

Meeting	LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Time/Day/Date	6.30 pm on Wednesday, 20 January 2016
Location	Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville
Officer to contact	Democratic Services (01530 454512)

All persons present are reminded that the meeting may be recorded and by attending this meeting you are giving your consent to being filmed and your image being used. You are kindly requested to make it known to the Chairman if you intend to film or record this meeting.

The Monitoring Officer would like to remind members that when they are considering whether the following items are exempt information under the relevant paragraph under part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 they must have regard to the public interest test. This means that members must consider, for each item, whether the public interest in maintaining the exemption from disclosure outweighs the public interest in making the item available to the public.

AGENDA

Item	Pages
1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
To receive and note any apologies for absence.	
2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
Under the Code of Conduct members are reminded that in declaring disclosable interests you should make clear the nature of that interest and whether it is pecuniary or non-pecuniary.	
3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING	
To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2015.	3 - 8
4. COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE	
Terms of Reference attached.	9 - 10
5. DRAFT LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Report of the Director of Services.	11 - 26



Circulation:

Councillor R D Bayliss
Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)
Councillor J Cotterill
Councillor R Johnson
Councillor J Legrys (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor V Richichi
Councillor M Specht

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on WEDNESDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2015

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors J Cotterill, S McKendrick (Substitute for Councillor J Legrys), V Richichi and M Specht

In Attendance: Councillors J Geary and T J Pendleton

Officers: Mr M Sharp (Consultant), Mr S Bambrick, Mrs M Meredith, Mr I Nelson, Mr J Newton and Mr S Stanion

13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Legrys and R Johnson.

14. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no interests declared.

15. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2015.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor J Cotterill and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2015 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

16. COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

RESOLVED THAT:

The Terms of Reference be noted.

17. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE ALLOCATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT: DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

The Director of Services presented the report to members. He advised that the approach set out in the Draft Local Plan in respect of making provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople included a criteria based policy which set out how the Council might deal with proposed new sites within the district. He added that officers felt it would be necessary for the Council to make significant progress on producing a separate document setting out how the needs of the travelling community could specifically be addressed, through the allocation of land for the provision of gypsy and traveller sites (i.e. a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD)). He referred to the risks outlined in the report and explained that officers felt this approach was necessary because in the absence of a more detailed assessment, there was some evidence that other Local Plans had been delayed. He made reference in particular to the case of Maldon District Council, where the Inspector had found the Council's Gypsy and Traveller policy unsound partly because it did not identify a supply of specific deliverable traveller sites sufficient to provide five years worth of sites, or a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations for growth beyond the five year period. The Local Plan had subsequently been called in by the Secretary of State for a decision, but in the meantime the Director of

Services advised members that in order to mitigate risk, it was incumbent upon the Council to set out how the needs of the travelling community might specifically be met in the future and to be able to demonstrate progress.

The Director of Services referred to page 16 of the agenda which set out the current evidence in respect of the overall needs of the travelling community. He advised that the current assessment had identified a need for a total of 68 permanent pitches, 28 transit pitches and 9 plots for travelling showpeople for the period up to 2031, which was a significant need and the highest in Leicestershire. He added that the needs assessment was in the process of being refreshed across the housing market area, and was being led by Leicester City Council. He explained that when the needs assessment had been refreshed, the Council would need to take account of that new evidence, and this may suggest that there was more or less need than had been currently identified. He advised that the approach that was being taken was to respond to whatever needs were identified, and therefore it was proposed to prepare a separate SADPD.

The Director of Services referred members to the attached appendix which set out a proposed paper which would form the basis of the consultation which was proposed to commence in the new year. He sought comments on the approach being taken and on the proposed consultation paper. He advised that there would subsequently be a report to Cabinet on 12 January, seeking their authority to commence the consultation and the call for sites, whereby a public approach would be made to all affected and interested parties to indicate to the Council where there may be potential sites to be identified in the SADPD. He added that there may be a number of sites coming forward and these would be assessed, consulted upon, and independently examined, before the Council eventually adopted the final SADPD.

Councillor V Richichi asked how information was gathered in order to assess the level of need. The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the previous piece of work was undertaken in 2013 by De Montfort University, and had been based on detailed interviews from representatives of the travelling community to understand their future needs, and statistical analysis and projections based on existing provision across the housing market area and in individual districts.

Councillor V Richichi sought clarification on the size and scope of a pitch. The Legal Advisor explained that the guidance contained a definition of what a pitch comprised, and advised each pitch should contain sufficient space for a mobile home and a touring caravan.

Councillor S McKendrick asked if the background information was available in respect of the assessment of need undertaken in 2013. The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the study itself was on the website. He added that he would check and advise if the background information was available.

Councillor S McKendrick asked whether the sites which had previously had planning permission but not developed would be reviewed or excluded. The Planning Policy Team Manager referred to the list of sites outlined in the report and advised that he was also aware of a couple of sites that had not been completed, but previously had planning permission, which would be reviewed as part of the process.

In response to a question from Councillor M Specht, the Director of Services advised that the Local Plan and the SADPD were separate documents, but once adopted would both form part of the Development Plan. He explained that the SADPD was at an earlier stage than the Local Plan and therefore it was anticipated that the Council would be in a position to adopt the Local Plan before the SADPD. He added however that significant progress should have been made on the SADPD by this point and he did not anticipate that the gap between adoption of the two documents would be very significant.

Councillor M Specht expressed concerns in respect of the situation at Maldon District Council. He emphasised the importance of taking the situation and the policies seriously and felt that the policy needed to be watertight. He made reference to the approach taken by Charnwood Borough Council in terms of allocating sites on the edge of housing developments, and felt that this approach should be considered.

The Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the level of need identified for Charnwood Borough Council was very low in comparison to North West Leicestershire District Council and most of their provision had been made as part of their large housing developments rather than as standalone sites.

The Legal Advisor felt that it was right to say that the inspector had had a number of concerns in respect of how Maldon District Council had sought to address gypsy and traveller issues, and considered that their criteria based policy may not bring forward any sites as the criteria was so restrictive, and he had also expressed some concern about the commitment of the Council to bring forward sites. He reemphasised the importance, therefore, of the Council demonstrating a clear intention to bring forward sites, and he believed that an inspector would be comfortable with that, even if the SADPD was adopted after the Local Plan.

Councillor M Specht stated that he did not want the officer time and cost involved to be wasted and he sought confirmation that an inspector would not look to dismiss the Local Plan because of the fact that the SADPD would be adopted afterwards.

The Legal Advisor stated that this was not completely risk free, however he was satisfied that what was being proposed represented the least risk. He added that ideally, site allocations would be included as a policy in the Local Plan, however he explained that there were also risks associated with this approach. He referred to the situation with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, where the whole local plan had been delayed due to the number of objections to the site allocations proposed for traveller sites. He highlighted that there were some advantages to having a separate allocations document.

The Chairman referred to a particular case that was lost at appeal and stated that it was critically important to bring the two documents as closely in line as possible. He added that the more weight that could be given to the document would demonstrate the Council's intent.

The Director of Services referred to the earlier comments in respect of taking the same approach as Charnwood Borough Council. He stated that clearly their level of need was significantly lower. He added that the majority of the housing need in this district had been met with existing planning permissions, and as such the opportunity to include gypsy and traveller sites within new housing developments had already passed.

Planning Policy Team Manager added that this had been explored as part of the previous Core Strategy, and the overwhelming response from developers and the representatives of the gypsy and traveller community was that they would not support this.

In response to a question from Councillor M Specht, the Planning Policy Team Manager clarified that the figures outlined at paragraph 3.3 of the report took account of existing provision and planning permissions. He added that in his view, the fact that a number of sites with planning permission had not come to fruition did raise doubt in respect of the assessed need and demonstrated that the review was needed.

The Chairman felt that there were sites in the district that could be expanded in conjunction with Leicestershire County Council and he felt that some responsibility for the management of the sites should be brought under the control of the Council.

Councillor S McKendrick acknowledged that this was an emotive subject and cultural differences had to be sensitively considered. She felt that having a site with a warden could mean that the community had more reassurance and the risk of conflict could be minimised.

The Chairman stated that he would like to include a statement in the recommendation to say that these avenues would be explored. He urged members to bring forward any recommendations. He emphasised the need to be mindful of the provisions contained within the legislation.

In response to a question from Councillor S McKendrick, the Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the guidance that would be provided as part of the consultation and the call for sites set out the requirements, but was fairly general in nature. He added that officers would consider whether this needed to be highlighted more in the consultation.

In response to a question from Councillor V Richichi, the Director of Services explained that the call for sites would be completely open as all options needed to be considered, and clearly the Council had a duty to consider the most sustainable options for this section of the community.

The Legal Advisor added that as sustainable development included a social dimension, the issues raised would need to be addressed in the planning process, in an open way.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor J Cotterill and

RESOLVED THAT:

- a) The proposals to commence preparation of a Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations Development Plan Document be noted;
- b) The proposal to issue a consultation paper and call for sites in January 2016 be noted;

and it was

RECOMMENDED THAT:

- c) The Council support working with other public bodies and private operators to bring forward sites, including the management of sites.

18. LOCAL PLAN - RISK MANAGEMENT

The Director of Services presented the report to members, providing an update on the risk assessment of the Local Plan project. He made reference to the most recent risk register which was appended to the report and which was reviewed by the project board each month. He highlighted the key risks which may or may not have an eventual impact upon the Local Plan.

The Director of Services referred to the agreement made by the Leicestershire authorities earlier this year in respect of the combined authority proposal. He advised that part of the proposal included an agreement to work on a strategic growth plan which would look at the development strategy for Leicester and Leicestershire, going beyond our plan period. He explained that this may have an impact on our Local Plan preparation and advised that new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was being commissioned to support the growth plan. He explained that when we the figures in the revised SHMA were eventually available, this may have an impact upon the plan period, and some of this was out of the Council's control. He highlighted to members that these risks were constantly

being taken account of. He added that no changes were proposed to the Local Plan or to the approach at this point, however changes may need to be made at some point in the future.

In response to a question from Councillor M Specht, the Planning Policy Team Manager advised that the need for affordable housing had been identified, however starter homes were a separate matter.

Councillor V Richichi sought clarification on the self-build legislation and whether this would make an application for a self-build proposal more difficult to refuse. The Chairman explained that the same development criteria would still apply.

The Director of Services pointed out that well over 90% of all planning applications in the district were approved, as a very small number were refused.

It was moved by Councillor M Specht, seconded by Councillor V Richichi and

RESOLVED THAT:

The update in respect of how changes to national policies might impact upon the Local Plan be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.23 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose of the Local Plan Advisory Committee

To enable cross-party discussion, guidance and support for the development of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.

Role of the Local Plan Advisory Committee

- To consider and comment on documents that relate to the North West Leicestershire Local Plan including (but not restricted to) policy options, draft policies and evidence prepared to support the Plan.
- To make recommendations as required to Council in respect of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.
- To monitor progress on the preparation of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.
- To provide updates to other Members who do not sit on the Local Plan Advisory Committee.
- To consider and comment on responses to plans being prepared by other local planning authorities as part of the Duty to Cooperate.

Membership of the Local Plan Advisory Committee

- The Advisory Committee will be constituted in accordance with the proportionality provisions contained within The Local Government and Housing Act 1989.
- The Council's Substitution Scheme will apply.
- The Advisory Committee will select a Chair at its first meeting of each civic year.
- Other members may be invited to attend and participate in meetings of the Advisory Committee in a non-voting capacity at the discretion of the Chair.
- The Advisory Committee meetings must have at least 3 members to be quorate.

Operation of the Local Plan Advisory Committee

- Council Procedure Rule 4 will apply to the Local Plan Advisory Committee
- The Advisory Committee will meet at least once every two months, but will meet more frequently where necessary to enable continued progress on the North West Leicestershire Local Plan.
- The Advisory Committee will have no direct decision-making powers but will consider documents and information relating to the Local Plan and make recommendations to Council. Any such report will include specific comments and issues raised by the minority group.
- The Advisory Committee will be supported by the Director of Service and officers in the Planning Policy Team.
- Meetings will be organised, administered and minuted by Democratic Services with agendas and minutes being made available on the Council's website.
- The Portfolio Holder may attend as an observer.

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 20 JANUARY 2016**

Title of report	DRAFT LOCAL PLAN – CONSULTATION RESPONSES
Contacts	<p>Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Head of Planning & Regeneration 01530 454782 jim.newton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p> <p>Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</p>
Purpose of report	To provide members with a summary of the responses received to the recent consultation on the draft Local plan.
Council Priorities	<p>These are taken from the Council Delivery Plan:</p> <p>Value for Money Business and Jobs Homes and Communities Green Footprints Challenge</p>
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	None
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	A risk assessment of the project has been undertaken. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise these risks, including monthly Project Board meetings where risk is reviewed
Equalities Impact Screening	None
Human Rights	None
Transformational Government	Not applicable.

Comments of Head of Paid Service	The Report is Satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The Report is Satisfactory
Comments of Deputy Monitoring Officer	The Report is Satisfactory
Consultees	Local Plan Project Board
Background papers	<p>Consultation responses copies of which are available on request from the Planning Policy team.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework which can be found at www.gov.uk/government/publications?topics%5B%5D=planning-and-building</p> <p>Ministerial Statement by Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, 18 June 2015 www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-vote-office/June%202015/18%20June/1-DCLG-Planning.pdf</p>
Recommendations	<p>THAT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:</p> <p>(I) NOTES THE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RECEIVED TO THE CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN AND;</p> <p>(II) COMMENTS ON THE ISSUES OUTLINED IN THE REPORT AND THE INITIAL SUGGESTED OFFICER COMMENTS</p>

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Members will recall that the draft Local Plan was approved for consultation purposes by Council at its meeting on 15 September 2015.
- 1.2 The draft Local Plan was published for consultation on 29 September 2015 up until 30 November 2015. The draft Local Plan was made available on the Council's website and comments were able to be made via the Citizen Space software which the Council has. Hard copies were made available at various places throughout the district, including all public libraries. In addition to Citizen Space, comments could also be submitted via the Planning Policy e-mail or in letter form. Those submitted via the Planning Policy e-mail or as letters have been summarised by officers on to Citizen Space in order to make the process of assessing the responses easier.
- 1.3 Publicity for the consultation was undertaken using a variety of means including the issuing of regular, themed press releases and social media releases through the Communications team. In addition, a number of events were held across the district where officers were on hand to provide advice and information to members of the public. These events took place in a range of locations including at supermarkets and in outdoor

locations so as to try and bring the Local Plan to the attention of as many people as possible.

- 1.4 This report provides information for members regarding the numbers of responses received and a summary of the key issues that were raised in the consultation responses.

2.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES – NUMBERS

- 2.1 The number of people or organisations who responded via Citizen Space, e-mail or in a letter was 326. These 326 responses generated 1,935 detailed comments
- 2.2 Appendix A to this report provides a summary of the number of comments made in response to each of the 53 questions included in the draft Local Plan. The questions were phrased in such a way that people could answer yes or no in terms of whether they supported the approach suggested in the draft plan, as well as providing more detailed comments if they wished. These are also summarised in the schedule so as to provide members with an understanding of the general picture.
- 2.3 From this it can be seen that:
- The Strategy chapter attracted the most number of detailed comments (453) followed by the Infrastructure and Facilities chapter (436) and the Housing chapter (353).
 - All policies/question attracted some form of detailed response.
 - The policy which attracted the most comments was S2 (Future housing and economic development needs) with 197 comments (of which 140 were in respect of housing requirements) followed by IF1 (Development and Infrastructure) with 167 comments, policy H3 (Housing Provision: new allocations) (147 comments) and policy IF3 (Open space, sport and recreation facilities)(103 comments).
 - Policy Ec14 (Local Centres) attracted the least number of responses (7) followed by Ec13 (Primary and Secondary frontages) with 8 and policy Ec7 (East Midlands Airport: Public safety Zones) with 9.
- 2.4 In addition, there were a further 424 responses received which were in the form of one of a number of standard letters. These comprised of:
- 384 in relation to Ashby covering policies S2,H3,IF1 and IF3
 - 2 in respect of Cliftonthorpe-Ashby in respect of policies S2,H3,Ec2 and En3 as well as 21 in respect of policies S2 and Ec2 only
 - 17 from Diseworth not in relation to a specific policy or proposal contained in the Local Plan, but rather seeking to ensure that no development takes place on land to the south of the A453.

3.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES – ISSUES

- 3.1 At the present time it is not possible to list all of the issues that have been raised as part of the consultation. However, officers are now in the process of assessing all of the responses and a detailed schedule will be made available for members when this has been completed.
- 3.2 Based on an initial assessment of the responses (not just the number of comments on each policy) the following key issues (on the basis in which they appear in the Local Plan) have been identified:

- Amount of new development, particularly housing;
- The settlement hierarchy;
- The suggested Limits to Development;
- The proposed allocation of land at Money Hill, Ashby de la Zouch;
- Concerns regarding the impact of new development (particularly housing) on existing infrastructure (including transport) and the need for additional infrastructure;
- Concerns regarding the lack of the identification of open spaces to be protected;

3.3 It should be stressed that there are (and will be other issues) that become clearer as officers work through the responses. Those highlighted above are considered in more detailed in the following paragraphs.

Amount of new development (Policy S2)

- 3.4 As might be expected the amount of new development, particularly housing, attracted a large number responses from residents who consider that sufficient housing provision has already been made. Their concerns relate to a number of issues including impact upon existing infrastructure and local communities.
- 3.5 Some developers consider that more housing should be provided with figures ranging between 12,000 and 13,000 over the plan period, compared to the 10,700 proposed in the draft Local Plan.
- 3.6 However, some developers recognise that the Council is proposing significantly more growth than the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed with the other Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area authorities.
- 3.7 Concerns about the amount of housing being over and above the OAN have been raised by both Charnwood and Oadby & Wigston Borough Councils.

Comments

- 3.8 It is essential that the Council can justify with evidence the scale of new housing development to be provided for in the Local Plan. Whilst the SHMA and MOU identify the OAN as being 350 dwellings each year for the period 2011-2031, both also recognise the importance of taking account of any local factors which would suggest a different housing requirement in the Local Plan from the OAN. This is what the draft Local Plan has sought to do.
- 3.9 Whilst the concerns expressed by both Charnwood and Oadby & Wigston are disappointing in this respect, discussions with officers of both authorities are ongoing under the Duty to Cooperate.
- 3.10 In addition, officers continue to explore this issue and are currently seeking some external advice from demographic experts.

The settlement hierarchy (Policy S3)

- 3.11 Two options were considered in terms of developing the settlement hierarchy. Option A proposed Coalville be identified as the Principal Town with Ashby, Castle Donington, Kegworth, Ibstock and Measham being identified as Rural Centres, beneath which were a

number of sustainable villages and rural villages. Option B included an additional tier (Main Town) with both Ashby and Castle Donington being identified as such. The other designations remained as per Option A. Option B was the preferred option in the draft Local Plan.

- 3.12 Of those who expressed a preference there was some support for both Options A and B, with Option B getting slightly more support.
- 3.13 Some respondents suggested that Ashby de la Zouch should be identified as a Principal Town alongside Coalville.
- 3.14 A number of people expressed concerns regarding the inclusion of some settlements as Sustainable Villages, particularly Appleby Magna and Blackfordby in view of the lack of facilities and services.

Comments

- 3.15 In population terms Coalville is significantly larger than Ashby de la Zouch and it does have a greater range of services and facilities. It is considered, therefore, that Ashby de la Zouch should not be identified as a Principal Town.
- 3.16 Policy S3 refers to Sustainable Villages as having “a limited range of services and facilities and so are suitable for a limited amount of growth”. Officers will review the list of both services and facilities available and the list of settlements, but in principle it is considered that the distinction between settlements based on available services and facilities is appropriate in order to ensure that the Local Plan delivers a sustainable pattern of development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Limits to Development (Policy S4)

- 3.17 There were a number of representations seeking amendments to the suggested Limits to Development, either taking some sites out or some sites in. Particular concern has been expressed by a number of residents of Appleby Magna.

Comments

- 3.18 Each representation will need to be assessed against the agreed criteria which have been used to define the Limits to Development to enable a judgement to be made of whether any amendments are required.

Proposed allocation of land at Money Hill, Ashby de la Zouch (Policy H3a)

- 3.19 As noted above 384 standard letters have been received expressing opposition to development at Money Hill, although no specific reason is stated.
- 3.20 However, a number of the detailed representations also object to the proposed development at Money Hill, with reference to impact upon local infrastructure (including roads) and the loss of identity of Ashby.

Comments

- 3.21 The issue of infrastructure is considered in more detail below.
- 3.22 As members will be aware decisions are currently awaited in respect of two planning appeals against the refusal of planning permission for residential development in the area covered by this proposed allocations (one for 605 dwellings and one for 70 dwellings). Decisions on these appeals are expected shortly. The outcome of these appeals will have implications for the Local Plan and these will need to be considered in due course.
- 3.23 In terms of the loss of identity, the site itself is contained within the boundary of the A511 relief road, such that it will not result in the physical coalescence with any other settlements. Furthermore, the site provides an opportunity to create an attractive and well designed development which will help to enhance the attractiveness of Ashby as a place to live.
- 3.24 It should be appreciated that if the Money Hill site is not allocated for development then a replacement site (or sites) would need to be identified instead. In view of the sustainability merits of Ashby de la Zouch it is considered that this would be difficult to justify.

Infrastructure (Policy IF1)

- 3.25 A lot of people who have expressed concerns regarding the amount of development and/or specific development proposals have also raised concerns regarding the impact upon existing infrastructure and the need for additional infrastructure.

Comments

- 3.26 It is the case that the vast majority of new development is already committed through planning permissions or resolutions to grant planning permission. In determining these proposals Section 106 Agreements have (or are in the case of resolutions) are being put in place to ensure that appropriate provision (or contributions) are made to the provision of new infrastructure to offset the impact of proposed development.
- 3.27 A schedule of these S106 Agreements is being prepared to show what infrastructure is proposed to be provided and when. It is possible based on experience elsewhere that such information might be enough to satisfy an Inspector at examination. However, officers consider that it would be prudent to go further and so consultants have been commissioned to prepare a detailed Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will not only support the Local Plan but would also provide an evidence base to support future work in respect of a Community Infrastructure Levy and future funding bids.

Open Spaces (Policies IF 3 and En 1)

- 3.28 The draft Local Plan noted that the NPPF refers to designating Local Green Spaces in either Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans. It was further noted that it was not proposed to identify Local Green Spaces as part of the Local plan but to leave this to Neighbourhood Plans.
- 3.29 A significant number of responses have been received suggesting that the Local Plan should identify Local Green Spaces. In particular, a number of respondents have suggested that land at the Bath Grounds and around Ashby Castle should be identified as

Local green Space. Similarly a number of respondents express concerns regarding the fact that sites which are identified in the adopted Local Plan as Sensitive Areas are no longer proposed to be identified.

Comments

3.30 The NPPF states that:

“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- *where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
- *where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*
- *where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”*

3.31 On the basis of the above it will be appreciated that there are quite specific requirements to be able to identify a Local Green Space, some of which are easier to deal with than others and so there would be resource implications if the Local Plan was to seek to identify Local Green Spaces. In particular, the second bullet point would be far easier to justify through a Neighbourhood Plan having regard to the very local nature of such plans. However, this matter will be considered further by officers.

Renewable energy provision (Policy Cc1)

3.32 Policy Cc2 sets out how the Council will seek to support the delivery of renewable energy provision. A number of representations support the provision of renewable energy and the general approach included in the draft Local Plan.

3.33 The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in a Ministerial statement of the 18th June 2015 the Department for Communities and Local Government stated that proposals for one or more wind turbine should only be approved if “ *The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan;*”.

3.34 This statement was made too late to be able to taken in to account in the draft Local Plan but it is appropriate for the matter to now be considered.

Comments

3.35 The draft Local plan does not identify whether any specific areas are suitable for wind energy. If the Local Plan does not identify areas as being potentially suitable for wind energy, then on the basis of the Ministerial Statement the Council would not be able to approve any planning applications for turbines anywhere in the district even if it were minded to do so.

3.36 If the Local Plan were to identify areas as being suitable for wind energy development, it does not automatically follow that permission would have to be granted for a proposal as it

would still fall to be considered on its relative merits. It would, however, enable the Council to resist proposals in areas considered unsuitable and in the process demonstrate that it was supportive of similar proposals in more suitable areas.

- 3.37 There is a risk that if no suitable areas were identified in the Local Plan that a Planning Inspector may consider that the Local Plan is not sound. This does not appear to have been the case so far although there are examples of where authorities who were close to , or had just finished, an Examination were required to include a new policy wording to address the principles of the Ministerial Statement. This happened in the case of the Charnwood Local Plan whereby new policy wording deferred dealing with this issue until the next stage of the Charnwood Local Plan.
- 3.38 On balance officers are of the view that it would be appropriate to commission some additional work to look at this issue but the views of the Advisory Committee are sought before doing so.

4.0 NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 It is proposed that the Local Plan will now be considered at the meeting of full Council on 28 June 2016, not March 2016 as originally envisaged.
- 4.2 The date when the Local Plan will be considered by Council has changed for a number of reasons. The scale of responses received is greater than had been anticipated and it would be appropriate to take some extra time now, ahead of a full Council decision, to collate and respond to all of these comments. In addition, this extra time will also allow the Council to enhance the evidence base, in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will support the Local Plan and ultimately ensure that what is built in the district is sustainable and supports strong local communities.
- 4.3 Following the decision of Council the plan will then be subject to a further round of consultation, before it is submitted for examination by an independent Planning Inspector.
- 4.4 The following timetable is now proposed. It should be noted that once the plan has been submitted the programme will be set by the Planning Inspector and so the Council has no control over these stages.

Date (Subject to Review)	Stage
28 June 2016	Council agrees publication version
4 July 2016 to 15 August 2016	Publication consultation
26 September 2016	Submission
December 2016	Examination starts
July 2017	Receipt of Inspector's Report
September 2017	Adoption

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

What are the issues?

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
Issues	1	Are there any other issues which the Local Plan has not identified? If so what are these and what is the evidence to support it?	29	17	54
Objectives	2	Do you agree that the identified strategic objectives are appropriate for North West Leicestershire? Should any changes be made? If so, please identify what changes should be made.	27	22	61
Issues total					115

19

Strategy

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
S1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development	3	Do you agree that the preferred approach provides a good basis for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development? If not, what changes do you suggest?	27	20	46
S2 – housing requirements	4	<i>Do you agree with the amount of housing development we propose to make provision for? If not what changes do you suggest?</i>	16	73	140
S2 – employment requirements	5	<i>Do you agree with the amount of employment development we propose to make provision for? If not what changes do you suggest?</i>	20	16	33
S2 – retail	6	<i>Do you agree with the amount of retail development we propose to make</i>	17	15	24

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
requirements		<i>provision for? If not what changes do you suggest?</i>			
S2 total					197
S3 - Settlement Hierarchy	7	Do you agree with our suggested settlement hierarchy? If not what changes do you suggest?	19	49	97
S4 - Countryside	8	Do you agree with our suggested approach to development in the countryside? If not what changes do you suggest?	25	30	72
S5 - Design	9	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the design of new development? If not what changes do you suggest?	22	21	41
Strategy total					453

Housing

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
H1 – housing permissions	10	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of housing sites with planning permission? If not what changes do you suggest?	22	23	47
H2 – Housing resolutions	11	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of housing sites with a resolution to grant planning permission? If not what changes do you suggest?	24	19	32
H3 – housing allocations	12	Do you agree with our proposed housing allocations? If not what change would you suggest?	20	83	147
H4 – Affordable Housing	13	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of affordable housing? If not what changes do you suggest?	23	18	45
H5 – Rural Exception sites	14	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of rural exceptions sites for affordable housing? If not what changes do you suggest?	21	15	26
H6 –Housing type and mix	15	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of house types and mix ? If not what changes do you suggest?	26	16	33
H7 – Provision	16	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the issue of making	22	11	23

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople		provision for gypsies and travellers? If not what changes do you suggest?			
Housing total					353

Economic

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
Ec1 – employment permissions	17	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of employment sites with planning permission? If not what changes do you suggest?	18	6	16
Ec2 – employment allocations	18	Do you agree with our proposed employment allocations? If not what change would you suggest?	14	13	35
Ec3 – Existing employment Areas	19	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of existing employment areas? If not what changes do you suggest?	21	5	22
Ec4 – Brickworks and Pipeworks	20	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of brickworks and pipeworks? If not what changes do you suggest?	20	1	11
Ec5 – East Midlands Airport	21	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of East Midlands Airport? If not what changes do you suggest?	25	3	25
Ec6 - East Midlands Airport: Safeguarding	22	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of safeguarding at East Midlands Airport? If not what changes do you suggest?	20	2	12

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
Ec7 - East Midlands Airport: Public Safety Zones	23	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of Public safety Zones at East Midlands Airport? If not what changes do you suggest?	20	1	9
Ec8 – Donington Park	24	Do you agree with our suggested approach in respect of Donington Park? If not what changes do you suggest?	23	1	14
Ec9 – Town Centres Hierarchy	25	Do you agree with our suggested Town Centre hierarchy and our approach to main town centre developments? If not what changes do you suggest?	15	13	35
Ec10- impact thresholds	26	Do you agree with our suggested thresholds? If not what changes do you suggest?	15	6	11
Ec11- Primary Shopping Areas	27	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Primary Shopping Areas? If not what changes do you suggest?	21	2	11
Ec12 – Hot Food Takeaways	28	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Hot Food Takeaways? If not what changes do you suggest?	18	4	13
Ec13 – Primary and Secondary frontages	29	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Primary and Secondary Frontages? If not what changes do you suggest?	20	2	8
Ec14 – Local Centres	30	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Local Centres? If not what changes do you suggest?	19	3	7
Ec15 – Tourism and Cultural development	31	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Tourism and Cultural development? If not what changes do you suggest?	21	10	31
Economic total					260

Infrastructure and Facilities

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
IF1 – Development and Infrastructure	32	<i>Do you agree with our suggested approach to securing infrastructure as part of new development? If not what changes do you suggest?</i>	22	44	98
IF1 – Development and Infrastructure	33	<i>Are there any other general items of infrastructure we should be seeking to secure?</i>	17	9	31
IF1 – Development and Infrastructure	34	<i>Is there a lack of any infrastructure in specific parts of the district? If so what are these and what evidence is there to demonstrate this?</i>	25	4	38
IF1 total					167
IF2 – Community Facilities	35	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Community Facilities? If not what changes do you suggest?	24	7	23
IF3 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation facilities	36	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Open Space, Sport and Recreation facilities? If not what changes do you suggest?	20	58	103
IF4 – Transport Infrastructure and new development	37	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Transport Infrastructure and new development? If not what changes do you suggest?	14	16	53
IF5 – Leicester-Burton rail line	38	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Leicester to Burton rail line? If not what changes do you suggest?	29	5	38
IF6 – Ashby Canal	39	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Ashby Canal? If not what changes do you suggest?	26	5	21

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
IF7 – Parking provision and new development	40	Do you agree with our suggested approach to parking provision as part of new development? If not what changes do you suggest?	16	9	31
Infrastructure and Facilities total					436

Environment

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
En1 – Nature Conservation	41	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Nature Conservation issues? If not what changes do you suggest?	20	33	58
En2 – River Mease Special Area of Conservation	42	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the river Mease Special Area of Conservation? If not what changes do you suggest?	22	2	18
En3 – The National Forest	43	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the National Forest? If not what changes do you suggest?	33	7	29
En4 – Charnwood Forest Regional Park	44	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Charnwood Forest? If not what changes do you suggest?	29	1	17
En5 – Areas of Separation	45	Do you agree with our suggested approach to protect the open and undeveloped area between Coalville and Whitwick? If not what changes do you suggest?	28	6	33
En6 – Land and air quality	46	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Land and Air Quality issues? If not what changes do you suggest?	24	3	15

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
Environment total					170

Historic Environment

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
He1 – Historic Environment	47	Do you agree with our suggested approach to the Historic Environment? If not what changes do you suggest?	24	8	32

Climate Change

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
Cc1 – Renewable Energy	48	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Renewable Energy issues? If not what changes do you suggest?	22	2	25
Cc2 – Sustainable Design and Construction	49	Do you agree with our suggested approach to achieve sustainable Design and construction as part of new development? If not what changes do you suggest?	25	3	17
Cc3 – Flood Risk	50	Do you agree with our suggested approach to dealing with flood risk as part of new development? If not what changes do you suggest?	19	3	18
Cc4 – Water – Sustainable Drainage Systems	51	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems? If not what changes do you suggest?	17	6	15

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
Climate Change total					75

Implementation and Monitoring

Policy	Question Number	Title	Yes	No	No of detailed comments
IM1 – Implementation and monitoring	52	Do you agree with our suggested approach to Implementation and monitoring? If not what changes do you suggest?	17	8	20
Neighbourhood Plans	53	Do you agree with our suggested distinction between strategic and local policies? If not, please explain why.	18	4	21
Implementation and monitoring total					41