



Scan the code above or visit [www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings) for a full copy of the agenda.

Meeting	<b>LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE</b>
Time/Day/Date	6.30 pm on Wednesday, 15 January 2020
Location	Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville
Officer to contact	Democratic Services 01530 454512

### AGENDA

Item		Pages
<b>1</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b>	
	Under the Code of Conduct members are reminded that in declaring disclosable interests you should made clear the nature of that interest and whether it is pecuniary or non-pecuniary.	
<b>3</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>	
	To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2019	<b>3 - 6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACES</b>	
	Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure	<b>7 - 12</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – UPDATE</b>	
	Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure	<b>13 - 20</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</b>	
	Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure	<b>21 - 38</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>DRAFT CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION</b>	
	Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure	<b>39 - 44</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT 2018/19</b>	
	Report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure	<b>45 - 64</b>

Circulation:

Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)  
Councillor D Harrison (Deputy Chairman)  
Councillor D Bigby  
Councillor R Boam  
Councillor J Houlton  
Councillor R Johnson  
Councillor J Legrys  
Councillor V Richichi  
Councillor A C Saffell  
Councillor N Smith  
Councillor M B Wyatt

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on WEDNESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2019

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors D Harrison, D Bigby, J Houlton, J Legrys, V Richichi, A C Saffell, N Smith, M B Wyatt and D Everitt (Substitute for Councillor R Johnson)

In Attendance: Councillors K Merrie MBE

Officers: Mr L Sebastian, Mr I Nelson, I Jordan, Mrs R Wallace and Mr C Elston

#### **14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence was received from Councillor R Boam and R Johnson.

#### **15 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **16 MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2019.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor V Richichi and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2019 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### **17 MONEY HILL MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION**

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report and referred Members to the additional papers, which detailed two further responses to the consultation and proposed amendments to recommendations.

Mr I Rhodes, Icen Projects on behalf of the developer consortium was introduced and was available to answer any questions if required.

In response to a question from Councillor V Richichi, Mr I Rhodes reported that realistically work would begin on the site in approximately spring 2020.

In response to a question from Councillor N Smith, the Planning Policy Team Manager confirmed that the parking provision behind the college had been agreed as part of the outline planning permission for the initial 605 dwellings and would therefore be included in the first phase.

Councillor D Bigby raised concerns that the report seemed to be 'side stepping' the requirement of the Ashby Neighbourhood plan, the wording of which stated that the masterplan had to be agreed in conjunction with the Town Council. He believed that the Town Council should have been involved in the discussions.

At 6.52pm, the Chairman adjourned the meeting to seek legal advice. The Chairman, Councillor D Bigby, the Head of Planning and Infrastructure, the Planning Policy Team Manager and the Legal Advisor left the room during the adjournment. The meeting re-convened at 6.55pm.

At this point the following interests were declared:

Councillor D Bigby declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item as he had responded to the consultation as a member of the public.

Councillor J Hoult declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item as the Chairman of Ashby Town Council.

Councillor N Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item as a business owner in Ashby.

Councillor D Bigby would like to see a reference to the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan in the recommendations of the report; specifically that developers should comply with this plan as well as the District Council's Local Plan. He also pointed out that Ashby Town Council had requested that employment land should only consist of type B1 and B2, not B8. He felt that the employment land figures indicated that the area was already oversubscribed in accordance with the HEDNA requirements, therefore the shortfall was for type B1 a and b only, and there was no justification for type B8 in the area.

In relation to the comments surrounding the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan, the Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the District Council could only take into consideration the Local Plan, which was the authority's responsibility. However, the aim of the Design Code was to be compliant with the Ashby Neighbourhood Plan and the suggested amendment should address this.

In relation to the comments about the employment land, the Planning Policy Team Manager explained that there was a shortfall against the HEDNA and needed to be addressed in the Local Plan. As the site was identified as suitable for employment land within the Local Plan, which included B8 then it could not be taken out, as changes could not be made to an adopted plan.

Councillor J Legrys raised concerns that once the site was developed, residents would have to drive into town unless access was made easier. He wanted to see more work and effort being placed on providing footways and cycle ways into the town. He also wanted to see reference to it as part of the application when it was considered by the Planning Committee. The Chairman concurred with the comments.

Councillor D Harrison asked if the development would include a nursing home, as he believed this was part of the planning permission. Mr I Rhodes stated that the existing outline permission included the provision of a care home but this was not a requirement and was dependant on the interest of service providers. Following a further question from Councillor D Harrison, Mr I Rhodes explained that the developers were only providing the land for the school; it would be the responsibility of the local education authority to develop the school.

The recommendations within the report with the additional recommendations within the additional paper were moved by Councillor V Richichi, seconded by Councillor N Smith and

**RECOMMENDED THAT:**

Cabinet support the revised masterplan as set out at appendix b as satisfying the requirement of local plan policies H3A(VIII) and EC2(1)(H) subject to:

- (i) The masterplan being reworded to make clear that the overall density of housing development achieved across the site should be 35 dwellings per hectare and not necessarily in each phase or parcel of development;
- (ii) The preparation and agreement of a design code for that area covered by the masterplan to be secured by either a condition on an outline planning permission or as part of the submission of a full planning application;
- (iii) The design code taking into account any national and local design guidance in place at the time that the design code was prepared;
- (iv) Consideration being given by the Development Consortium to the comments received in response to the consultation when preparing the design code;
- (v) The Design Code including a review mechanism for purposes as specified in the Design Code.

At conclusion of the item, Councillor M B Wyatt left the meeting.

## **18 LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW**

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report to Members highlighting the slight change to the dates of the consultation period as detailed at paragraph 3.5. It was proposed that the consultation period run from 20 November 2019 to 8 January 2020.

Councillor V Richichi asked if the officers felt that the Local Plan would be sound once completed. The Planning Policy Team Manager explained that no approach was risk free but the proposed partial review was the best way to ensure the Local Plan was kept up to date.

Councillor D Bigby was proud of the amendment he moved at the previous meeting as it pointed out the issues with putting the countryside at risk. He was disappointed that Cabinet had not taken on board the amendment as agreed by the committee. However, he did not want to see the Local Plan become out of date, so he had no intentions of proposing any further amendments.

Councillor J Legrys did not wish to delay the Local plan any further but was disappointed that there was not an opportunity for debate earlier in the process. He asked officers to consider meeting schedules and timetables in the future.

It was moved by Councillor D Harrison, seconded by Councillor V Richichi and

RESOLVED THAT:

- (i) The publication of the Local Plan Partial Review as set out at appendix B of the report be approved.
- (ii) The publication and invite of representations upon the Local Plan Partial Review Document together with the Sustainability Appraisal Report and Habitat Regulation Assessment in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, be approved.

- (iii) The authority to submit the Local Plan Partial Review to the Secretary of State following receipt and consideration of representations including the identification of possible modifications to the inspector be delegated to the Strategic Director of Place.
- (iv) It be noted that the appointed inspector would be requested to recommend modifications to the submitted Local Plan Partial Review to the Council in the event that the inspector considers that such modifications would make the plan sound.
- (v) It be noted that the Strategic Director of Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration would agree and publish a new Local development Scheme.
- (vi) The substantive review should cover the period to 2039.

## **19 LOCAL PLAN SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW - HOUSING REQUIREMENTS**

The Planning Policy Team Manager presented the report to Members.

Members understood the need to start planning for the additional housing and was pleased that there would be an opportunity in the future to discuss new settlements, housing mix and housing figures. They also recognised that the figure proposed in the report was not likely to be the final figure.

It was moved by Councillor D Harrison, seconded by Councillor J Hault and

RESOLVED THAT:

The figure of 480 dwellings be used as the interim housing requirement until such a time as:

- a) The unmet need and the implications of any redistribution from Leicester City was known; and
- b) The outcome from the 2018 household projections as applied to the standard method was known.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm

Councillor M B Wyatt left the meeting at 7.20pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.48 pm

<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>LOCAL GREEN SPACES</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Robert Ashman Planning and Infrastructure Portfolio Holder	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">The National Planning Policy Framework</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
	<a href="#">Local Plan Committee Report 20 June 2018</a>	<b>Key Decision:</b> Yes
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The cost of the potential work on Local Green Space can be met from existing budgets.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	There is no specific requirement to include Local Green Spaces as part of the Local Plan. Where they are included, they will need to be justified to ensure that they are considered 'sound' as part of the Examination process.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	As set out in the report, including Local Green Spaces as part of the new Local Plan will have some resource implications.	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To consider whether the new Local Plan should designate Local Green Space.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>THAT LOCAL GREEN SPACES NOT BE IDENTIFIED AS PART OF THE SUBSTANTIVE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW</b>	

## 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraphs 99, 100 and 101) states:

*“The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.*

*The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is: a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) 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 c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.*

*Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts”.*

1.2 It is clear from the NPPF that the designation is not suitable for every green space in a settlement. It also cannot be used to put in a blanket cover to achieve Green Belt type protection under a different name and prevent sustainable development.

1.3 Any open green space is eligible to be considered including privately owned land as long as the criteria set out in the NPPF are met. It should be noted that designation of private

land does not confer any additional rights of access over the land in question than already exist.

- 1.4 If a site already has a level of protection under another designation for example National Park, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or Conservation Areas, then consideration needs to be given to whether a further level of protection would generate any additional local benefit.

## **2.0 CURRENT POLICY POSITION**

- 2.1 The adopted Local Plan does not identify Local Green Space and instead leaves such designations to be considered as part of Neighbourhood Plans.
- 2.2 The issue of Local Green Space was discussed at the Local Plan Examination in response to comments from local residents. The Local Plan Inspector suggested that the designation of Local Green Space could be explored as part of the Local Plan review, but he did not require that Local Green Spaces be included as part of any subsequent review.

## **3.0 LOCAL GREEN SPACE CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 As part of the review of the Local Plan, a report on Local Green Space was considered by a meeting of this Committee on 20 June 2018. The report recommended that consideration be given to the inclusion of a Local Green Space policy in the new Local Plan depending on the outcome of a call for sites. The Committee agreed that an 8 week consultation would be undertaken to allow evidence to be gathered and that the call for sites be sent to Parish Councils, Local Ward Members and a webpage published to make the consultation accessible to the wider population.
- 3.2 The Local Plan Committee Report also identified that once the consultation had ended that an assessment of the nominated sites could be undertaken and a report published which would outline the sites submitted and the consideration of each.
- 3.3 The Council undertook an 8-week consultation between 25 June and 28 August 2018. The Council contacted the Parish and Town Councils within the District and all District Councillors to seek nominations based on their knowledge of their local areas. Parish and Town Council and/or Local Councillors were requested to collate responses from local people and submit sites that might be appropriate. A specific webpage was also published.
- 3.4 A total of 83 sites were nominated through the call for sites process. These nominations were largely from Parish Council's (73 nominations from 11 different parish councils) and the remaining nominations came from other organisations.
- 3.5 The following list identifies the number and the location of the responses:



<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Number of sites put forward</b>
Appleby Magna	1
Ashby de la Zouch	20
Blackfordby	3
Breedon on the Hill	4
Ellistown and Battleflat	2
Hugglescote and Donington le Heath	1
Kegworth	8
Newton Burgoland	2
Packington	3
Swannington	9
Swepstone	1
Tonge	1
Whitwick	27
Wilson	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>83</b>

3.6 As can be seen from the table above the nominated sites do not cover all parts of the district.

3.7 In addition, a number of the responses contained incomplete information, such as missing site plans and little or no justification as to why sites should be designated as Local Green Space. Where there was insufficient information respondents were contacted after the close of the consultation and asked to provide the additional information. In the majority cases no additional information was provided.

#### **4.0 ASSESSMENT OF NOMINATED SITES**

4.1 Following the close of the consultation, the responses were collated and a draft methodology was produced for assessing the sites. The methodology was based on the criteria in the NPPF and sought to assess the sites in two stages: an initial assessment, based on the more general requirements in the NPPF and then a more detailed assessment based on the more detailed/subjective criteria.

4.2 The first stage of assessment involved a desktop review of the sites against the initial criteria (listed below):

- Does the proposed site already have planning permission for development?
- Is the proposed site allocated/proposed for development in the Local Plan?
- Is the proposed site subject to any other designations in the Local Plan?
- Is the proposed site in close proximity to the community it serves?
- Is the proposed site an extensive tract of land?

4.3 Given the nature of the above criteria only sites where a site plan had been provided could be assessed. On this basis 73 of the 83 submitted sites were assessed.

4.4 The results of the initial assessment identified that 16 sites could be discounted as they did not meet one or more of the initial criteria. This leaves 57 sites that could be assessed in more detail.

4.5 The detailed assessment looked to consider the following:

- How the site is demonstrably special to the community with regard to :
  - Beauty
  - History
  - Recreation
  - Tranquillity
  - Wildlife
- Is the site publically accessible
- Is the site capable of enduring beyond the Local Plan Period

4.6 The 57 sites that met the initial criteria have yet to be assessed against the above (detailed) criteria. This is primarily due to the fact that the information is incomplete for many of the sites which will take time and resources to resolve

## **5.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS**

5.1 Since the adoption of the Local Plan (November 2017) two Neighbourhood Plans have been made within the District; Ashby de la Zouch (29 November 2018) and Ellistown and Battleflat (16 July 2019).

5.2 In addition two further Neighbourhood Plan Areas have been designated at Hugglescote and Donington le Heath and Swannington. This is in addition to Blackfordby Neighbourhood Plan Area that had been designated before the Local Plan was adopted.

5.3 Both Ashby de la Zouch and Ellistown and Battleflat have a policy in their Neighbourhood Plan that designates Local Green Spaces. There are 10 sites designated in Ashby de la Zouch and two in Ellistown. Blackfordby in their pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan identify 3 sites to be designated as Local Green Space. In addition, Hugglescote and Donington le Heath have recently (November 2019) published their draft pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan for consultation which includes a Local Green Space Policy that identifies 6 green spaces they wish to designate as Local Green Space. All of the sites identified in made and emerging neighbourhood plans are included in those sites that were nominated through the call-for-sites.

## **6.0 NEXT STEPS/POLICY OPTIONS**

6.1 There are two potential next steps, these are outlined below.

### Do not include Local Green Spaces in the new Local Plan

6.2 This is the approach taken in the adopted Local Plan. The NPPF identifies that Local Green Space can be designated in Local Plans and/or Neighbourhood Plans and is therefore acceptable for the Local Plan to not designate Local Green Space.

6.3 The Local Plan Inspector required the council to explore the designation of Local Green Spaces, there was no requirement from the Inspector to include a Policy as part of the review of the Local Plan.

6.4 In addition, Neighbourhood Plans are (and have) coming forward within the District, all of which seek to designate Local Green Space. Encouragement could be given to the inclusion of Local Green Spaces as part of any future Neighbourhood Plans.

### Include a Local Green Space Policy in the new Local Plan

6.5 Some initial work on this option has already taken place, such as the call for sites and an initial assessment of sites. Based on this there would be 57 sites to assess in further detail.

6.6 However, there are gaps in the information that was provided during the consultation, particularly in respect of the justification of why sites are considered to be demonstrably

special to the community. Therefore, this information would need to be requested and could delay the assessment process.

- 6.7 As already noted, the responses received during the consultation do not cover the whole district.
- 6.8 Therefore, if only those sites which have been put forward were to be designated as Local Green Spaces only some parts of the district would be covered. This could be addressed by officers seeking to identify potentially suitable sites in those areas not the subject of proposed sites. This would have implications from a resource perspective.
- 6.9 If it was decided to not include any sites other than those put forward to date, this may lead to a number of additional sites being put forward for consideration when the new Local Plan is consulted upon in due course. This would result in more sites needing to be assessed at that point in time and could delay the preparation and submission of the new Local Plan.
- 6.10 From the above, it is apparent that including Local Green Spaces as part of the new Local Plan will, whichever approach is taken, have implications in terms of resources and potentially the timescale for preparing the new Local Plan. This needs to be weighed against the potential benefits arising from designating such sites.

### Conclusion

- 6.11 The original intention to include Local Green Spaces as part of the substantive Local plan review remains an option. However, the response to the call for sites would suggest that there is less support than might have been expected. If the Local Plan were only to include those sites put forward to date, this would be unsatisfactory, as large parts of the district would not have any sites identified. To ensure a comprehensive coverage would have significant resource implications.
- 6.12 On balance, officers are of the view that having regard to the above considerations, that the substantive Local plan review should maintain the approach taken in the adopted Local Plan. Instead, officers should encourage the inclusion of Local Green Spaces in supporting the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. The recommendations above allow for this.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	- Developing a clean and green district
Policy Considerations:	None
Safeguarding:	None discernible
Equalities/Diversity:	None discernible
Customer Impact:	None identified
Economic and Social Impact:	None identified
Environment and Climate Change:	Not identifying Local Green Spaces in the Local Plan would mean that no sites were protected against possible development.

Consultation/Community Engagement:	A call for sites in 2018 was undertaken with Parish and Town Councils.
Risks:	<p>There is no specific requirement for Local Green Spaces to be identified as part of local plans. Not including Local Green Spaces in the Local Plan would be likely to be challenged through the consultation and examination process. The fact that the Council could demonstrate that it has given consideration to their designation should minimise the risk to the Local Plan.</p> <p>If Local Green Spaces are to be identified as part of the Local Plan it is essential that there is appropriate evidence available to justify their designation. The current level of evidence which has been submitted in a significant number of cases is lacking and so this would need to be addressed.</p>
Officer Contact	<p>Ian Nelson  Planning Policy Team Manager  01530 454677  <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

## LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 JANUARY 2020



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – UPDATE</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Robert Ashman Planning and Infrastructure Portfolio Holder	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
		<b>Key Decision:</b> Yes
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The cost of the partial review is met from existing budgets.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	A Statement of Common is required to demonstrate that the Council has satisfied the Duty to Cooperate.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	None identified	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To provide an update for Members in respect of the Local Plan review.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>THAT LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE:</b>  <b>(I) AGREES THAT THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND FOR THE PARTIAL REVIEW BE SIGNED BY THE DISTRICT COUNCIL;</b>  <b>(II) NOTES THE LEVEL OF UNMET NEED DECLARED BY LEICESTER CITY</b>	

**1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 This report sets out for members an update in respect of:
- the Partial Review;
  - and the issue of unmet need in Leicester City

**2.0 THE PARTIAL REVIEW**

- 2.1 Following approval by the Local Plan Committee of 13 November 2019 the consultation on the Partial Review commenced on 20 November and runs until 8 January 2019.
- 2.2 A verbal update will be provided at the meeting in terms of the number of responses received to the consultation.

- 2.3 Members will be aware that the Localism Act 2011 requires effective cooperation between bodies in relation to strategic cross boundary planning matters. To demonstrate such co-operation a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is required. A SoCG has been agreed at officer level with all of the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. A copy is attached at Appendix A of this report.
- 2.4 The SoCG commits signatories to joint working on long term strategic planning for housing and economic growth and the associated strategic infrastructure across Leicester and Leicestershire. Section 7 of the SoCG sets out the key strategic matters, which the authorities agree upon.
- 2.5 The SoCG is currently being taken through the respective sign-off process by each of the authorities. This is due to happen before the Council submit the Partial Review for Examination by 20 February 2020.

### 3.0 LEICESTER CITY UNMET NEED

- 3.1 Members will be aware that Leicester City has previously advised that it would be unable to accommodate all of its housing needs within the City boundaries. The city has now identified that it considers its unmet housing need to be 7,813 dwellings up to 2036. The evidence to justify this has yet to be published and the draft plan has yet to be approved for consultation, so this figure may change either in the short term or later on in 2020 in a further iteration of the Leicester City Local Plan.
- 3.2 Discussion amongst the Housing Market Area (HMA) authorities are currently ongoing with a view to agreeing a Statement of Common Ground to redistribute this need. The outcome of such discussion may have implications for individual authorities, including this Council's Substantive Review of the Local Plan

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	None
Policy Considerations:	None
Safeguarding:	No issues identified
Equalities/Diversity:	No issues identified
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	No issues identified
Environment and Climate Change:	No issues identified
Consultation/Community Engagement:	None
Risks:	Having a Statement of Common Ground will enable the council to demonstrate that the Duty to Cooperate is being satisfied in terms of the Partial Review.
Officer Contact	Ian Nelson - Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>

**North West Leicestershire Local Plan Partial Review**

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND between**

- **Blaby District Council**
- **Charnwood Borough Council**
- **Harborough District Council**
- **Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council**
  - **Leicester City Council**
  - **Leicestershire County Council**
  - **Melton Borough Council**
- **North West Leicestershire District Council**
- **Oadby & Wigston Borough Council**

**Xx xxx 2019**

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The North West Leicestershire Local Plan was adopted in November 2017. It sets out a strategy for delivering the homes, jobs and infrastructure needed in the district between 2011 and 2031. The Council committed to start a review of the plan within three months of the date of adoption.
- 1.2 There are two main reasons why an immediate review was required:
- A shortage of employment land up to 2031 compared to what is needed (as identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment, or HEDNA)
  - The possible need to accommodate additional housing arising from unmet needs in Leicester city.
- 1.3 The review commenced in February 2018. It was the district council's intention that the review would be a 'partial review' to address those issues above. It was also the intention, as required by Policy S1 of the adopted Local Plan, to submit the review for Examination within two years of commencing it.
- 1.4 Through the granting of a number of planning permissions, the district council is making good progress towards addressing the shortage of employment land. However, there remains a lack of sufficient clarity regarding the issue of unmet housing need in Leicester City and how such need would be redistributed amongst the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. In addition, there have been significant changes in circumstances since the Local Plan was adopted, including a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and a new approach to identifying housing requirements coupled with uncertainty regarding nationally produced household projections.
- 1.5 Due to the above Submission within two years is no longer feasible. North West Leicestershire District Council is now proposing that the Partial Review will be limited to a review of Policy S1 only, but that a Substantive Review will also be undertaken to address not only the issues outlined above, but also to address other matters arising from changes in national policies. The Substantive Review will cover a longer period than the adopted Local Plan, going to at least 2036 but more likely later. The work undertaken on the Partial Review to date will feed in to the Substantive Review
- 1.6 This SOCG only relates to the Partial Review. There will be a separate SOCG in respect of the Substantive Review.

## **2 What is the purpose of a Statement of Common Ground?**

- 2.1 The Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a duty on local planning authorities and other bodies to co-operate with each other to address strategic issues relevant to their areas. The duty requires ongoing constructive engagement on the preparation of development plan documents and other activities in relation to the sustainable development and use of land.



2.2 A Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) is a written record to demonstrate how the duty to co-operate has been met as part of the plan making process.

2.3 This SOCG has been prepared in relation to the North West Leicestershire Local Plan Partial Review.

### **3 What administrative areas are covered by this SOCG?**

3.1 Whilst the Local Plan Partial Review only relates to the administrative area of North West Leicestershire, the SOCG refers to matters of strategic importance which affect all of Leicester and Leicestershire.

3.2 There is a wide range of evidence, as set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) (2017) to show that Leicester and Leicestershire operates as both a Housing Market Area (HMA) and Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA). The HEDNA concluded that *“The study area is a self-contained area where the majority of the workforce works and live within its administrative boundaries”*<sup>1</sup>

3.3 The map at Appendix A shows the geographic extent of the area covered by the SOCG.

### **4 Which plan-making authorities are party to this Statement of Common Ground?**

4.1 The SOCG has been prepared by North West Leicestershire District Council and agreed jointly by the following authorities:

- Blaby District Council
- Charnwood Borough Council
- Harborough District Council
- Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
- Leicester City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Melton Borough Council
- North West Leicestershire District Council
- Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

### **5 What are the governance arrangements for the cooperation process?**

5.1 There is a strong history of joint working and co-operation amongst the authorities, including the joint preparation and agreement of a Strategic Growth Plan up to 2050.

5.2 The authorities listed above, along with the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP), work collaboratively to address strategic issues across the area. This work is led by the Members’ Advisory Group (MAG).

5.3 The MAG comprises of a councillor from each of the authorities, plus an observer from the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP). The MAG meets on a regular frequency and its role is advisory. Any proposals or recommendations of MAG are not binding on the constituent member authorities. However, where there are matters pertaining to key strategic planning, for example the preparation of a joint plan (e.g. the

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 2.29, Appendices to Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (2017)

Strategic Growth Plan) or the distribution of development, then any agreement at MAG is subject to ratification at individual authority level. The MAG meets on a quarterly basis.

- 5.4 The MAG is supported by a Strategic Planning Group (SPG) made up of senior management representatives of each of the authorities and is responsible for overseeing policy development for strategic planning purposes. The SPG meets on a monthly basis.
- 5.5 The SPG is itself supported by further officer groups. The Planning Officers' Forum (POF) is a formal meeting of Chief Officers (or their nominee) responsible for planning and transport services across Leicester and Leicestershire. The Forum provides professional advice to the SPG and meets on a monthly basis.
- 5.6 The Development Plans Forum is a formal meeting of the managers responsible for planning and transport policy within Leicester and Leicestershire and reports to POF with the Chair attending POF as required.

## **6 How have the authorities been engaged in the Local Plan Partial review?**

- 6.1 An Issues and Options Consultation was undertaken between 21 February and 4 April 2018 with an Emerging Options Consultation being undertaken between 12 November 2018 and 11 January 2019. All of the authorities were consulted on both consultations.
- 6.2 At the Issues and Options stage responses were received from both Charnwood Borough Council and Leicester City Council. Charnwood Borough Council also responded to the Emerging Options consultation.
- 6.3 A report was presented to the authorities at the Planning Officers Forum on 23 August 2019 which outlined the approach which North West Leicestershire District Council was proposing to take on the Partial review and the reasons for it.

## **7 What are the key strategic matters, which the authorities agree upon?**

- 7.1 The authorities agree that:
  - They are committed to joint working on long term strategic planning for housing and economic growth and the associated strategic infrastructure required to support growth across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Market Area , including meeting the areas housing and economic needs within its boundaries.
  - The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) (2017) is the most recent Housing Market Area wide based evidence study.
  - The annual housing need for Leicester and Leicestershire set out in the HEDNA for the period to 2031 is 4,829 dwellings, or 96,580 for the period 2011-2031. The figure for North West Leicestershire for the same period is 481 dwellings. This is the housing requirement set out in the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan.
  - The annual housing need for Leicester and Leicestershire using the standard method (2014-based) is 4,867 dwellings. The figure for North West Leicestershire is 379

dwellings. For the purpose of the Partial Review it is agreed that no change should be made to the housing requirement of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan due to the reasons set out in paras 1.2 to 1.6 above.

- To date only Leicester City has declared that it will not be able to meet all of its housing needs up to 2031 and that the amount of the unmet need has yet to be quantified and resolved in discussion with the housing market area partners.
- A redistribution of unmet housing needs from Leicester City (or any other authority declaring and quantifying an unmet need) will be agreed through the established joint working mechanism outlined at Section 5 above.
- No authority has declared that it is unable to meet its own economic development needs.
- It is recognised that there have been changes in circumstances since the North West Leicestershire Local Plan was adopted. These changes are such that completing the Partial Review within the two years specified is not feasible.

7.2 This statement is provided without prejudice to other matters of detail that the parties may wish to raise during the subsequent Examination of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan Partial Review.

**8 Are there any key matters upon which the authorities do not agree?**

8.1 No key matters have been identified upon which the authorities do not agree in the context of the Partial Review

**9 Are there any other SOCG which are of relevance to the Local Plan Partial Review?**

9.1 Not at this time. However, the authorities are working jointly on a SOCG which will address the issue of the redistribution of unmet housing needs from Leicester City. This is not expected to be finalised and signed off by all of the authorities until 2020. This SOCG will inform the Substantive Review of the Local Plan.

**10 How will this statement will be maintained and kept up to date?**

10.1 In the event that there are any changes in circumstances from those outlined in this SOCG, then these will be brought to the attention of the SPG and MAG and any amendments will be agreed accordingly.

# APPENDIX A



Produced by the Strategic Business Intelligence Team,  
Leicestershire County Council  
© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.  
Leicestershire County Council  
LA100018271. Published 2017.

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL



## LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 JANUARY 2020

<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Robert Ashman Planning and Infrastructure Portfolio Holder	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
		<b>Key Decision:</b> Yes/No
<b>Financial Implications</b>	<p>The Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Neighbourhood Plan will incur direct costs to the District Council to support an independent examination of the plan and, should the examination be successful, a local referendum. Grant funding from central government (£30,000 per Neighbourhood Plan) is payable to the authority to support this agenda, but may not meet the costs in full. Any such additional costs would need to be met from the contingency budget held by the Planning Service.</p> <p>Once the Neighbourhood Plan is made it will form part of the Development Plan for North West Leicestershire. Should the document be subject to legal challenge, the District Council will be responsible for meeting such costs. Any such costs would need to be met from the contingency budget held by the Planning Service.</p>	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	<p>Once the Neighbourhood Plan is made it will form part of the Development Plan for North West Leicestershire. This means it will be used to determine planning applications within the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	<p>Officer time has, and will continue to be, provided to support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Depending upon the extent of such involvement, this may have implications for other work undertaken by the respective officers.</p>	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	<p>To agree the District Council's response to the pre-submission draft of the Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Neighbourhood Plan and set out the proposed delegation arrangements for the future stages in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	

<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	<p><b>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE;</b></p> <p><b>(I) ENDORSES THE SUGGESTED PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 14) RESPONSE TO HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH PARISHCOUNCIL AS SET OUT AT APPENDIX B;</b></p> <p><b>(II) AGREES TO DELEGATE ENDORSEMENT OF ANY FURTHER RESPONSE BY OFFICERS AT SUBMISSION (REGULATION 16) STAGE TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING &amp; REGENERATION;</b></p> <p><b>(III) NOTES THAT ONCE THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN HAS BEEN SUBMITTED THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING &amp; REGENERATION WILL:</b></p> <p><b>A) PUBLISH THE PLAN FOR A SIX WEEK PERIOD AND INVITE REPRESENTATIONS;</b></p> <p><b>B) NOTIFY CONSULTATION BODIES; AND</b></p> <p><b>C) APPOINT AN INDEPENDENT EXAMINER TO CONDUCT THE EXAMINATION OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN;</b></p> <p><b>(IV) NOTES THAT FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE INDEPENDENT EXAMINER’S REPORT, THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING &amp; REGENERATION WILL DETERMINE WHETHER THE CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN MET FOR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO PROCEED TO REFERENDUM;</b></p> <p><b>(V) IF THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO VOTED IN THE REFERENDUM ARE IN FAVOUR OF THE HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AND THE DISTRICT COUNCIL DOES NOT CONSIDER THE MAKNG OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TO BE INCOMPATIBLE WITH ANY EU OR HUMAN RIGHTS OBLIGATIONS, AND THAT THERE IS NO AVAILABLE MEETING OF CABINET WITHIN EIGHT WEEKS OF THE REFERENDUM THEN THE DECISION WHETHER TO MAKE THE PLAN BE DELAGTED TO THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF PLACE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING &amp; REGENERATION</b></p>
-------------------------------	--

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Parish Council has published a pre-submission draft (in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) of its Neighbourhood Plan for consultation between 6 November and 18 December 2019.
- 1.2 Because the consultation closed before a meeting of this committee, officers have submitted comments, following discussion with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning but on the understanding that they were subject to being agreed by this committee.
- 1.3 The purpose of this report is to agree the Councils response to the pre-submission plan and to agree the approval process for the subsequent stages of the Neighbourhood Plan preparation.

## **2. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS**

- 2.1 Neighbourhood Planning was introduced under the Localism Act 2011 to give local communities a more hands on role in the planning of their neighbourhoods. It introduced new rights and powers to allow local communities to shape new development in their local area.
- 2.2 Neighbourhood Plans can be prepared by a Parish or Town Council (or Neighbourhood Forums in areas not covered by a Parish or Town Council) once they have been designated as a neighbourhood area by the District Council.
- 2.3 Neighbourhood Plans should consider local and not strategic issues and must be in line with higher level planning policy. A Neighbourhood Plan can be detailed or general, depending on what local people want but they must be in line with European Union obligations as incorporated into UK law and human rights requirements; they must have regard to national planning policy and must be in general conformity with strategic policies in the adopted development plan in force for the local area.
- 2.4 The District Council as Local Planning Authority has an important role to play in the Neighbourhood Plan process even though the District Council is not responsible for its preparation. The key stages in producing a Neighbourhood Plan as governed by The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 together with the District Council's role are summarised in the Table at Appendix A of this report.
- 2.5 At present, there are two 'made' Neighbourhood Plans in the district (Ashby de la Zouch and Ellistown and Battleflat).

## **3.0 THE HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON-LE-HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

- 3.1 The Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Neighbourhood Plan area covers the parish of Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath and was designated on 7 June 2017.
- 3.2 At this stage the role of the District Council is as a consultee (See Appendix A for details of each Neighbourhood Plan preparation stage).

- 3.3 The draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out policies under seven headings:
- General
  - Housing
  - Natural and Historic Environment
  - Transport and Access
  - Community facilities and amenities
  - Employment
  - Developer Contributions
- 3.4 In addition to the draft document there are a number of supporting documents which have been produced, including a Housing Needs Report and an Environmental Inventory.
- 3.5 In making comments officers have assessed the proposed plan against the adopted Local Plan and any relevant national policies to ensure that it is consistent with both of these. The comments are set out at Appendix B of this report.
- 3.6 The comments made are with the intention of assisting with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan rather than seeking to be critical. The District Council as the Local Planning Authority will be required, if the plan is 'made', to use the plan in determining planning applications. It is important to ensure, therefore, that policies are as clear as possible to avoid any confusion at a later date. Where possible suggestions have been made as to how the plan could be amended to address any potential concerns.
- 3.7 At this stage none of the issues raised are considered to be such that the plan is likely to be at risk.

#### **4.0 NEXT STEPS**

- 4.1 Once the current consultation period ends, the Parish Council will have to consider all of the comments received, including those provided by the District Council. Following any changes to the Neighbourhood Plan that they believe are necessary, the Parish Council will then submit a revised version to the District Council.
- 4.2 As set out at Appendix A, the District Council's role at submission stage is firstly to be a consultee - but to also arrange for a further round of consultation, subject to the Neighbourhood Plan meeting the various legal requirements. The District Council is also required to appoint an independent examiner (with the agreement of the Parish Council) who will examine the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the technical / procedural nature of these various tasks, it is recommended that they be delegated to the Strategic Director of Place, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning – in line with the procedure undertaken for both Ashby de la Zouch and Ellistown and Battleflat Neighbourhood Plans.
- 4.3 Following receipt of the independent examiner's report, the District Council must formally decide whether to send the Neighbourhood Plan to referendum (with or without modifications proposed by the examiner or NWLDC). Reg 17A(5) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as added by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 gives the District Council 5 weeks from receipt of the examiner's report to decide whether to proceed with the referendum or not. Given the short timescale, the Strategic Director of Place, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning will exercise the executive power of making this decision



as delegated to them in the Constitution (paragraph 5.2.1 of the Scheme of Delegation).

- 4.4 Should the Neighbourhood Plan be sent to referendum, and the referendum declares in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan, then the District Council is required to make (i.e. adopt) the Neighbourhood Plan within 8 weeks of the referendum (Reg 18A(1) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as added by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016). The decision to 'make' a Neighbourhood Plan is an executive decision. However, it may be necessary, depending upon the timing of any referendum and dates for any Cabinet meeting, for a decision to 'make' the Neighbourhood Plan to be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning. This is allowed for in recommendation (v).

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for businesses and helping people into local jobs</li> <li>- Developing a clean and green district</li> <li>- Local people live in high quality, affordable homes</li> <li>- Our communities are safe, healthy and connected</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	Policies in the adopted Local Plan as highlighted in the report
Safeguarding:	No issues identified
Equalities/Diversity:	No issues identified
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	No specific impacts identified
Environment and Climate Change:	No specific impacts identified
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Other Council services have been consulted in drawing together the proposed response. The draft Neighbourhood Plan is subject to public consultation undertaken by Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Parish Council.
Risks:	The ultimate decision on how to proceed in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan rests with Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath Parish Council. Officers will work with the Parish Council to seek to minimise risks to the Neighbourhood Plan if so requested.
Officer Contact	Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A – TABLE HIGHLIGHTING STAGES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PREPARATION PROCESS

Regulation	Stage of Neighbourhood Plan process	District Council role
Reg 6A	Designating a neighbourhood area	To agree to the designation of a neighbourhood area
	Preparing a draft Neighbourhood Plan	To provide advice and assistance
Reg 14	Pre-submission publicity & consultation	To be a consultee
Reg 15	Submission of a neighbourhood plan to the local planning authority	<p>Ensure that the submitted draft Neighbourhood Plan is accompanied by the following</p> <p>(a) a map or statement which identifies the area to which the proposed neighbourhood development plan relates;</p> <p>(b) a consultation statement;</p> <p>(c) the proposed neighbourhood development plan; and</p> <p>(d) a statement explaining how the proposed neighbourhood development plan meets the “basic conditions” (requirements of paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act). Basic conditions are:</p> <p>(a) That it has regard to national policies and advice;</p> <p>(b) That it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;</p> <p>(c) That it is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the local Development Plan;</p> <p>(d) That it is compatible with EU obligations; and</p> <p>(e) That it is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site</p>
Reg 16	Publicising a plan proposal	Organise and undertake consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for a 6 week period
Reg 17	Submit the draft plan for independent examination	Arrange for an independent examination including the appointment of an examiner in

		consultation with the Parish or Town Council.
--	--	---

**NWLDC OFFICER RESPONSE TO PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT  
HUGGLESCOTE AND DONINGTON LE HEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Plan Section/Policy Number (Page Number in brackets)	Officer Response
<b>Section A General</b>	
General (page 16) 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph under methodology	Might be appropriate to quote what the NPPF says (page 49). NPPF refers to valued landscapes and recognising the “intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” rather than protecting the countryside per se.
Figure 2a Limits to development (page 17)	It would help if this showed all of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. The inclusion of additional land south of The Green Donington Le Heath which has planning permission and is not included in the adopted Local Plan is noted.
South East coalville Deelopment Scheme (page 17)	Planning permission is in place for all of south east Coalville.  The latest housing trajectory identifies that 2,236 dwellings will be built by 2031. It is not clear if the reference to 1,900 dwellings is only that part of the site that is within the plan area?
Policy G2 (South East Coalville Development Scheme) (page 19)	The reference to figure 2b is slightly misleading as it suggests that all of the area shown on figure 2b is in the plan area. It would be helpful to delineate in some way that part that is within the plan area.
Policy G3 (Design) (pages 20/21/22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Provision of insulation is not a matter considered through the planning system</li> <li>b) The requirement for a Design and Access Statement for all developments of more than 1 dwelling conflicts with the Planning Practice Guidance. Such a requirement only applies in areas designated as a World Heritage Site or conservation area (see link below).</li> <li>d) would it be worthwhile also including links to Bardon employment area?</li> <li>h and i) Are these the same points expressed differently?</li> <li>p) Is the reference to two bed properties necessary as they are also caught by being in the “three bedrooms or less “ category in the second part of this criteria.</li> <li>q) First part does not make sense as worded. Should the last word be ‘supported’ rather than ‘promoted’?</li> <li>r) The aspiration for this is supported, but there is currently no national requirement for universal vehicle charging points. It is also not clear as to whether this is technically feasible at the present time.</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#Design-and-Access-Statement">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-an-application#Design-and-Access-Statement</a></p>

The approach to future residential growth (page 20, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph)	Unclear what the Leicester Housing Market Assessment (2017) is.
<b>Section B Housing</b>	
Policy H1 (Housing Mix) (page 23)	<p>4<sup>th</sup> paragraph. It would be helpful to also include the HEDNA recommendations for the mix of affordable housing alongside the market housing mix rather than later on.</p> <p>The housing needs report which accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan identifies (Table 5) that the proportion of 4 or more bedroomed properties (20.4%) are somewhat greater than the North West Leicestershire average (23.5%). Whilst it is recognised that there is some evidence of under occupancy, it is considered that the evidence does not support the approach set out in respect of larger homes.</p> <p>It would be helpful if some support was to be given for the provision of 1-bed market properties as well, otherwise developers assume they can provide them as affordable units only. This would provide a better mix as suggested in the HEDNA.</p> <p>It is not clear what is meant by the term “any single site” in the policy. Does it refer to an application site? What if the application site is a phase of part of a larger development?</p>
Policy H2 (Affordable Housing) (page 24)	<p>3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph – the Local Plan requirement for affordable housing in Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath is 20% as they fall within the Coalville Urban Area.</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> paragraph – since the HEDNA was produced a new NPPF has been published which includes a requirement that 10% of new homes be available for low cost home ownership (paragraph 64). Presumably this 10% requirement would form part of the 20% ‘low cost starter homes or other home ownership products’ quoted in the policy. The use of the term ‘intermediate housing’ no longer appears in the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF glossary. It is noted that the proposed policy does not use this term, but it would be useful to explain why this is.</p> <p>It should be noted that for the South East Coalville development area, the provision of affordable housing has already been agreed. The policy could only be applied to any additional development that comes forward within the parish.</p>
Policy H3 (Windfall Sites) (Page 25)	<p>In g) it would be helpful to make it clear that it is the occupiers of the “proposed dwelling” which is being referred to.</p> <p>It would be useful to consider including a further requirement as there may be instances where a site of up to 5 dwellings satisfies the floorspace requirement of the adopted Local Plan policy. Suggest something like <i>“where the requirement for an affordable housing contribution is triggered against the local plan affordable housing policy, that such provision is to be made”</i></p>

<p>Policy H4 (Support to be given to brownfield sites) (Page 25)</p>	<p>What is meant by redundant land? Would it include land no longer used for agricultural purposes? The policy could include a cross reference to the definition of previously developed land as set out in the NPPF. For example,</p> <p>“Within the Limits to Development, proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of redundant land or buildings <u>(which satisfies the definition of previously developed land as set out in the NPPF or any successor document)</u> will be supported, unless it conflicts with policies in the Development Plan”.</p>
<p><b>Section C Natural and historic environment</b></p>	
<p>Environmental Inventory (Page28)</p>	<p>Last sentence on page 28 refers to ‘<i>National Planning Policy Framework 2018</i>’ should this be 2019?</p>
<p>Environmental Inventory (Page 29)</p>	<p>The use of a scoring system to assess sites for designation as Local Green Space is questioned.</p> <p>In particular in assessing Accessibility as the Planning Practice Guidance states that land can be considered for designation as Local Green Space even if there is no public access. Therefore, sites with public access should not score higher than those with no public access.</p> <p>Also in terms of the ‘bounded’ criteria this appears to consider whether sites have some form of boundary i.e that they are not extensive tracts of land. In terms of the criteria set out in the NPPF there is no requirement for sites to have a specific boundary. This criteria may need re-wording.</p>

<p>Policy ENV1: Protection of Local Green Space (Page 30)</p>	<p>A scoring system has been used to assess green spaces within the Neighbourhood Plan Area that could be designated as Local Green Space. The scoring system is based on the Local Green Space criteria as set out in the NPPF. The six sites included in Policy ENV1 are those with the highest overall score.</p> <p>Our interpretation of paragraph 100 of the NPPF (2019) is that sites only need to meet one of the criteria: beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife. The scoring system used appears to require sites to meet a number of the criteria in order to achieve a high overall score. This would appear to be more onerous than the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy ENV1 identifies 6 sites that are to be designated as Local Green Space. Appendix 5 appears to suggest that sites which score 24 or more should be designated as Local Green Space. However, Appendix 5 details numerous additional sites that score 24 or more and would therefore meet the scoring requirement to be designated as Local Green Space. It is not clear as to why these other sites have been excluded.</p> <p>These 'other' high scoring sites have been identified in Policies ENV2 and ENV3 which appears to create a hierarchy of protected sites based on what Local Green Space criteria they score the highest in. The methodology could be better explained and this approach may be overly complicated and add unnecessary tiers of designations.</p> <p>Unclear what "<i>exceptional circumstances</i>" might be, therefore it may be worth detailing what is meant by this.</p> <p>Table 2 Page 31 Hugglescote Cemetery, there is an additional 3 in the History criteria column.</p>
<p>Sites of environmental significance (page 35)</p>	<p>See the comment under EV1 re the scoring system for the Local Green Space designation</p>
<p>Figure 7.1 (page 36)</p>	<p>The key is not clear in the title for the figure, it would be easier to see if it followed the format of figure 7.2</p> <p>The purple features are very difficult to see unless very zoomed in, if this is being used as a paper copy then it could help the reader to label the features .</p>
<p>Important Open Space (page 37)</p>	<p>Sentence states that 'This policy is in general conformity with NWLDC Adopted Local Plan (2017) Policy IF3 (4-6)' - unsure if this sentence is needed as only part of the Neighbourhood Plan Policy refers to the Loss of Open Space which is what is referred to in the Local Plan Policy IF3 parts 4-6.</p>

Policy ENV3: Important Open Spaces (page 37)	<p>Policy ENV3 refers to the loss of open space. This is already included in Policy IF3 of the adopted Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan is not required to repeat this.</p> <p>The wording of Policy ENV3 could be made clearer. The Policy identifies sites that are to be protected as Important Open Spaces therefore it is unclear what is then meant by 'through confirmation as existing or designation as new, Open Space, Sport and Recreation (OSSR) sites in appropriate typologies'. Unclear as to what the typologies are and how they have been applied as they have not been applied to all of the sites. An explanation in the supporting text would be useful.</p>
Biodiversity and habitat connectivity (page 44)	<p>The third paragraph states there has been an 'observed 70% decline' what is the source for this claim?</p> <p>The following paragraph has a ' mark before embed which seems to suggest it is a quote, but there is no end to the quote and nor is it clear where it comes from.</p>
Local Wildlife Corridor (page 44)	The cross reference needs to be completed, at present to refers to Policy ENV xx
Figure 13 (page 45)	<p>It is not clear on the choice for the green habitat sites supporting the wildlife corridor. When compared with figure 7.2 it would appear the same but not all of various types of site of natural significance have been used to create one linear corridor. Indeed there are areas of land which are not identified in figure 7.2 being used.</p> <p>What is the justification / assessment for including sites in this policy and why is the map focussing on a single line of corridor and not connecting to the other sites identified in figure 7.2?</p>
Policy ENV 6 (page 45)	<p>In the second paragraph it states "<i>In cases where the development is determined...</i>"</p> <p>This is a bit ambiguous as to what is acceptable to outweigh the the biodiversity loss is it the scale / type / benefits of the development?</p>
<b>Section D Transport and Access</b>	
Policy T1: Transport Assessment for new Housing Development (Page 48)	<p>It is assumed that the role of this policy is not to require the submission of Transport Assessments. Rather it details what sort of the information should be submitted, in the instances that a Transport Assessment is required. The Leicestershire County Council Highway Design Guide identifies the circumstances a Transport Assessment is required, which is determined by the size and type of development. It maybe useful to refer to this document in order to provide clarity.</p> <p>Point e refers to NP policy H8 however, there are only 4 housing policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Policy T2: Residential and Public Car Parking (page 49)	<p>With respect to the parking standards proposed for 4+bedroom dwellings, this aspect of the policy would not comply with the North West Leicestershire Local Plan, the district's Design SPD nor the parking standards set out within the Leicestershire County Council Highway Design Guide. These only require the provision of 3 spaces per dwelling for four or more bed properties.</p>



Policy T3: Leicester to Burton Railway Line (page 49)	<p>It is not clear as to what exactly is meant by “Proposals that threaten...”. Suggest that it be reworded to state “Proposals for development within the plan area that threaten ...”</p> <p>At the current time there are no proposals to reopen the line and nor have any potential station sites. What happens if land between the Bardon Grange development and the railway line is not available, but land elsewhere in the plan area is? It might be better to state “Development of a new station and associated infrastructure within the plan area will be supported...”</p>
<b>Section E Community Facilities and Amenities</b>	
Community Facilities and Amenities (page 50)	<p>Should the reference to the Working Mens Club be changed to the Social Club?</p> <p>There only appears to be one shop (McColls with Post Office) if the second shop is the Central Stores, this was converted in 2016. If the second shop is not either of the two above then it may help to include the road they are on. Similarly, it would help to identify the location of many of these facilities and/or their name.</p>
Policy CF1: Community Facilities and Amenities (pages 50-51)	<p>Point d refers to policy G2 (SE Coalville) is this correct? Should it be G3 the general design policy?</p> <p>Point f refers to “unacceptable traffic movements” how will these be quantified? We suggest this include reference to the standard of the Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>Points e and f are partly repetitive and can be joined together.</p>
Policy CF3 Doctors Surgery (page 52)	<p>Point a refers to “unacceptable traffic movements” how will these be quantified? We suggest this include reference to the standard of the Local Highway Authority.</p>
Policy CF4 Noisy Sports (page 52)	<p>It is not clear as to how in determining a planning application, the areas in point a would be defined and how excessive noise in point b should be interpreted?</p>
<b>Section F Employment</b>	
POLICY E1: Support for existing employment opportunities (page 53)	<p>The general principle of the policy is supported – however it is not clear if both bullet points need to be demonstrated (i.e. if there should be an ‘and’ between them) or whether only one needs to be demonstrated (so there should be an ‘or’ between them).</p> <p>Also, is the 12 months in bullet point a) additional to or concurrent with the six months marketing included in bullet point b).</p> <p>Does the employment-generating uses in bullet point b) relate only to B-class uses or any employment generating uses?</p>
POLICY E2: New small-scale employment (page 53)	<p>The policy states that small scale employment needs to comply with the provisions of Policy.... – which Policy is this?</p>
POLICY E3: Working from home (page 54)	<p>In bullet point 3, it might be useful to reference design policies in the Local Plan and the Good Design SPD.</p> <p>There should either be ‘and’ or ‘or’ between each bullet point to clarify if one or all need to be satisfied.</p>

POLICY E4: Re-use of agricultural and commercial buildings (page 55)	<p>There should either be 'and' or 'or' between each bullet point to clarify if one or all need to be satisfied.</p> <p>It is not clear as to what is meant by a 'rural building'; is it a building in a rural location (ie outside of the Limits to Development) or is it a building in use for a rural purpose? Clarification would be helpful.</p>
<b>Section G Developer Contributions</b>	
Developer Contributions (page 56)	<p>The third paragraph uses a reference to “(PPG 46)” the Planning Practice Guidance is organised like a glossary with an alphabetised list so it is not clear how this reference works.</p> <p>The District Council is not currently considering the introduction of CIL. However, it may do so at some future point in time. It is suggested that this section be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The list under CF1 has two points which should be reconsidered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reference to gateway features for the village seems to be a better fit under the highways requirements rather than a community facility due to the tie in to speed reduction. Notwithstanding this, any request needs to relate to the impact that the new development will have on the existing facilities, it is difficult to see how a development would be unacceptable in planning terms if the gateways are not provided.</li> <li>• The reference to “<i>securing the community centre which is currently owned by the Anglican Church</i>”, will be difficult to achieve as it involves land in a third party ownership, an unknown cost (at this time) and the likelihood that the scale of new development beyond that already committed will be limited and so would not generate a significant financial contribution.</li> </ul>
Appendix 5: Survey and Research (end of Page 3)	This includes an extract from the NPPF which details the Local Green Space criteria and is taken from the 2012 NPPF, this should be updated to show para. 100 from the 2019 NPPF.

Comments of Conservation Officer

The parish of Hugglescote and Donington-le-Heath contains eight listed buildings including the grade II\* listed Manor House at Donington and the grade II\* listed parish church at Hugglescote. Pevsner (1984) describes the latter as “easily the best C19 church [in Leicestershire] outside Leicester”. The parish contains two conservation areas and five identified local heritage assets. These include the former National School (1862) and the former Grammar School (1909) as well as three buildings in the Hugglescote conservation area. In 2017 we adopted a rapid appraisal to support the designation of the Hugglescote conservation area.

I am pleased that heritage is important to the Parish Council. For instance the foreword refers to “the importance of retaining our heritage”; the ‘background’ says that protection of “buildings and structures of historic and architectural interest” is one of seven planning issues that “matter most to the community”; the ‘vision’ refers to the need to “balance the distinct heritage of the parish” (although it does not say what it should be balanced against).

The subchapter “natural and historic environment” accounts for one-third of the draft plan. Hence it is a pity that the draft plan makes no reference to conservation areas and contains no policy relating to development affecting conservation areas. It is a pity that it contains no policy relating to development affecting the settings of listed buildings. It is a pity that it contains no reference to the District Council’s list of local heritage assets and no reference to the shrunken medieval village of Snibston.

### **‘Planning issues [that] matter most to the community’**

Page nine contains a bullet list of seven “planning issues [that] matter most to the community”, including the protection of “buildings and structures of historic and architectural interest”. Page fourteen contains a bullet list of eight “policy issues identified by the community as being of special importance”; this list does not refer to heritage assets. It is not clear how the bullet lists relate to each other.

### **‘Brief history’**

Page ten contains a ‘brief history’ of the parish. It contains no reference to the shrunken medieval village of Snibston.

- Paragraph one says that “the first written record ... is to be found in the Domesday Book, with reference to Donington manor”. It would be useful to note that Hugglescote does not appear in the Domesday Book and that the first chapel-of-ease at Hugglescote was erected in the late fourteenth century (Moore, 2005).
- Paragraphs three and four appear to quote at length from a Victorian trade directory but the source is not credited. Paragraph four contains population figures for the ‘township’ and ‘ecclesiastical parish’ that do not agree with the figures on page 11. If these figures are ‘historic’ then this should be made clear.
- Paragraphs four and seven refer to the Church of St John the Baptist. The paragraphs repeat and contradict each other. Paragraph four says that the church was built in 1879 in the Franco-Norman style but paragraph seven says that it was built in 1878 in the English Geometrical Decorated style.
- Page 26 describes Hugglescote as a “nineteenth-century expansion of Coalville based on a medieval village” but page ten makes no reference to this expansion.

Paragraph four says that “the manor belonged to Lord Donington and is now part of Leicestershire Museums”. This paragraph appears to confuse the manor (lower case) with the Manor House (upper case). The Hastings family were lords of the manor (Charles Hastings was created Lord Donington in 1880) but the *soi disant* Manor House was owned by the Osgathorpe Charity (now part of Thomas Charley’s Charities). It may be interesting to explore the connection between the Manor House, the Osgathorpe Charity and the former Grammar School, which succeeded the Free Grammar School at Osgathorpe.

Paragraph six says that Hugglescote and Donington “were part of the parish of Ibstock until 1878, when they were formed into a separate civil parish”. It says that “in 1936 the parish was absorbed by the urban district of Coalville”. This paragraph appears to confuse the civil parish and the ecclesiastical parish. Our rapid appraisal says that Hugglescote “was anciently a township in Ibstock parish” but it was administered by Coalville urban district council from 1894. Kelly (1891) describes Hugglescote as a township in Ibstock parish; Kelly (1899) describes it as a township in Coalville urban district.

### **Policy G3 ‘Design’**

Policy G3 is two pages long and contains twenty sub-policies. The headline policy says that development should “reflect the character and context of existing development”. Good

design is about more than being “sympathetic to local character”. Chapter 12 of the NPPF and Local Plan policy D1 recognise other aspects of good design; some of these aspects are reflected in policy G3’s sub-policies. The headline policy should be amended to reflect these other aspects. The NPPF says that “Neighbourhood Plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development” (paragraph 126). It is a pity that the draft plan does not do this.

Policy G3 contains eight sub-policies that relate to “character and context” (sub-policies (b) and (c) and sub-policies (h) to (m)). Considering the length of policy G3 I would recommend that the Parish Council split policy G3 into two separate policies, the first referring to “character and context” and the second referring to other aspects of good design. The headline policy says that development should “reflect the character and context of existing development” but supports “contemporary and innovative materials and design” in some circumstances. The headline policy is contradicted by sub-policy G3(b), which says that “all development will enhance and reinforce the local character” but makes no allowance for “contemporary and innovative” design.

- Sub-policies G3(a), G3(f), G3(g) and G3(q) refer to “green technology” and “sustainable design”. I am pleased that these sub-policies have been included – they reflect Local Plan policy D1(5) – but the sub-policies are repetitive and sub-policy G3(f) does not appear to constitute a policy.
- Sub-policies G3(h) and G3(i) refer to the “diversity” of new development. Sub-policy G3(i) says that “within each development the housing should not be the same in appearance”. Parts of the parish (e.g. the “nineteenth-century expansion of Coalville”) exhibit a great degree of uniformity and in these contexts uniform development would be “sympathetic”.
- Sub-policies G3(p) and G3(r) refer to parking and electric vehicle charging. These sub-policies appear more relevant to chapter D “Transport and access”.

Finally I am disappointed that policy G3 makes no reference to the creation of safe places. For instance please refer to NPPF paragraph 127(f) and Local Plan policy D1.

### **Donington Fields**

Page 27 contains two paragraphs of text entitled “historic environment”. The text does not appear to refer to the historic environment but instead refers to “the agricultural land known locally as ‘Donington Fields’”. The text says that “this is an important environmental and recreational area” but the draft plan does not refer to it as a heritage asset. The fields are not identified on figure 7.1 “sites of historic environment significance” or in policy ENV4 “local heritage assets”. Figure 11.3 indicates that one of the fields contains well preserved ridge-and-furrow.

### **Destroyed features**

Page 28 refers to the “site of the Manor House bank-and-ditch” and describes this as a “feature of high historical and archaeological significance”. Policy ENV4 refers to the site of a cruck framed house and describes it as a “local heritage asset ... important for [its] contribution to the village”. These features have been destroyed.

### **Local heritage assets**

Page 39 says that the NPPG “confirms the ability of Neighbourhood Plans to identify non-designated heritage assets”. The NPPG says that “there are a number of processes through which non-designated heritage assets may be identified, including the local and Neighbourhood Plan-making processes”. It also says that “it can be helpful if LPAs keep a list of local heritage assets, incorporating any such assets that are identified by Neighbourhood Planning bodies”. Historic England (2016) *Local heritage listing* says that

“work in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan may indicate buildings and sites that merit inclusion on the local list” but recommends that “final ratification” of a local list should be “sought at the appropriate level within the LPA”.

In conclusion a Neighbourhood Plan should not contain a list of local heritage assets, but the plan-making process (“the work in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan”) may identify non-designated heritage assets and the LPA may subsequently include these assets on a local list.

Page 39 says that the County Council “has identified five buildings and structures ... that are considered to be of local significance”. The draft plan does not say when or how this work was carried out or which buildings and structures were identified. I suspect this is a reference to the District Council’s adopted list of local heritage assets. Page 39 says that “recent research for the Parish Council has identified a further seventeen buildings and structures of similar local heritage significance”. Again the draft plan does not say when or how this work was carried out and I suspect that the “research” is based substantially upon our draft list of local heritage assets, which was prepared in 2017. The Parish Council should credit the District Council for the work that it has carried out.

Figure 7.1 indicates “sites of historical [sic] environment significance”. It indicates no more than twenty sites so it should be feasible to list the sites in the text (see policy ENV3). Figure 7.1 depicts earthwork remains at Hugglescote Grange and Snibston in a manner that differs substantially to our draft list of local heritage assets (see attached). At Snibston the Historic Environment Record notes that “most earthwork remains have been ploughed out”.

### **Ridge and furrow**

Page 42 says that Historic England “recognises the national historic importance of ridge-and-furrow and supports its protection as a non-designated heritage asset”. No source is offered to support this assertion. Figure 11.3 indicates “surviving ridge and furrow” coloured buff and orange. There is no key to explain the significance of the two colours.

### **Other comments**

- On page 14 the ‘vision’ refers to the area’s “proud industrial heritage” but none of the sites identified in figure 7.1 or in policy ENV4 are industrial heritage sites.
- The map on page 18 indicates the boundary of the South Eastern [sic] Coalville development scheme. It would be useful to indicate the parish/plan boundary on this map.
- Page 38 refers to listed buildings and says that development should “take into account their settings as defined (on a case-by-case basis) by Historic England”. This makes no sense. Historic England has defined the term ‘setting’ but it is not responsible for defining the settings of listed buildings “on a case-by-case basis”.
- Page 46 refers to six “important views”. For monitoring purposes it would be useful to include a photograph to indicate each view.

This page is intentionally left blank

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL



## LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 JANUARY 2020

<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>DRAFT CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN - CONSULTATION</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Robert Ashman Planning and Infrastructure Portfolio Holder	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019-36 (October 2019)</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
	<a href="#">The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan</a>  <a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework</a>	<b>Key Decision:</b> No
<b>Financial Implications</b>	None identified	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Council is a consultee and any comments it makes will need to be taken in to account by Charnwood Borough Council as part of the process for preparing a further iteration of the Local Plan. If necessary, the District Council's comments could be considered as part of the subsequent Local Plan Examination.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	None identified	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	The purpose of this report is to advise Members of comments submitted in response to consultations in respect of the Charnwood Local Plan and to seek formal approval of these.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>THAT:</b>  <b>(I) CHARNWOOD BOROUGH COUNCIL BE THANKED FOR CONSULTING THIS COUNCIL ON ITS EMERGING LOCAL PLAN; AND</b>  <b>(II) THE RECOMMENDATIONS AT PARAGRAPHS 2.3, 2.10-2.11, 2.16-2.17, 2.26-2.28 AND 2.31 OF THIS REPORT BE AGREED AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN</b>	

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Charnwood Local Plan was adopted in November 2015. The Adopted plan covers the period 2011-28.
- 1.2 Charnwood Borough Council recently issued a draft Local Plan for consultation. The consultation document can be viewed at [https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/draft\\_charnwood\\_local\\_plan\\_2019\\_36](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/draft_charnwood_local_plan_2019_36)
- 1.3 Most of the matters raised in the consultation are matters for local consideration. The following concentrates upon those matters that are of more strategic significance.
- 1.4 The consultation closed on 16 December 2019. As this was before a meeting of this committee, officers submitted comments following discussion with the Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning but on the understanding that they were subject to their being agreed by this committee.

## 2.0 KEY MATTERS

### Plan period

- 2.1 It is proposed that the plan should cover the period 2019-2036.

### Comment

- 2.2 The current timetable envisages that the Plan will be adopted in November 2020. This is considered to be somewhat optimistic. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 22) requires that the strategic policies in plans should look ahead at least 15 years from adoption. Strategic policies include those relating to the amount of development to be provided for. This might be difficult to achieve, but is something that Charnwood Borough Council will need to reflect upon.

### Recommendation

- 2.3 That the plan period 2019-36 be noted but that Charnwood Borough Council be advised that they need to consider whether a longer period may be required when having regard to the NPPF requirements.

### Future development needs

#### ***Housing***

- 2.4 In terms of future development needs, the plan identifies a Local Housing Need of 1,082 dwellings every year. This equates to a total of 18,394 dwellings to 2036. This is based on the use of the government's standard method. It is higher than the rate identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Needs Development Assessment (HEDNA) (994 homes a year).
- 2.5 Notwithstanding this requirement, the plan proposes a total provision of 19,716 dwellings (an additional 1,322 dwellings). This is 7% more than the requirement.
- 2.6 The plan states (paragraph 4.9) that:  
*"It is anticipated that the city of Leicester will have unmet needs; however the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire identifies how this unmet need will be*



*redistributed in Leicestershire and it does not affect the number of homes we need to plan for in Charnwood.”*

#### Comment

- 2.7 The proposed Local Housing Need is considered to be appropriate as it is based on the government’s standard method and is consistent with the NPPF.
- 2.8 The statement in the plan that the unmet need from Leicester City has been redistributed and that it does not affect Charnwood is somewhat misleading. It is assumed that this conclusion is based on Table 4 of the Strategic Growth Plan. Whilst the Strategic Growth Plan states “*Table 4 will be used as the basis for future Local Plans*”, the issue of unmet need from Leicester City and its redistribution has yet to be determined.
- 2.9 Planning for more growth than the Local Housing Need represents positive planning as required by the NPPF. Charnwood will need to satisfy themselves that this level of over provision is appropriate and that it will ensure that the needs of the borough will be met without the need to redistribute development to elsewhere within Leicester and Leicestershire. However, the proposed approach is to be welcomed.

#### Recommendations

- 2.10 That Charnwood Borough Council be advised that whilst the Local Housing Need set out in the draft plan is considered to be appropriate, it will be necessary to ensure that any later iteration is consistent with the outcome from the Statement of Common Ground which is currently being discussed by the HMA authorities.
- 2.11 That the proposed provision over and above the Local Housing Need be welcomed.

#### ***Employment***

- 2.12 The plan identifies a need for 55.9ha of employment land. Of this 11.4ha is for offices and 44.5ha for small industrial units and warehouses.

#### Comment

- 2.13 An Employment land Study (ELS) was prepared to support the plan. This took as its starting point the HEDNA. It suggested different figures for office uses from the HEDNA but a similar one for small industrial units and warehouses. The figures quoted in the plan for offices (11.4ha) is slightly less than that identified in the ELS (14ha). The reason for this is not clear and so clarification is required.
- 2.14 The figures for small industrial units and warehouses is consistent with the ELS.
- 2.15 The ELS also suggested that 10ha should be identified to accommodate larger warehouses (those over 9,000sqm). This has not been included in the plan and nor is any reason supplied as to why it has not been considered appropriate to include such provision. Again, clarification is required.

#### Recommendation

- 2.16 That clarification is required regarding the apparent discrepancy between the draft Local Plan and the Employment land Study reading the amount of office development required.

2.17 That clarification is required as to why the plan does not make provision for 10ha of land for larger warehouses as recommended in the Employment Land Study.

***Development Strategy***

2.18 The preferred development strategy is for an urban concentration and intensification strategy, with some growth dispersed to other areas of the borough. It focuses housing and employment at the edge of Leicester, proposes managed growth at Loughborough, and directs some growth to Shepshed with smaller scale growth to the Service Centres and Other Settlements.

2.19 In terms of housing the proposed distribution of development is as follows:

<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Existing Planning permissions and Allocations</b>	<b>Preferred Distribution of New Homes</b>	<b>Total</b>
Leicester Urban Edge	5,489	1,567	7,056
Loughborough	4,412	1,919	6,331
Shepshed	830	2,041	2,871
Service Centres	1,559	931	2,490
Other Settlements	151	794	945
Small Villages/Hamlets	23	0	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,464</b>	<b>7,252</b>	<b>19,716</b>

2.20 In arriving at the proposed Development Strategy, the Council has considered a number of alternatives as part of the Sustainability Appraisal. The preferred approach represents a hybrid of these various alternatives.

2.21 The plan states:

*“The proposed managed growth at Loughborough reflects the spatial strategy set out in the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire and takes account of landscape, settlement identity and transport constraints.”*

and:

*“The growth directed to Shepshed reflects the evidence of landscape and transport capacity and supports the Leicestershire International Gateway set out in the Strategic Growth Plan.”*

Comments

2.22 The reference to the Growth Plan and how it has influenced the preferred strategy is to be welcomed.

2.23 The Growth Plan covers the period to 2050, some 14 years more than the Local Plan. The Growth Plan identifies that the Leicestershire International Gateway, which covers

the northern parts of both North West Leicestershire and Charnwood Borough, is to accommodate 11,200 dwellings but it does not identify how much of this should be located in each authority. The 2,000 additional dwellings proposed on the west side of Shepshed would contribute towards this and is to be welcomed. However, it is not clear at this stage as to how deliverable this amount of development is. For example, paragraph 5.7 of the plan highlights that the proposed allocations to the west of Shepshed would have an impact upon biodiversity. It is not clear as to whether this might affect the suitability and deliverability of the sites. Charnwood Borough Council will need to satisfy themselves that it is deliverable within the plan period. If the development is not deliverable it could increase the pressure for more development in North West Leicestershire as part of the Gateway.

- 2.24 The proposed growth at Shepshed is close to the border with North West Leicestershire. The topography of the area means that most of this would not be visible from settlements in North West Leicestershire. The only exception is site HS44 which would be partly visible from the Belton-Hathern Road (B5324). It will be necessary to ensure that appropriate landscaping is included along the northern and western boundaries to minimise such impact. A transport assessment has been undertaken of the alternative strategies considered. This appears to have concentrated upon the impact on key junctions along the A512 at Shepshed. It is not clear what consideration has been given to the impact on the Belton to Hathern Road (B5324) in terms of the 2,000 dwellings proposed at Shepshed.
- 2.25 Some initial discussions have taken place with officers of Charnwood about the Gateway and its potential implications. Further discussion and potentially joint working will be required to ensure that both authorities are accommodating an appropriate amount of development and to ensure a consistent strategy across the Gateway area which also addresses any infrastructure impacts and needs.

#### Recommendation

- 2.26 That the proposed identification of 2,000 dwellings at Shepshed be noted and that no objection be raised, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being provided so as to minimise any visual impact and the impact upon the local highway network, particularly the B5324.
- 2.27 Notwithstanding the above, Charnwood Borough Council needs to ensure that adequate evidence is provided that the proposed 2,000 dwellings at Shepshed are deliverable so as to avoid increased pressure for development in North West Leicestershire.
- 2.28 That Charnwood Borough Council be advised that the district council welcomes the recognition of the Gateway in the draft plan. However, further discussions and joint working between the two authorities is required with a view to reaching an agreement regarding the distribution of development associated with the Gateway and to ensure that the impact arising from any development in the Gateway is appropriately mitigated.

#### ***Strategic Allocations***

- 2.29 Two Strategic Allocations are proposed north of Birstall and the Watermead Regeneration Corridor. These are subject to specific policies that identify a series of detailed requirements.

### Comment

- 2.30 It is not clear as to why these areas have been singled out and that such detailed requirements are not set out for other large developments proposed in the plan, including the 2,000 dwellings at Shepshed. Such requirements would provide clarity and certainty.

### Recommendation

- 2.31 That consideration be given to including detailed requirements for all large-scale developments, including the 2,000 dwellings proposed at Shepshed should this proposal be taken forward in the next iteration of the plan.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	None
Policy Considerations:	None
Safeguarding:	No issues identified
Equalities/Diversity:	No issues identified
Customer Impact:	No issues identified
Economic and Social Impact:	No issues identified
Environment and Climate Change:	The potential impact of proposed development upon parts of the district are highlighted in the report
Consultation/Community Engagement:	Portfolio Holder for Infrastructure and Planning
Risks:	The District Council is a consultee on the draft Charnwood Local Plan. It is important that the District Council engage in the process to ensure that any concerns are raised to protect the Council's interests.
Officer Contact	Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

## LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – 15 JANUARY 2020



<b>Title of Report</b>	<b>AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT 2018/19</b>	
<b>Presented by</b>	Councillor Robert Ashman Planning and Infrastructure Portfolio Holder	
<b>Background Papers</b>	<a href="#">Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 – Part 8 (regulation 34).</a>	<b>Public Report:</b> Yes
		<b>Key Decision:</b> No
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The cost of monitoring and preparing the Authority Monitoring Report is met from within existing budgets.	
	<b>Signed off by the Section 151 Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Legal Implications</b>	The Council is required to publish an Authority Monitoring Report on an annual basis.	
	<b>Signed off by the Monitoring Officer:</b> Yes	
<b>Staffing and Corporate Implications</b>	None identified	
	<b>Signed off by the Head of Paid Service:</b> Yes	
<b>Purpose of Report</b>	To outline for Members the key results from the Authority Monitoring Report 2018/19.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>THAT THE LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE NOTES THE CONTENT OF THE RECENTLY PUBLISHED AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT 2018/19</b>	

**1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 Local planning authorities must publish information at least annually that:
- shows progress with local plan preparation,
  - reports any activity relating to the duty to cooperate,
  - any information collected which relates to indicators in the plan, and
  - any policies which are not being implemented.
- 1.2 This is done through an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) – formerly known as an Annual Monitoring Report.
- 1.3 The content of AMRs is prescribed by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 – Part 8 ([regulation 34](#)).
- 1.4 In December 2019, the Council published its Authority Monitoring Report for 2018/19. The data in this report covers the period 1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019 to allow for year-by-year comparison over time. However if any significant changes/events have

taken place between April 2019 and December 2019 these have also been referenced in the report.

- 1.5 The 2018/19 AMR can be seen at Appendix A and at [www.nwleics.gov.uk/authority\\_monitoring\\_report](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/authority_monitoring_report). The main issues covered by the 2018-19 AMR are summarised below:

## **2.0 HOUSING MONITORING**

- 2.1 There were 710 housing completions within the district in 2018/19. This is less than the 978 completed the year before (which was an all-time high), but above the average since 2011/12 of 594 and significantly more than that required by the adopted Local Plan (481 per annum). Over 500 of the completions in 2018/19 were in the Coalville urban area and the key service centres (Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington) - in line with the settlement hierarchy in the adopted Local Plan.
- 2.2 At 31 March 2019, there were 7,709 dwellings with permission in the district. Over 4,200 of these are in the Coalville urban area, with 1,850 in the key service centres. This suggests that the current locational pattern of completions is likely to continue in the future. Overall the number of permissions has declined (down from 8,965 dwellings in 2017), but bearing in mind the continued high build rate it has not decreased as much as might have been expected. This indicates that new permissions are coming forward and replacing some of those dwellings that have been built out and so maintaining a healthy pool of permissions for the future.
- 2.3 The percentage of dwellings built on previously developed land fell to 11%. This probably reflects the increasing importance in recent years attached by government policy to supporting new development and the Council's previous lack of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply.
- 2.4 In terms of housing mix, over half of the completed market dwellings in 2018/19 contained 4 or more bedrooms. Only 13% of completions were for dwellings or 1 or 2 bedrooms. For affordable dwellings, over 65% of completions contained 2 bedrooms.
- 2.5 At October 2019, there were 39 individuals on the Council's Self Build Register. There are 34 plots with permission (largely because of an appeal decision at Woodville). This means that we have fully met the demand up to October 2021, and partly met demand up to October 2022.

## **3.0 EMPLOYMENT MONITORING**

- 3.1 At April 2019, there was a residual requirement up to 2031 for nearly 19ha of B1, B2 and small scale B8 employment land. However it should be noted that since April 2019, the Council has granted permission for a further 5ha site for B2/small scale B8 uses at Bardon Road and has resolved to approve (subject to s106 agreement) another site of 11ha for B2/small scale B8 at Regs Way.
- 3.2 In terms of strategic B8 development (development over 9,000sqm in floorspace), the biggest change since the last AMR is the granting of planning permission (post-April 2019) for a 96ha site at Junction 11 of the A/M42 to be occupied by Jaguar Land Rover and DSV.

#### **4.0 RETAIL AND SERVICE CENTRE MONITORING**

- 4.1 The AMR outlines some of the key findings of the Retail and Leisure Capacity study that was completed in February 2019. These include a requirement of just over 8,000sqm additional comparison goods sales area and over 1,800sqm additional convenience goods sales area by 2036.
- 4.2 It also sets out the vacancy rates for the five largest centres in the district. Three of these show little change from 2017/18 (Coalville at 17.7%, Castle Donington at 7.1% and Measham at 2.8%). However, the other two have seen increases in vacancies – Ashby de la Zouch rising from 1% to 3.9% and Ibstock from 10.8% to 13.1%. The AMR compares this to a national vacancy rate for ‘High Streets’ of 11.7% at September 2019.

#### **5.0 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS MONITORING**

- 5.1 The monitoring of developer contributions is a new addition to the AMR this year. This is in anticipation of the requirement for local authorities to produce Infrastructure Funding Statements by December 2020, which has now been inserted into the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations. Infrastructure Funding Statements will be required to set out the infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure that an authority intends to fund, either wholly or partly, by planning obligations.
- 5.2 The AMR notes that in the period 2018/19 contributions were received totalling £4,155,208.38. The addition of interest means that the balance for the year is £4,168,143.31.

<b>Policies and other considerations, as appropriate</b>	
Council Priorities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting Coalville to be a more vibrant, family-friendly town</li> <li>- Support for businesses and helping people into local jobs</li> <li>- Developing a clean and green district</li> <li>- Local people live in high quality, affordable homes</li> <li>- Our communities are safe, healthy and connected</li> </ul>
Policy Considerations:	Adopted Local Plan
Safeguarding:	None
Equalities/Diversity:	None discernible
Customer Impact:	The AMR is available on the Council's website for customers to view.
Economic and Social Impact:	None
Environment and Climate Change:	None
Consultation/Community Engagement:	None
Risks:	None applicable – this report is to be noted only and no decision is required.
Officer Contact	Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a>





# **AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT**

## **2018/19**

**December 2019**

# Contents

## Section 1 – Monitoring Background

Introduction	1
Policy Context and the Monitoring Process	1
District Context	1
Demographic Context	1
Document Preparation against the LDS	2
Neighbourhood Planning	2
Community Infrastructure Levy	3
Duty to Cooperate	3

## Section 2 – Monitoring Outputs for 2018/19

Housing	4
Employment	10
Retail & Service Centres	11
Developer Contributions	12

## Section 1 – Monitoring Background

### Introduction

Local planning authorities must publish information at least annually that shows progress with local plan preparation, reports any activity relating to the duty to cooperate, any information collected which relates to indicators in the plan, and any policies which are not being implemented. This is done through an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) – formerly known as an Annual Monitoring Report.

The content of AMRs is prescribed by the [Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012 – Part 8 \(regulation 34\)](#).

This Authority Monitoring Report for 2018/19 was published in December 2019. This covers the period 1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019 to allow for year-by-year comparison over time. However if any significant changes/events have taken place between April 2019 and December 2019 these have also been referenced in the report.

The start date for monitoring is 1 April 2011 in order to coincide with the start date for the adopted Local Plan.

### Policy Context and the Monitoring Process

Within England, the [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#) sets out the government’s planning policies and how these are to be applied. A revised NPPF was published in February 2019. It provides a framework within which local people and their responsible councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. The Council collects and analyses data in order to establish how effective policies have been and whether they are being implemented in the intended manner. This process of monitoring planning policies is important to ensure they are achieving their objectives and delivering sustainable development. The monitoring process can also help to identify whether policies are having any unintended consequences and whether they are still relevant and effective. The AMR also plays an important role in the provision of evidence for emerging planning policies at the local level. The [Local Plan](#), adopted in November 2017, includes a chapter on monitoring and implementation and also contains a Monitoring Framework.

### District Context

North West Leicestershire is a largely rural district and covers a size of 27,900 hectares (108 square miles). Coalville is the principal administrative centre, with the other main settlements being Ashby de la Zouch, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham. The district shares borders with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, Charnwood Borough, Rushcliffe Borough, Erewash Borough, South Derbyshire District, Lichfield Borough and North Warwickshire Borough Councils. There are good road links within North West Leicestershire including the M1, the A42/M42, the A50 and the A511, which help to link the district with larger centres including Nottingham, Derby, Leicester and Birmingham.

### Demographic Context

At the 2011 Census the population of the district was about 94,500. The majority of residents lived within the main settlements of Coalville (37,437) and Ashby de la Zouch (12,530). The residents within these two settlements accounted for more than half of the district’s population (ONS Census, 2011). The percentage of people within the district of working age (16-64) was 62.9% which is slightly lower than the national figure of 64.2% (ONS Census, 2011).

By 2018, the population of the district had increased to an estimated 102,100<sup>1</sup>; an increase of 8%. The percentage of people aged 16-64 had decreased slightly to 61.7% , a decrease of 1.2% compared to a national decrease of 1.5%

## **Document Preparation against the Local Development Scheme**

North West Leicestershire District Council's Local Plan was adopted on 21 November 2017. The Local Plan includes a Monitoring Framework which outlines how the policies in the Local Plan will in the future be monitored annually. Through monitoring the council can regularly assess the performance of individual policies and overall progress in delivering the strategic objectives of the Local Plan.

The adopted Local Plan includes a commitment to undertake an immediate review of the plan commencing in early 2018. In accordance with the then published Local Development Scheme (LDS) the review formally started in February 2018. The review is being undertaken in two parts; a Partial review and a Substantive review.

The Partial review seeks to amend the current wording in Policy S1 only. The Substantive review will be a much broader review covering a range of issues and will also cover a longer time period.

Following a Peer Review of the Planning Service in early 2018, it was decided that the Local Plan Advisory Committee should become a formal committee (Local Plan Committee) and have decision making powers, including overseeing the preparation of the Local Plan. The first meeting of the Committee took place in June 2018.

The [most recent LDS](#) was published in November 2019 and it sets out timetables for both the Partial and Substantive Reviews.

## **Neighbourhood Planning**

Neighbourhood planning was introduced by the Localism Act 2011. Through producing a Neighbourhood Plan communities can take the lead on developing planning policies. However, any plans and policies must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the adopted Local Plan in place at the time a Neighbourhood Plan is prepared.

Neighbourhood Plans attain the same legal status as the Local Plan once it has been agreed at a referendum and is made by North West Leicestershire District Council. Applications for planning permission must then be determined in accordance with the neighbourhood plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The [Ashby de la Zouch Neighbourhood Plan](#) was made on 29 November 2018 and the [Ellistown and Battleflat Neighbourhood Plan](#) was made on 16 July 2019.

There are currently three other designated Neighbourhood Plan areas within the District:

- [Blackfordby](#),
- [Hugglescote and Donington le Heath](#), and
- [Swannington](#).

Blackfordby published a pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan for consultation during May/June 2019 and in November 2019 Hugglescote and Donington le Heath published a pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan for a 6 week consultation period ending on 18 December 2019.

---

<sup>1</sup> ONS Population estimates – local authority based by five year age bands

## **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

The Localism Act introduced the CIL which is a tool for Local Authorities to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of the area. CIL is a one off payment charged on new development (but may also be payable on permitted development) to be used to respond to pre-determined infrastructure needs in the district. Where a planning permission is phased, each phase of the development is treated as if it were a separate chargeable development for levy purposes.

There are not currently any plans to introduce CIL in North West Leicestershire.

## **Duty to Cooperate**

The Duty to Cooperate was introduced through the Localism Act 2011 and is a legal duty for local planning authorities, county councils and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. The duty to cooperate is not a duty to agree but local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters.

North West Leicestershire forms part of the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) and the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership area (LLEP). The District Council has and continues to engage and co-operate in joint working with the other authorities within and also outside the HMA. In terms of the Local Plan the council has worked with partners across the HMA/LLEP on a variety of matters including establishing housing requirements, and employment needs, planning for climate change and the Charnwood Forest.

There are on-going mechanisms for co-operation between the HMA authorities at both officer and Member level through the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and the Members Advisory Group (MAG). In addition, the HMA authorities have jointly produced a [Strategic Growth Plan](#), which is an overarching non-statutory plan which sets out the aspirations for delivering growth (housing, economic and infrastructure) in Leicester and Leicestershire until 2050. To reflect the timing of its formal approval by each of the authorities the Strategic Growth Plan is dated December 2018.

Outside of the HMA/LLEP the council has a regular dialogue with neighbouring authorities regarding meeting development needs and works - specifically with South Derbyshire and Lichfield on matters relating to the River Mease Special Area of Conservation.

## Section 2 – Monitoring Outputs for 2018/19

The figures and statistics included in this report have been collected by North West Leicestershire District Council unless otherwise stated.

### Housing

#### Completions

Table 1: Housing completions (net) from 2011/12 onwards:

Monitoring Period	Housing Completions Net
2011 / 2012	235
2012 / 2013	365
2013 / 2014	428
2014 / 2015	686
2015 / 2016	628
2016/2017	727 <sup>2</sup>
2017/2018	978 <sup>3</sup>
2018/2019	710
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,757</b>

Table 1 shows the number of new dwellings completed in each monitoring period, dating from 2011/12 onwards. The table shows the net figure i.e. the number of houses remaining after accounting for any deductions e.g. demolitions or conversions. The table shows that in the first 3 years the annual requirement identified in the adopted Local Plan (481 dwellings) was not met, but has been significantly exceeded in the subsequent years. Since 2011/12 the average annual build rate has been 594 dwellings, significantly in excess of the annual requirement of 481 dwellings.

#### Location of completions

Table 2: Location of housing completions within the district from 2011 to 2019 (net figures):

	Coalville Urban Area	Key Service Centres	Local Service Centres	Sustainable Villages	Small Villages	Total
2011/12	121	-24	63	70	5	<b>235</b>
2012/13	93	91	153	16	12	<b>365</b>
2013/14	33	198	148	32	17	<b>428</b>
2014/15	97	308	184	31	66	<b>686</b>
2015/16	122	221	166	78	41	<b>628</b>
2016/17	297	122	157	101	50	<b>727</b>
2017/18	315	237	121	235	70	<b>978</b>
2018/19	288	221	31	129	41	<b>710</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>1,374</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>4,757</b>

Table 2 shows the location of housing completions recorded from the start of the plan period. The district's Key Service Centres (Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington) have seen the largest amount

<sup>2</sup> There have been amendments to the completions figures for 2016/17 following a review of our monitoring data.

<sup>3</sup> There have been amendments to the completions figures for 2017/18 following a review of our monitoring data

of new housing built since 2011 although there has been a significant increase in the amount of new dwellings built in the Coalville Urban Area (CUA) over the last three years. This reflects the upturn in the housing market in the CUA and also the resolving of issues relating to viability and infrastructure provision which were previously holding back development. Build rates in Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington have been fairly consistent, although there was a slight decrease in 2016/17 as sites were built out and new developments had yet to come on stream. This was reversed in 2017/18 and has continued in 2018/19.

Policy S2 of the adopted Local Plan identifies the CUA as the Principal Town of the district and where the largest amount of development in a single settlement will take place. This is reflected in the completion figures to date. The most amount of new development outside of the Coalville Urban Area has been in Ashby de la Zouch (1,022 dwellings), followed by Ibstock (584 dwellings) and Castle Donington (352 dwellings). Ibstock is classified in the Settlement Hierarchy as a Local Service Centre whereas Castle Donington is identified as a Key Service Centre. The greater than might be expected amount of development that has taken place in Ibstock reflects the fact that in the absence of an up-to-date plan prior to the adoption of the Local Plan, the Council was supporting developments in locations which it would not necessarily otherwise have supported. The adoption of the Local Plan should help to redress this issue. Indeed, the level of completions in Local Service Centres has decreased steadily since 2014/15 as the sites in these centres have been built out whereas the Colaville urban Area has seen a significant increase in build rates as larger, more problematic sites have been brought forward.

In terms of Sustainable Villages, these account for about 14.5% of new development since 2011. This is perhaps higher than might be expected. The most development has taken place in Ravenstone (171 dwellings), followed by Moira (102), Appleby Magna (98) and Ellistown (79). In the case of the first 3 villages again the lack of an up-to-date plan had resulted in developments being permitted which may not otherwise have been. However, in the case of Ellistown the amount of development is due to developments early on the plan period which were a 'hangover' from the previous Local Plan.

### Location of Permissions

Table 3: Location of housing permissions 2019

	<b>Coalville Urban Area</b>	<b>Key Service Centres</b>	<b>Local Service Centres</b>	<b>Sustainable Villages</b>	<b>Small Villages</b>	<b>Total</b>
2017	4,734	2,279	1,200	528	224	<b>8,965</b>
2018	4,558	2,115	1,150	639	131	<b>8,593</b>
2019	4,234	1,854	1,094	445	82	<b>7,709</b>

Table 3 shows the location of planning permissions for housing as at 31 March 2019. Again, these figures reflect the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy. Within the Key Service Centres there were 981 dwellings with permission in Ashby de la Zouch and 873 at Castle Donington. This split between the two reflects what has been observed historically in terms of completions and suggests that it will continue in the future. In terms of the Local Service Centres the number of permissions is the reverse of completions. So whilst the most completions since 2011 have taken place in Ibstock (584 dwellings), the most permissions are in Measham (507 dwellings, followed by Kegworth (484 dwellings) and then Ibstock (103 dwellings). Through time, therefore, it is expected that the total amount of development in the three Local Service Centres will balance out.

Overall the number of permissions has declined slightly (down from 8,965 dwellings in 2017), but bearing in mind the continued high build rate it has not decreased as much as might have been

expected. This indicates that new permissions are coming forward and replacing some of those dwellings that have been built out and so maintaining a healthy pool of permissions for the future.

In percentage terms the biggest decrease in permissions has been in Small Villages (down 63%) followed by Sustainable Villages (down 30%). This reflects the status of such settlements in the settlement hierarchy and suggests that the adoption of the Local Plan in late 2017 is having the desired effect. In contrast permission sin Coalville were down 10%, Key Service Centres 19% and Local Service Centres (9%).

### Location of dwellings under construction

As at 31 March 2019 653 dwellings were under construction. Table 4 shows how these were distributed across the district settlement categories.

Table 4: Location of housing under construction 2018 and 2019

	Coalville Urban Area	Key Service Centres	Local Service Centres	Sustainable Villages	Small Villages	Total
2018	192	215	47	142	57	653
2019	176	202	78	178	26	660

The number of dwellings under construction has increased slightly from the 653 dwellings under construction as at 31 March 2018. Both the Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages have seen increases of 31 dwellings (39%) and 36 dwellings (20%) respectively. The biggest decrease is in the Small Villages category (down 31 dwellings).

In terms of the main settlements the Coalville Urban Area had the most number of dwellings under construction (176) followed by Ashby de la Zouch (173 dwellings). The next highest was 59 in Ibstock, 51 in Blackfordby, 29 in Castle Donington, 28 in Heather, and 20 in Measham. The higher than might be expected number in the Sustainable Villages is accounted for by a number developments of 10 or more dwellings in Appleby Magna, Blackfordby, Heather and Ravenstone which were all approved at a time when the Council could not demonstrate a 5-year land supply and did not have an up-to-date Local Plan in place. However, some of these developments have been built out or are close to completion and so there has been a decrease in those specific settlements which is expected to continue.

### Greenfield and Brownfield Land Development

Table 5: Residential development on Greenfield and Previously Developed Land (PDL) from 2011/12 onwards:

	PDL Sites	Greenfield Sites	Total	Percentage on PDL
2011/12	72	163	235	31%
2012/13	77	288	365	21%
2013/14	108	320	428	25%
2014/15	187	499	686	27%
2015/16	181	447	628	29%
2016/17	150	577	727	21%
2017/18	155	823	978	16%
2018/19	81	629	710	11%
<b>Total</b>	1,011	3,746	4,757	21%



Table 5 shows the amount and proportion of new housing on Greenfield Land and Previously Developed Land (PDL). The table shows that the percentage of new houses built on PDL has fluctuated between 11% and 31% over the plan period. The increases on PDL recorded in 2014/15 and 2015/16 have been reversed in the last three years. This probably reflects the increasing importance in recent years attached by government policy to supporting new development and the Council's previous lack of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply, meaning some of the former adopted Local Plan Policies were out of date.

The actual number of new dwellings provided on PDL (save for the first 2 years and 2018/19) has been fairly consistent; in contrast development on Greenfield sites has shown a significant variation.

It also reflects the fact that there is a greater dependency upon small sites (i.e. those of less than 10 dwellings) to deliver development on PDL. The following table identifies the number of dwellings, on small sites since 2011 and the number of these built on PDL or greenfield sites.

Table 6: Net completions on small sites (PDL and Greenfield) since 2011.

Small Site Completions on PDL Sites	Small Site Completions on Greenfield Sites	Total number of dwellings completed on small sites
<b>207</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>594</b>

Table 6 identifies the number of dwellings completed on small sites since 2011. Although such sites by their size will deliver less development than larger sites it does impact upon the overall proportion of new development on PDL as illustrated in Table 7 below, where the percentage of small site completions on PDL (35%) were much higher than those overall (11%) as shown in table 5 above.

Table 7: Completions on small sites (Percentage on PDL and Greenfield) since 2011.

Small Site Completions on PDL Sites	Small Site Completions on Greenfield Sites
<b>35%</b>	<b>65%</b>

Table 7 identifies the amount (in percentage terms) of dwellings completed on small sites since 2011 that have been on greenfield or PDL. Although such sites by their size will deliver less development than larger sites they do contribute to the overall proportion of new development, especially on PDL.

#### **House types and sizes on completed sites**

Policy H6 seeks to achieve a mix of house types and sizes. Whilst the policy does not specify the mix required it does refer to the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) which identifies the ideal dwelling mix, having regard to a range of factors including how the age structure of residents within the district will change up to 2031.

Table 8 below identifies the HEDNA suggested mix and compares this with the actual mix achieved in 2017/18 and 2018/19.

Table 8: house mix: HEDNA and actual

Type of Housing	Dwelling size			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
<b>Market (HEDNA)</b>	<b>0-10%</b>	<b>30-40%</b>	<b>45-55%</b>	<b>10-20%</b>
<b>Actual 2017/18</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>36.2%</b>	<b>51.9%</b>
<b>Actual 2018/19</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>36.6%</b>	<b>50.3%</b>
<b>Affordable (HEDNA)</b>	<b>30-35%</b>	<b>35-40%</b>	<b>25-30%</b>	<b>5-10%</b>
<b>Actual 2017/18</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>Actual 2018/19</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>65.7%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>0%</b>

It can be seen that in terms of market housing the actual provision is disproportionate in respect of both 2 and 4 bed properties, with a significant under provision of 2 bed and over provision of 4 bed properties. Whilst the HEDNA mix is not prescriptive and it is necessary to have regard to other factors, the mix achieved in 2017/18 and 2018/19 if repeated in future years would result in a housing mix which may not meet the housing need.

In respect of affordable dwellings, the lower provision of 1-bed affordable properties is not considered to be a concern as it is recognised that 1-bed properties do not provide sufficient flexibility for changing household composition and hence are not sustainable. The high provision of 2-bed affordable properties is a consequence of the above and strategically the council consider that 2-bed properties are more sustainable long term. For example there are a high number of single elderly applicants who could be suitably housed in one-bed bungalows but would have a better standard of accommodation if they had a spare bedroom which would enable a carer or family member to stay overnight and offer support. The number of 3-bed affordable properties completed has declined slightly, this could be a result of the increase in two bed properties. The need for 4 bed & 5 bed houses is quite small and is linked to the locational requirements of those in need. With such a specific need applicants may choose to pursue privately rented, they may move into older housing association or Council properties. Some larger properties have been agreed on sites that are currently being developed therefore this figure may increase next year.

### **Self-Build**

Self-build and custom housebuilding is a key element of the government’s agenda to increase the supply of housing, both market and affordable housing. As such, legislation has been introduced in recent years that places duties on Local Planning Authorities (LPA) that are concerned with increasing the availability of land for self-building and custom housebuilding.

The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the housing and Planning Act 2016) provides a definition of a self-build and custom housebuilding. It means the building or completion by individuals, an association of individuals or persons working with or for individuals, of houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals.

The Act requires local councils in England to keep and have regard to a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the authorities area for their own self-builds and custom housebuilding. A ‘serviced plot of land’ is defined as a plot of land that has access to the public highway and connections to utilities (electricity, water and waste water), or that these circumstances can be provided within a specified period of time.

The Act places a further duty upon LPAs to grant suitable development permission to enough suitable plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their area. The level of

demand is established by the number of entries added to the authority’s register during a base period which runs from 31 October to 30 October each year. The local authority then has 3 years from the end of each base period in which to permit an equivalent number of plots.

North West Leicestershire District Council seeks to support those who wish to self-build and custom build and established a Self-build and Custom Build Register in April 2016. The Council holds a webpage [https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/self\\_build](https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/self_build) dedicated to self-build and custom housebuilding setting out the purpose of the register and how to apply for entry onto the register.

### **The North West Leicestershire Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Register**

This Register was established in April 2016 and has been available for people to submit their application using the information and form provided on the council website. As of 30 October 2019 there are 39 individuals on the list. Using the prescribed base periods, for our district this demand equates to:-

- By October 2019 we are required to permit 6 plots;
- By October 2020 we are required to permit an additional 10 plots;
- By October 2021 we are currently required to permit an additional 9 plots;
- By October 2022 we are currently required to permit an additional 14.

The above equals a cumulative total requirement of 39 plot permissions.

All entrants on the register are individuals who are interested in building their own properties. The Council does not require there to be a ‘local connection test’ for entry on its register.

Of the total number of individuals on the list, the following statistics can be provided;

- 21% own a plot for such a build, 10% have a plot but do not own it and the remaining 69% need to find a plot.
- 80% would be seeking to build a detached property and 20% seeking to build a bungalow.
- In terms of the number of bedrooms required, 9% are seeking a 2 bedroom property, 33% are seeking a 3 bedroom property, 31% are seeking a 4 bedroom property and 27% are seeking a 4+ bedroom property.

### **Planning Permissions Granted**

The level of demand is established by the number of entries added to the authority’s register during a base period. As each base period runs from 31 October to 30 October each year, data collected for the purposes of self-building monitoring runs beyond the 30 March 2019 end date for the purposes of this AMR. This data however is included within this report and although not required for the purposes of the AMR, the inclusion of all self-build data ensures consistency with the required base dates for the purposes of Self Build.

From April 2016 to October 2019, 34 dwellings for serviced plots suitable for self and custom build have been granted planning permission. Details of which are provided in the table below.

Table 9: Number of Self Build Plots with Planning Permission from April 2016 to October 2019

<b>Site</b>	<b>No. of plots</b>	<b>Decision Date</b>
Park Farm, Overton Road, Ibstock	1	07/10/2016
Land adjacent 16 Measham Road, Ashby	1	10/04/2017
Land at Top Road, Griffydam	2	26/02/2018

Land off Hepworth Road, Woodville	30	26/06/2019
-----------------------------------	----	------------

Given the number of permissions to date and based on the number of entrants on the register as of 30 October 2019, permission has been granted for enough suitable plots of land to fully meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the area, for the period up to October 2021. Furthermore the number of permissions would also meet in part the demand that is identified for the period up to October 2022.

## Employment

North West Leicestershire District Council monitors the provision of employment land within the district to ensure that there is an adequate supply of land available to support the needs of businesses and residents. Employment land is land that is appropriate for the development of employment generating uses, usually within the B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage or Distribution) land use categories.

A Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HEDNA) was published for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (LLHMA) in January 2017. The principal purpose of the HEDNA is to identify the housing and employment land requirements for the LLHMA for the periods 2011-31 and 2011-36.

The employment land requirements for the district, as detailed in the HEDNA, are set out in the table below. Only those figures to 2031 are included as this is the period covered by the adopted Local Plan.

Small B8 is defined as floor space of less than 9,000sq metres and Strategic B8 is floor space of more than 9,000sq metres. In terms of the requirements for Strategic B8 a Strategic Distribution Study was undertaken for LLHMA which identifies a need for a minimum of 361 Ha up to 2031 for the LLHMA as a whole - there is no distribution below LLHMA level. The HEDNA repeated these findings.

Table 10: HEDNA Employment Land Requirements (2011-2031) against NWLDC Employment Completions and Commitments (April 2011-March 2019)

	B1a/b	B1c/B2	Small B8	Strategic B8	TOTAL
Requirements 2011-2031 (not including strategic B8)	44.7	3.3	16.8		64.8
Completions April 2011 – March 2019	7.9	2.6	8.8		19.3
Under construction at 31st March 2019	1.0	0.3	0.0		1.3
Allocated in Local Plan (Money Hill)	5.3	5.3	5.3		15.9
With permission at 31st March 2019	4.9	3.4	11.1		19.4
Residual requirement up to 2031	25.6	-8.3	-8.4		8.9
Allowance for potential loss of employment land					10.0
<b>Residual requirement up to 2031</b>					<b>18.9</b>
Strategic min B8 requirement 2011 – 2031 (HMA wide)				361.0	
NWL strategic B8 Completions April 2011 – Mar 2019				68.9	
NWL strategic B8 Under construction at 31st Mar 19				174.7	
NWL strategic B8 With permission at 31st Mar 19				72.8	
<b>Residual requirement (HMA wide) 2011-2031</b>				<b>44.6</b>	

Although this Authority Monitoring Report covers the period April 2018-March 2019, it should be noted that since April 2019, the Council has granted permission for a further 5ha site for B2/small scale B8 uses at Bardon Road and has resolved to approve (subject to s106 agreement) another site of 11ha for B2/small scale B8 at Regs Way.

The Strategic B8 under construction figure includes 139ha of land at East Midlands Gateway, which has now started the first phases of construction. Again, the period covered by this AMR is from April 2018 to March 2019 – but it is also worth noting that a very large site (97ha) has since been granted permission at J11 of the A/M42 for strategic B8 use.

## Retail & Service Centres

The Retail and Leisure Capacity Study and Appendices (February 2019), undertaken by Lichfields, provides a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the need for new retail, leisure and other main town centre uses within North West Leicestershire District. The study will be used to inform future planning policy on retail and town centre matters, including future retail needs, as part of the Local Plan Review. The recommendations set out in the report are as follows:

- The capacity assessment identifies a ‘requirement’ of 8,069 sqm additional comparison goods sales area floor space by 2036, seeking to maintain the District’ shopping role and market share within the sub-region;
- A requirement of 1,847 sqm additional convenience good sale area floor space by 2036, is also identified. In qualitative terms there are no identified areas of deficiency;
- With respect to food and beverage development, there is an opportunity to enhance food and beverage provision within all centres. The capacity assessment identifies a ‘requirement’ of 2058 sqm by 2036.
- In terms of other main town centre uses there is theoretical capacity for a small/medium cinema and a health and fitness capacity.

### Vacancy Rates

Table 10 below shows the vacancy rates within the main settlements within the district. It should be noted that the 2019 data for Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch is from October 2019 and for the other three centres from July 2019.

Table 11: Vacancy rates within centres

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Coalville	12.6%	14.7%	15.7%	14.7%	10.1%	12.9%	17.2%	17.7%
Ashby de la Zouch	2.8%	4.7%	3.7%	3.1%	0.5%	1.6%	1%	3.9%
Castle Donington	7.1%	3.6%	2.7%	0%		3.6%	7.1%	7.1%
Ibstock	5.4%	0.0%	1.8%		0%	2.7%	10.8%	13.1%
Measham	2.9%	5.9%	5.9%	8.8%		2.9%	2.9%	2.8%

Source: Business Focus Team, North West Leicestershire District Council

Coalville continues to have the highest number of vacant units in the district, with an increase in vacancy rates continuing, albeit at a much reduced rate. Despite having the lowest percentage of vacancy rates of any centre in the district, Ashby de la Zouch has seen an increase in its vacancy rates during the past 12 months. This reverses a decrease in rates that has taken place over the last three years.

In Castle Donington there has been no change in vacancy rates although when compared to the majority of the district's centres, the vacancy rate is comparatively high. Ibstock saw a significant increase in vacancy rates in 2017/18, and this trend has continued in the last 12 months.

Vacancies in Measham have dropped slightly in the past 12 months and overall there has been a significant drop in the percentage of vacancies since 2015.

The figures above for centres in the district can be compared to a national vacancy rate of 11.7% for 'High Streets' in September 2019 (Source: Local Data Company).

## Developer Contributions

Legal Agreements under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act secure developer contributions to mitigate the impacts of the development on the local area. The District Council holds funds generated from legal agreements on behalf of the Council and third parties, such as the Health bodies or the National Forest Company. The Council then holds those funds in an interest bearing account until they are spent by the body responsible for implementing the requirements in the legal agreement which secured them.

The Table below (table 11) summarises the contributions received for the last six financial years to the end of 2018/19. Each row relates to the contributions received in that year and shows the closing balance of that years contributions. For example, the figure of £4,168,143.31 is only the balance for 2018/19 and not the total funds held. Please note that the addition of interest means the expenditure and balance will not equal the contribution column.

Table 12: Section 106 contributions received by year from 2013/14 to 2018/19

Year	Contribution	Expenditure	Balance
<b>2013/14</b>	£288,852.49	£141,949.93	£153,547.01
<b>2014/15</b>	£1,889,543.98	£837,329.19	£1,085,429.16
<b>2015/16</b>	£592,634.37	£123,623.77	£478,530.44
<b>2016/17</b>	£2,426,233.39	£2,331,865.62	£96,239.23
<b>2017/18</b>	£3,963,328.32	£2,626,965.83	£1,403,494.67
<b>2018/19</b>	£4,155,208.38	£0.00	£4,168,143.31

Contributions secured as part of S106 Agreements must be proportionate to the scale of the development concerned and its impact upon local communities. This means that large-scale projects, for example, extensions to health facilities or a school or large-scale road improvements, can often only be undertaken by contributions from a number of developments. The Council holds several contributions which are being accrued to pay for such large projects, this is known as 'pooling'. The Council works with service providers to ensure that these projects are implemented in accordance with the S106 agreements.

In the last two years there has been an increase in the sums collected. This is due to the number of developments that have hit triggers for paying contributions. For example, there was £2,376,627.49 collected for the Coalville bypass and A511 improvements to be spent by the County Council. In addition, there was £805,051.12 collected specifically for affordable housing.

It is important to note that these figures are not static as contributions can be spent at any time during the year, once a scheme has been worked up. For example, at the time of reporting the Hood Park Improvement project has committed £565,181.48 of eligible funds, and the Clinical Commissioning Group is working with several health practices to spend their contributions.

This page is intentionally left blank