 3 (Policy DC17) and Box 7 (Policy DC20) refer to future ground stability? [Coal Authority]*

The Council has no objection to the inclusion of reference to ground stability in Box 3 (Policy DC17) and Box 7 (Policy DC20) as suggested by the Coal Authority. The Council accordingly proposes that item 29 in Box 3 (Policy DC17) be amended to read: 'Restoration proposals including finished levels, depths and source of soils and landscaping; *and measures to ensure future ground stability.*' The Council also proposes that the following be added to the matters listed in Box 7 (Policy DC20): 'Details which will ensure the future stability of the ground following restoration.'

25. *Should "bird strike" conditions be added to the list at Box 4?*

The Council has no objection to the inclusion of reference to "bird strike" conditions in Box 4 (Policy DC18). The Council accordingly proposes that the following be added to the matters listed in Box 4 (Policy DC18): 'bird management/control'.

26. *Should reclamation matters for inclusion in planning applications (Policy DC20, Box 7) refer to the National Forest, Charnwood Forest and contributions to Green Infrastructure? [CBC]*

Policy DC20 (Box 7) lists the restoration details that the Council considers should be submitted with a planning application. The submitted details will be assessed to ensure that the development accords with the intentions of policies contained within the Core Strategy. Policies CS13 and 14 deal with the National Forest and Charnwood Forest. The Council would expect these policies (together with any other relevant ones such as CS11, CS12, CS15 and CS17) to be taken into account in drawing up reclamation and after-use proposals.

The Council does not therefore consider that reclamation matters for inclusion in planning applications (Policy DC20, Box 7) should make specific reference to the National Forest or Charnwood Forest, but has no objection to the inclusion of reference to Green Infrastructure. The Council accordingly proposes that the following be added to the matters listed in Box 7 (Policy DC20): 'the contribution of the development to the County's Green Infrastructure'.