

# Leicester City Local Plan Examination

## Matters and Issues Statement

---

Participant **CEG (Commercial Estates Group)**  
Ref number **318**  
Prepared by **Lichfields**  
Date **24 October 2024**

### **Matter 12: Issue 12 – Open Space, Sports and Recreation (14 November 2024)**

---

#### **Q405. Does Diagram 17: Open Space Network, Leicester Urban Area provide a clear and effective representation of the Green Wedges, Open Spaces and rivers/canals within Leicester?**

- 1.1 In principle, Diagram 17 should provide a helpful strategic representation of the Open Space *Network* with the Leicester Urban Area and this is welcomed.
- 1.2 The diagram would however benefit from some refinement to ensure it is clear and effective. We suggest the Leicester City Administrative Boundary could be more clearly identified and, as raised in our Regulation 19 representations, the Green Wedges and open spaces areas beyond the City boundary should be represented as accurately as possible at the time of adoption, having regard to commitments and emerging allocations in neighbouring authority areas.

#### **Q406. Diagram 17 includes details of Green Wedges and open spaces which lie outside Leicester’s administrative boundary. Is this approach justified?**

- 1.3 Yes. Given the wider spatial context and relationships to development in neighbouring administrative areas, identifying Green Wedges and open spaces which lie just outside Leicester’s administrative boundary is justified and would be consistent with the approach to other matters (as discussed in earlier Examination sessions). This approach should assist the proper planning of the area, including in the Leicester Urban Area.

#### **Q410. Should the supporting text to Policy OSSR01 include reference to the wider benefits which transport connections within the Green Wedges can secure to be consistent with national policy?**

- 1.4 The benefits of transport connections within the Green Wedges should principally be addressed in the Transport chapter and policies. As noted in our Regulation 19 representations, the supporting text to Policy OSSR01 should however provide for and support transport connections within the Green Wedges.

**Q411. In order to be effective, should Policy OSSR01 include a criterion which would permit development proposals within the Green Wedge where they would deliver essential infrastructure, subject to appropriate mitigation being provided?**

1.5 Yes. In particular, Policy OSSR01 should recognise and, where appropriate, support the wider benefits which improved transport connections within Green Wedges can provide. We suggested in our Regulation 19 response that a further scenario/criterion should be added top Policy OSSR01:

*‘...(f) where proposals will deliver essential infrastructure providing appropriate mitigation will be provided.’*

1.6 This change is proposed having regard to the Southern Access Road which will serve the Thorpebury development, but there may be other scenarios, such as the introduction of bus priority measures at junctions within a Green Wedge, which would benefit from this policy provision. This additional criterion will provide in-principle policy support for essential infrastructure, while still allowing for case-by-case assessment through the development management process.

**Q412. Is the extent of the Green Wedges justified and effective?**

1.7 Generally yes, subject to the considerations set out in our Regulation 19 response on behalf of CEG and the answers above.

1.8 We note the minor ‘cartographic revisions’ to the Green Wedges identified in EXAM 17 and can confirm we do not have any concerns in relation to the minor alterations to boundaries in the Hamilton area (Figures 1 to 6).