

**LEICESTERSHIRE & LEICESTER
WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**CORE STRATEGY &
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

**AGENDA
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES**

Whether there would be inappropriate repetition or reformulation of national policy

1. Having regard to Annex E of PPS 10, are elements of national policy repeated in Policies CS10, DC2, DC4, DC8, DC10, DC12 and DC13. If so, what amendments would be appropriate? [GOEM]
2. Having regard to the contents of Circulars 02/08, 11/95 and 05/05, how appropriate is the inclusion of Policies DC14, DC17 and DC18? Do they present policy that should be the starting point for the consideration of planning applications? [GOEM]
3. Does Policy DC9 duplicate PPS 10 at Para 21(i)? If so, what amendments would be appropriate? [GOEM]
4. Does Policy DC6 add anything to the content of PPS 7? If so, what amendments would be appropriate? [GOEM]

Whether the provisions in respect of design are clear and appropriate

5. Should Policy DC1 also refer to minimising the production of waste in the *operation* of new development?
6. If Policy DC1 and the supporting text were headed "Sustainable Design", would this better reflect the policy intentions?
7. In Para 5.3, is sufficient clarity given to the importance of visual appearance? Should there be "hooks" to design tools and mechanisms?
8. In Policy DC1, how realistic is a criterion requiring enhancement? Would an alternative be to require development to contribute positively?
9. Is it necessary to include listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments within Policy DC2 given their statutory protection? [EH]

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

10. In Policy DC2 should there be a distinction between direct and indirect effects; also to the effect that any overriding reasons should be of national importance? [EH]
11. Should Paragraph 5.8 recognise that some Conservation Areas may be of national importance? [EH]

12. Does Policy DC4 add anything to the content of PPG 16? If so, what amendments would be appropriate? How are "important archaeological remains" to be defined and where could developers find details?

Whether the provisions in respect of transport are clear and appropriate

13. Would Policy DC10 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.
14. In the policies referring to transport impacts, should there be reference to minimising adverse effects?

Whether the provisions in respect of the control of waste development as well as reclamation, after-care and after-use are clear and appropriate

15. Should Box 1 (Policy DC14) refer to the need for Appropriate Assessment for any development having an impact on the River Mease SAC?
16. 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]
17. Should "bird strike" conditions be added to the list at Box 2?
18. Policies DC15 and DC16 are directed at temporary uses. Do the same policy considerations apply to permanent installations and, if so, would any related change of wording be appropriate?
19. In Policy DC16, should agriculture be listed as an alternative after-use?
20. In respect of after-use (Policy DC16), should there be reference to linking public access and improvements to the public rights of way network? [NE]

Anticipated participants:

WPAs
GOEM
English Heritage (EH)
Environment Agency (EA)
Natural England