

**MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**TUESDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

## **ADDITIONAL PAPERS**

## **CONTENTS**

<b>Item</b>		<b>Pages</b>
5.	<b>QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION</b>	3 - 20
6.	<b>QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS</b>	21 - 38

**COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

**QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

**QUESTION FROM CLAIRE PALMER TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“How does not taking the opportunity to convert the many derelict sites in Leicester city into residential property but instead shifting this housing quota to decimate prime agricultural rural sites in NWLDC concord with the levelling up agenda?”

**REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO CLAIRE PALMER**

“Leicester City Council through its Local Plan is seeking to secure the redevelopment of brownfield sites across the City, as required by government policy. However, government policy has also significantly increased the amount of housing that the City needs to provide. This requirement is more than can be achieved on the brownfield sites in the City. The District Council is required by government policy to work with the other authorities in Leicestershire to address the unmet need. The distribution proposed in the Statement of Common Ground achieves this. The failure to agree a redistribution represents a significant risk to the Council’s local plan which in turn would leave the district vulnerable to unwanted planning applications.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM GERALD PALMER TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“In light of the conflict in Ukraine exasperating the issue, how will Britain ever be able to be sustainable for grain production if all our fields are built on?”

#### **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO GERALD PALMER**

“The District Council is required by government policy to work with the other authorities in Leicestershire to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met. This includes agreeing how the unmet need in Leicester City can be accommodated elsewhere. A failure to do so represents a significant risk to the Council’s local plan which in turn would leave the district vulnerable to unwanted planning applications. Even without the unmet need, it is inevitable that some agricultural land will need to be released for development. The amount of land that this entails represents only a very small proportion of the district.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM SIMON HAGGART TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“If the housing need proposed for Leicester City is to address the expected population increase in Leicester City residents, how will this population be best served by housing them in a rural environment, lacking all urban amenities and disconnected entirely from Leicester City? (They won’t want to live there and we don’t want the housing here, destroying yet more Countryside)”

#### **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO SIMON HAGGART**

“The District Council is required by government policy to work with the other authorities in Leicestershire to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met. The distribution proposed in the Statement of Common Ground achieves this. The proposed distribution has regard to a whole range of factors, including not just the functional relationship of each authority area with Leicester City, but also the balance of jobs and homes in each authority area and deliverability of the distribution of development. It is the balance between jobs and homes that has driven the figure for North West Leicestershire rather than the functional relationship with the City.

The failure to agree a redistribution represents a significant risk to the Council’s local plan which in turn would leave the district vulnerable to unwanted planning applications.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM PAULA HAGGART TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

‘Our district is already the only district in Leicestershire ear marked to lose significant rural land to HS2 despite being one of the few without access to a train station, any additional loss would be devastating so why is NWLDC being considered for such a disproportionately high ‘quota’ from Leicester City (an area with which we have no nexus).’

#### **REPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO PAULA HAGGART**

“As previously stated, the District Council is required by government policy to work with the other authorities in Leicestershire to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met. The distribution proposed in the Statement of Common Ground achieves this. The proposed distribution has regard to a whole range of factors, including not just the functional relationship of each authority area with Leicester City, but also the balance of jobs and homes in each authority area and deliverability of the distribution of development. It is the balance between jobs and homes that has driven the figure for North West Leicestershire rather than the functional relationship with the City. The failure to agree a redistribution represents a significant risk to the Council’s local plan which in turn would leave the district vulnerable to unwanted planning applications.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM GRAHAM BUDD TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“With reference to Charnwood BC recommending building 56 new homes on 16 acres of farmland and justifying this against local’s objections by saying they ‘have a lack of useable land to meet **their** building quota’ why are they then considering taking 1248 housing quota and 23 ha employment land from Leicester City Council and Is this counterintuitive argument going to be mirrored here?”

#### **REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO GRAHAM BUDD**

“Charnwood Borough Council is not able to demonstrate that it has a 5-year supply of housing land. Therefore, in accordance with government policy its current adopted local plan is out-of-date. Therefore, unless it has very good reasons to reject a proposed site there is a presumption in favour of the development. This Council is able to demonstrate that it has a 5-year supply of housing land.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM JENNI BUDD TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“Why are we considering building in NWLDC where such development would counteract multiple government policies such as sustainable transport (we have no train station stations and poor bus services), net zero (losing fields will reduce natural carbon sinks), biodiversity, woodland creation, green corridors - all these are undermined by greenfield development whereas Leicester city has ample brownfield sites available?”

#### **REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO JENNI BUDD**

“Leicester City Council through its Local Plan is seeking to secure the redevelopment of brownfield sites across the City, as required by government policy. However, government policy has also significantly increased the amount of housing that the City needs to provide. This requirement is more than can be achieved on the brownfield sites.

Government policies require that all of the Leicestershire authorities have to work together to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met.

The distribution proposed in the Statement of Common Ground achieves this. The proposed distribution has regard to a whole range of factors, including not just the functional relationship of each authority area with Leicester City, but also the balance of jobs and homes in each authority area and deliverability of the distribution of development. It is the balance between jobs and homes that has driven the figure for North West Leicestershire rather than the functional relationship with the City. Achieving a better balance between jobs and homes will help to reduce the need to commute which in turn will assist with meeting zero carbon aims. The local plan review will not only need to identify suitable sites, but also the new infrastructure required to support development, such as improved public transport, walking and cycling as well as making provision for enhanced biodiversity.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM ANNE STAFFORD TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“If the housing need for Leicester City is to reflect, or ensure, Leicester City’s increased prosperity, how is this objective achieved if housing is given to other authorities for whom taking it represents a diminishing of its very essence?”

#### **REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO ANNE STAFFORD**

“Leicester City Council through its Local Plan is seeking to ensure that as much of its needs can be accommodated within its boundaries. However, government policy has significantly increased the amount of housing that the City needs to provide. This, coupled with the fact that the city boundary is already very tight, means that in accordance with other government policies all of the Leicestershire authorities have to work together to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met.

The distribution proposed in the Statement of Common Ground achieves this. The proposed distribution has regard to a whole range of factors, including not just the functional relationship of each authority area with Leicester City, but also the balance of jobs and homes in each authority area and deliverability of the distribution of development. It is the balance between jobs and homes that has driven the figure for North West Leicestershire rather than the functional relationship with the City.

The failure to agree a redistribution represents a significant risk to the Council's local plan which in turn would leave the district vulnerable to unwanted planning applications.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM KEVIN ANDERSON TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“Why should NWLDC take any excess housing quota from the unitary authority of Leicester City as we are not geographically neighbouring nor do we have any connection in either classification or economy?”

#### **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO KEVIN ANDERSON**

“The District Council is required by government policy to work with the other authorities in Leicestershire to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met. The distribution proposed in the Statement of Common Ground achieves this. The proposed distribution has regard to a whole range of factors. This includes the functional relationship of each authority area with Leicester City as well as the balance of jobs and homes in each authority area and deliverability of the distribution of development. It is the balance between jobs and homes that has driven the figure for North West Leicestershire rather than the functional relationship with the City.

The failure to agree a redistribution represents a significant risk to the Council’s local plan which in turn would leave the district vulnerable to unwanted planning applications.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

#### **QUESTION FROM FIONA ANDERSON TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“As Leicester City Council was asked to build 39,400 new homes between 2020 and 2036 after the Government announced that the 20 largest cities in England would need to increase their housing supply targets by 35%, why is it not doing so? [or telling the government it cannot, or won't, manage it]”

#### **REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO FIONA ANDERSON**

“Leicester City Council through its Local Plan is seeking to ensure that as much of its needs can be accommodated within its boundaries. However, government policy has significantly increased the amount of housing that the City needs to provide. The city boundary is very tight such that it cannot accommodate of all of its needs within its boundary. Government policy requires that all of the Leicestershire authorities work together to ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing needs are met. The Statement of Common Ground achieves this.”

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

**QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR DR T EYNON TO COUNCILLOR T GILLARD**

"What memorial events has this Council held in 2022 as part of the UK-wide *Remembering Srebrenica* initiative?"

**RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR T GILLARD TO COUNCILLOR DR T EYNON**

"The 11th July is recognised internationally as the Remembering Srebrenica day. I had intended to propose that we take a minute to pay our respects at the nearest Council meeting which was to be on 21st June. Unfortunately, that meeting was cancelled. I am pleased however that we have been able to provide remembrance by marking a minutes silence this evening.

In addition to Remembering Srebrenica there are a number of other memorial days which have relevance to the people of North West Leicestershire.

I have asked our new Chief Executive to produce a list of dates that this council may wish mark, with the intention of producing a corporate memorial calendar."

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR D BIGBY TO COUNCILLOR A WOODMAN**

"What is the estimated cost of repairs expected to be necessary to ensure Hood Park Lido remains open to the public for the medium to long term?"

#### **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR A WOODMAN TO COUNCILLOR D BIGBY**

"The Council's leisure partner, Everyone Active (EA), has identified a potential issue with the lido pool tank at Ashby Leisure Centre and Lido. Under the terms of the contract and the lease, EA has a responsibility to ensure facilities are maintained and kept open to the public, and they continue to do that. In order to understand the nature of the issues, EA has so far had one contractor visit site who has offered an opinion as to what the issue is, a potential solution and an indicative cost rather than a formal quotation. As this information has been supplied to EA by a contractor, the Council is unable to share it due to the commercially sensitive nature.

EA is also seeing what alternative options may be available and so have engaged additional contractors to understand if the issue is as identified, and to fully understand any different solutions that could be considered."

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR J LEGRYS TO COUNCILLOR R BLUNT**

"Can the Leader please provide an update on the progress on the Marlborough Sq Improvement project & if the Section 278 agreement with Leicestershire County Council has finally been agreed and signed?"

#### **REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R BLUNT TO COUNCILLOR J LEGRYS**

"I'd like to thank Cllr Legrys for his continued interest in the Marlborough Square project.

I'm aware that he has recently been briefed by the Head of Regeneration on the steps that need to be completed before construction can start and it is, therefore, pleasing to note that he recognises the criticality of obtaining Highway Authority consents.

Section 278 agreements are notoriously complicated and time-consuming to obtain. Our officers have been submitting drawings, reports and information to Leicestershire County Council colleagues for the last 12 months and believe that with imminent submission of Designers Response to the Road Safety Audit, will have everything should in place to allow LCC to issue Technical Approval of the S278 works.

Officers are encouraging their County Council colleagues to issue this approval by 30th September.

Once we have the S278 agreement our contractor will then be able to confirm the programme for both starting and completing the works to Marlborough Square."

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

**QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR J GEARY TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN**

“Could I please be updated on the progress or lack of it on the provision of a Transit Site for the Gypsy / Travelling Community.”

**RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO COUNCILLOR J GEARY**

“Officers are in the process of seeking to identify a potential site for transit provision for gypsies and travellers. As soon as officers are able to, they will share information with members. In addition, the Council is awaiting the outcome from an update to the Gypsy and Traveller needs assessment. This will be reported to the Local Plan Committee when it is finalised.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR S SHEAHAN TO COUNCILLOR R BLUNT**

“The Administration did not develop a bid for the Levelling Up fund this year. What needs to change in order for a bid to go forward next year?”

#### **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR R BLUNT TO COUNCILLOR S SHEAHAN**

“The production of funding bids to government is both expensive and consuming of officer time. The decision not to submit a Levelling Up fund bid for round 2 was tactical, following conversations with prospective bid partners. Discussions have already started with these partners in regard to whether bids should be submitted to round 3.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR C SEWELL TO COUNCILLOR N RUSHTON**

"It has been reported in the local media that the Skylink bus service run by Trent Barton is to experience cuts to some routes, including the one linking Loughborough to Diseworth, Long Whatton, and Kegworth. The route between the logistics park at East Midlands Airport and Coalville will also be affected, with buses no longer running after 8pm.

Additionally, the no 9 Midland Classic which runs from Burton-on-Trent to the QMC, Nottingham is being axed on 5<sup>th</sup> September. This bus serves Ashby-de-la-Zouch and Diseworth.

These two cuts will severely affect some of the residents in our area.

Are NWLDC going to offer cost support to the County Councils involved to keep these services running in NWL?"

#### **RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR N RUSHTON TO COUNCILLOR C SEWELL**

"We have recently become aware of the proposed service changes proposed by Trent Barton to the Skylink services. We are engaging with the company in order to better understand the likely impacts on residents of North West Leicestershire and how the company are justifying the changes. Only once we have these answers will it be possible to ascertain how the council might intervene.

Officers have asked for a full update on changes to service provision to be discussed at the EMEG Access to Work Partnership meeting (Chaired by NWLDC) that is scheduled for 13th September 2022.

With regards to the proposed changes to the Airline 9 service operated by Diamond East Midlands (formerly Midland Classic) this service is no longer being withdrawn. Following conversations between the operator and members the EMEG Access to Work Partnership, it has been agreed to retain and extend the Airline 9 service for a further 12 months and to provide additional support to promote patronage and secure the long term commercial viability of the service.

Through the EMEG Access to Work Partnership, the councils Economic Development team will continue to maintain regular contact with both of the bus operators as well as Leicestershire County Council and Derbyshire County Council to monitor changes in the bus service provision."

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR M WYATT TO COUNCILLOR A WOODMAN**

“Since the precinct owners removed the barriers at the entrance of the shopping centre we have seen a dramatic increase in anti-social behaviour, vandalism and burglaries within the town centre. We have also seen an increase in incidents of bad behaviour involving scooters and cyclists within the town and several incidents where pedestrians have been hit or harassed.

Can I ask what steps the council are able to take to help address this problem including increasing cctv coverage in the town so it's easier for the police to identify the perpetrators and take appropriate legal action against those causing criminal damage and advising the precinct owners to install appropriate cctv and look at banning scooters and cyclist from their property?”

#### **REPNSE FROM COUNCILLOR A WOODMAN TO COUNCILLOR M WYATT**

“Officers are aware of one break-in and instances of windows being smashed recently as these have all been reported to the police. Other reports to the police consist of low-level vandalism incidents including the pulling up of the plants that have recently been installed. The suspects have been identified and dealt with by the police beat team.

Officers are already working closely with the shopping centre owners looking at how the CCTV coverage can be made more effective. Both the Council and the police have concluded that at least one additional camera is required to provide the necessary coverage and this is currently being looked into by the owners alongside the council's upcoming investment in cabling infrastructure to facilitate this installation. The Council provides CCTV surveillance to the shopping centre under a Service Level Agreement and a review of the processes followed by the Council's CCTV operatives is currently underway with the objective being to increase efficiency, creating more time for the operatives to proactively monitor the cameras and increase communication with both shop keepers and the police through the radios.

More resource is required in the shopping centre to respond to instances identified through the CCTV and officers are currently encouraging the shopping centre owners to increase their security presence in the centre to provide a visible deterrent and improve the ability to respond to an incident. Limited police resourcing levels means that they are unable to respond to every incident.

The Council will also continue to respond to any request from the police for CCTV footage for crime and disorder purposes.

The Council monitors the cameras between 10.30 and 18.30 Monday to Thursday and 10.30 to 03.00 on a Friday and Saturday. The hours of monitoring will be changing soon to provide better coverage early morning and on a bank holiday Sunday.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022

### QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

#### QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR V RICHICHI TO COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN

“It is noted that High 2 scenario with a minimum of 730 dwellings per year housing growth is considered to be appropriate and *‘performs best’* and *‘provides a very significant degree of flexibility to help address the issues of unmet need’* and *‘would have the potential to provide a significant number of smaller sites which could benefit small to medium sized developers’* and given that within the SoCG, NWL are now exposed in assisting with the unmet housing need arising from Leicester in addition to the high probability of some potential unmet housing need arising from HBBC - in the reassessment of the Councils 5 YHLS being measured with the stated apportionment quantum of Leicester’s unmet need in conjunction with the very latest 5 Year Supply Statement (April 2022).

Would it be possible for you to inform me what the true 5 YHLS position for NWL is?”

#### REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR R ASHMAN TO COUNCILLOR V RICHICHI

“The National Planning Practice Guidance states:

***“What housing requirement figure should authorities use when calculating their five-year housing land supply?”***

*Housing requirement figures identified in adopted strategic housing policies should be used for calculating the five-year housing land supply figure where:*

- *the plan was adopted in the last five years, or*
- *the strategic housing policies have been reviewed within the last five years and found not to need updating.*

*In other circumstances the five-year housing land supply will be measured against the area’s local housing need calculated using the standard method.”*

The adopted Local Plan was adopted within the last five years and so provides the basis for assessing the five-year housing land supply. The latest assessment (April 2021) shows that there was 13.5 years supply.

If Council agrees the Statement of Common Ground then this will provide the basis for the housing requirement to be addressed as part of the Local Plan review. The Local Plan review will need to ensure that there is a continuous five-year supply of sites throughout the plan period to 2040.

Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) has not as yet declared an unmet need. Should they do so, then just like Leicester City they would need to demonstrate why they cannot meet all of their need and then the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities will need to agree how this would be met.”

This page is intentionally left blank

## **COUNCIL – 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

#### **QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR M HAY TO COUNCILLOR A WOODMAN**

“Re: Solar Together

As an environmentalist I am 100% behind any initiative that makes renewable energy more accessible, especially in ways in which it can also reduce fuel poverty, which is an issue that will only grow in the current climate. The idea of a ‘bulk buying’ scheme that would give our residents an offer that is keenly priced and also vetted against quality sounds amazing in principle.

However sometimes the principle does not match the reality.

I have seen a few examples of the offers that have been sent to residents, all heavily using the district council’s branding and in at least one case with the name of an NWLDC officer on the bottom. So our reputation is very much on the line with this scheme. So it has to deliver quality systems at a market-leading price. I am also disappointed that the first I heard about it was when I saw an advert for it on social media.

The information given to residents that had applied made it very difficult to understand exactly what was being offered, for example giving system size in “number of panels” instead of the power output of the system. This makes it very difficult to compare prices with others offers they may have received. That being said, there are installers in the market that seem to be offering big domestic systems (3.5-4.0kW – i.e. at the 16A limit suitable for most single phase domestic connections) for far less than that being offered by the winning bidder, sometimes 65-75% of the prices quoted by a scheme with our name on it (even when accounting for battery storage too – so comparing like-for-like as much as possible on the limited information provided). So this bulk-buying scheme does not, on the face of it, look like it is offering best value.

Whilst I understand that the scheme was county-led, given the risk to the council’s reputation if this scheme goes horribly wrong, please can the portfolio holder explain what involvement the district council had in the scheme before offers were sent out with our name on them (e.g. with regards the bidding process and any due diligence around the scheme or potential suppliers) and what, if any, involvement will the council have with the scheme going forward, especially if there is any dissatisfaction with the prices offered or systems installed?

#### **REPOSENSE FROM COUNCILLOR A WOODMAN TO COUNCILLOR M HAY**

“An article was placed on the Member’s Hub on 9 May this year and the scheme was then reported to Corporate Scrutiny on 8 June as part of the Zero Carbon update which was then considered by Cabinet on 19 July.

There was lengthy scrutiny of the scheme before signing up to Solar Together which was led by Blaby District Council on behalf of the eight Leicestershire councils who are all part of the scheme. Blaby has the contract with Solar Together and will hold them to account under the contractual arrangement that is in place for any performance issues on behalf of the eight councils.

iChoosr, the company who we have partnered with have worked with a number of local authorities across the UK with great success with large numbers of solar panels having been installed and significant private investment in renewables. A proven track record was also a key consideration for all parties and this council along with Blaby, Melton and Harborough have also worked with iChoosr for a number of years on the Energy Switch Scheme which

has helped 100's of residents switch to green electricity and save money on their bills and so we have confidence in their ability to deliver an excellent service.

Climate Emergency UK cite the Solar Together Scheme as a good action for councils to join in order to bring about district wide emission reductions.

Regarding the cost of the proposed systems, it is difficult to say whether other companies would provide better value as it is important that when other quotes are obtained they are on a like for like basis.

Residents wishing to join the scheme are not obliged to accept an iChoosr quote and can gain other quotes.

The scheme is very clear that customers are provided with a free, no obligation quote and robust product guarantees, warranties and technical accreditation are also provided See below. <https://solartogether.co.uk/info/guarantees-and-warranties>

What this scheme does provide is a robust due diligence and qualification process to ensure product quality and guarantees are in place and this is summarised as follows.

### ***The Qualification Process carried out by iChoosr:***

*In order to ensure that any installers entering the Solar Together auction can offer the required high level of service to a large group of customers in the required timeframe, iChoosr interrogates the experience, quality, stability and capacity of the installers beforehand through a rigorous qualification procedure.*

*The qualification procedure takes a number of weeks and is designed to ensure that only installers that can successfully execute the group-buying scheme can enter the auction, thus safeguarding the required level of quality.*

*The qualification not only includes a review of all essential certifications and insurance policies, but also covers customer satisfaction and a detailed financial due diligence of the company.*

*The qualification procedure includes provision of:*

- *Evidence of MCS certification plus either HIES or RECC certification*
  - *Evidence of a CRM system that enables them to manage a high volume of customers*
  - *Evidence that the installer can realise an Insurance Backed Guarantee for workmanship*
  - *Evidence of Insurance policies that cover liability, works and indemnity*
  - *Annual Accounts*
  - *Details Of Organisation And Employees*
  - *Evidence of Customer Satisfaction Results*
- Detailed Financial Due Diligence*

*We use an independent expert third party organisation to conduct detailed financial due diligence investigation on all installers progressing through the process.*

### ***Method of Approach & Risk Management***

*iChoosr requests that installers submit a Method of Approach that demonstrates in detail how the installer will organise the process in order to successfully complete the project, this includes a full detailed project risk-analysis.*