



Scan the code above or visit www.nwleics.gov.uk/meetings
for a full copy of the agenda.

Meeting	LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE
Time/Day/Date	6.00 pm on Wednesday, 23 March 2022
Location	Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville
Officer to contact	Democratic Services 01530 454512

AGENDA

Item		Pages
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
2	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS	
	Under the Code of Conduct members are reminded that in declaring disclosable interests you should make clear the nature of that interest and whether it is pecuniary or non-pecuniary.	
3	PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION	
	To receive questions from members of the public under rule no.10 of the Council Procedure Rules.	
4	MINUTES	
	To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2022.	3 - 6
5	HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH LOCAL PLAN 2020-39 – REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION	
	The report of the Head of Planning and Infrastructure	7 - 14

Circulation:

Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)
Councillor R L Morris (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor D Bigby
Councillor R Boam
Councillor D Everitt
Councillor J Hoult
Councillor J Legrys
Councillor A C Saffell
Councillor J G Simmons
Councillor N Smith
Councillor M B Wyatt
Councillor R Ashman (Portfolio Holder)
Councillor K Merrie MBE (Portfolio Holder)

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Coalville on WEDNESDAY, 26 JANUARY 2022

Present: Councillor J Bridges (Chairman)

Councillors R L Morris, D Bigby, J Hoult, A C Saffell, J G Simmons, N Smith, M B Wyatt, J Geary (Substitute for Councillor J Legrys) and R Johnson (Substitute for Councillor D Everitt)

Officers: Mr I Nelson, Mr C Elston, Mrs C Hammond, Ms S Grant, Mr C Colvin and Ms S Lee

37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Legrys and D Everitt.

Councillor M Wyatt left the meeting at 6.35pm

38 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no interests declared.

39 PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

There were no questions received

40 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021.

Councillor A C Saffell stated that he considered the minutes did not accurately reflect the reason given for the non-suitability of a piece of land in Castle Donington as a new settlement nor did it reflect his strong views as to why this settlement should be included.

The Chairman offered to amend the minute to include "it was considered unsuitable due to the fact it was in multiple ownership" and to add Councillor Saffell's comments in support of this piece of land.

Councillor Saffell advised that he was happy to change "was not considered appropriate" to "was difficult to deliver" but asked if he could put forward his reasons as to how he considered it could be delivered.

The Legal Advisor stated that, whilst the proposed amendment could be accepted, it was not appropriate to re-visit this item as it was outside the remit of this meeting. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained his reasons as to why the proposal was inappropriate.

Following further discussion on this matter

It was moved by Councillor J Hoult, seconded by Councillor J Simmons and

RESOLVED THAT: -

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the following amendment to minute 34 which currently reads

"Following comments made by Councillor A C Saffell in relation to the proposal to make land available for a new settlement that would provide affordable homes for those employed at the sites in the north of the district, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager reminded

members of the information in relation to this, that was contained in the Development Strategy report that they had considered at the last meeting and that land west of Belton was not considered to be appropriate”

TO BE AMENDED TO READ

“Following comments made by Councillor A C Saffell supporting the proposal to make land available for a new settlement that would provide affordable homes for those employed at the sites in the north of the district, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager reminded members of the information in relation to this which was contained in the Development Strategy report considered at the last meeting; and that land west of Belton was not considered to be appropriate in view of issues around multiple ownership and the need to demonstrate deliverability in accordance with the national planning policy framework”

41 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGE POINTS

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report to members and set out the Government’s final policy positions and the requirements for EV charge points in various building types, including the conversion of buildings. The report included the exemptions from the requirements that the government will introduce. These exemptions are largely intended to ensure that developments remain viable, where installations would be disproportionately difficult or costly.

Councillor Wyatt asked whether the Council would be adopting this stance with all new builds by making it standard practice to include charge points to all new houses being built within the district.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that from mid-2023 onwards this would be a requirement and, in the interim, he would speak with Housing Services to establish whether they would be adopting this policy any earlier.

The Committee sought information on how many new homes had already had charge points installed; had this policy already been introduced; and if not then why not?

Councillor Bigby confirmed that there were a couple of charge points in the new car park in Ashby and was not aware that any had been included in any council houses. He had requested, unsuccessfully, that one be included in the new car park on the Willesley estate. He asked whether the requirements set out in the Local Plan would be any more stringent than those set out in the Building Regulations which would enable the Council to install more than the minimum requirement where it was deemed appropriate to do so.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that evidence would be required to demonstrate why North West Leicestershire is any different to anywhere else, requiring us to have more stringent requirements than those included in the Building Regulations.

Councillor Bigby felt that we should be considering looking at evidence such as being a largely rural area and our reliance on the car due to lack of public transport. Furthermore, we could look at what other local authorities are doing in this regard.

Councillor Johnson referred to the Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Neighbourhood Plan which includes a requirement for charging points on new developments and gave an example of where this had already been implemented. He argued that if the Parish Council could be forward thinking in this regard, then this Committee should be able to follow suit.

Councillor Geary referred to restrictions which he felt may give way to developers manipulating figures to exempt them from their duty to provide charge points. He also felt that planning permission should not be granted where there is insufficient power to install charge points.

The Chairman explained the difficulties faced by the Planning Committee in refusing planning applications on this ground where there are no objections from the energy companies.

In response to concerns raised by members who felt that the Local Plan should include its own policy on this matter, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager referred to the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Plans should serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies. Therefore, should it be included in the Local Plan, he would be surprised if it survived an examination.

Some members felt that we should do it anyway and if it fails, at least we can say we tried.

It was moved by Councillor R Morris, seconded by Councillor N Smith and

RESOLVED THAT: -

The proposed changes to the Building Regulations in respect of EV charge points and the implications for the Local Plan Review as set out in section 3 of the report, be noted.

42 RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR POWER STATION PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report to members and provided the Committee with information about the proposed Local Development Order for the Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station site, including the response to the initial public consultation and matters of interest and concern to this council.

The Chairman considered the timeframe proposed by Rushcliffe Borough Council to be extremely challenging and was concerned regarding the duty to co-operate within the given timescales.

Councillor R Morris referred to the lack of any mention of a cycleway, particularly linking Kegworth with Castle Donington which he considered would be relatively straightforward and highly sustainable given there was already a bridge in situ over the M1.

Councillor A C Saffell referred to a press article regarding this site which was reported to have been earmarked as a possible high technology generation and battery centre and the new electricity energy fusion plant would not now be located at Ratcliffe but instead at Retford in west Burton.

Councillor R Johnson considered that the assumption of 7-8,000 jobs was unrealistic; the land is contaminated and that the timescales are unachievable. He also referred to any future house building in the vicinity being impractical given the area was prone to flooding.

Councillor J Hoult advised that he had worked at this site for 28 years and advised that there was a significant amount of concrete underground at the site.

Councillor D Bigby sought confirmation on the mention of housing as he couldn't see any reference to it in the report and asked why the provision of housing had not been included in the plans, particularly given the number of jobs the proposal was said to be generating. He was advised that Rushcliffe Borough Council was not in need of any more housing land and was not looking for further sites and that this particular site was deemed more suitable for employment use. That said, it was noted that it would be no surprise if more parties put forward the suggestion that the provision of housing may be appropriate to accommodate the workers.

It was moved by Councillor J Geary seconded by Councillor R Johnson and

RESOLVED THAT: -

The response to the consultation on the Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station Proposed Local Development Order as set out at appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

43 PLANNING POLICY UPDATE

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report to members and provided an update in respect of the Local Plan and other matters related to the ongoing work of the Planning Policy team, namely the Authority Monitoring Report; Infrastructure Funding Statement; Neighbourhood Plans; Brownfield Land Register; and Strategic planning.

The Chairman asked whether the Statement of Common Ground would still need to be considered by the Committee if it came back showing no effect on the current position. He was advised that the Statement of Common would have to be agreed and signed off by each required Authority.

Councillor D Bigby asked how much of the Section 106 monies had attached to it a timescale and whether any backlog of unspent monies had been cleared. He was advised that all the monies would have a timescale by which it must be spent, most of which would be within 5 years from the date of the payment, and some would be slightly longer. The situation is constantly monitored, and appropriate prompts are sent to the relevant bodies to establish whether the monies will be spent, or an extension is required.

Councillor Bigby referred to the Neighbourhood Plan in respect of Blackfordby which he advised included an area of separation between Blackfordby and Woodville which is not included in the Local Plan. This was considered encouraging for future Neighbourhood Plans.

Councillor N Smith asked what the implications might be in relation to plans to extend HS2 through to Parkway. He was advised that sites previously discounted for housing may be brought back into play, but the details are not expected until the middle of the year and, until then, it is difficult to know for certain.

Councillor Johnson sought and received confirmation that the consultants referred to in the report had been used before and expressed his dismay at the number of houses being 'thrown up' in his ward.

It was moved by Councillor J Geary seconded by Councillor J Houlton and

RESOLVED THAT: -

The contents of the report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.07 pm

LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 23 MARCH 2022

Title of Report	HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH LOCAL PLAN 2020 - 39-REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION	
Presented by	Ian Nelson Planning Policy Team Manager	
Background Papers	National Planning Policy Framework Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Local Plan 2020 – 2039 (regulation 19) Submission Consultation	Public Report: Yes
Financial Implications	None identified	
	Signed off by the Deputy Section 151 Officer: Yes	
Legal Implications	The Council is a consultee and any comments it makes will need to be taken in to account by Hinckley and Bosworth 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.	
	Signed off by the Monitoring Officer: Yes	
Staffing and Corporate Implications	None identified	
	Signed off by the Head of Paid Service: Yes	
Purpose of Report	The purpose of this report is to advise Members of comments submitted in response to consultations in respect of the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and to seek formal approval of these.	
Recommendations	THAT HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL BE ADVISED THAT THIS COUNCIL: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) OBJECTS TO POLICY SS02 AS BEING NOT EFFECTIVE FOR THE REASONS SET OUT AT PARAGRAPH 3.5 OF THIS REPORT; (II) OBJECTS TO POLICY SS02 AS NOT BEING POSTIVELY PREPARED AND EFFECTIVE FOR THE REASONS SET OUT AT PARAGRAPH 3.7 OF THIS REPORT; (III) OBJECTS TO POLICY SS03 AS NOT BEING EFFECTIVE FOR THE REASONS SET OUT AT PARAGRAPH 3.13 OF THIS REPORT; (IV) OBJECTS TO POLICY HO01 AS NOT BEING JUSTIFIED FOR THE REASONS SET OUT AT PARAGRAPH 3.15 OF THIS REPORT; (V) OBJECTS TO POLICY HO07 AS NOT BEING POSTIVELY PREPARED, JUSTIFIED OR EFFECTIVE FOR THE REASONS SET OUT AT PARAGRAPHS 3.19 - 3.21 OF THIS REPORT; (VI) WELCOMES AND SUPPORTS POLICIES NAT04 AND NAT05 	

- 1.1 The development plan for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough currently comprises of
- Hinckley & Bosworth Core Strategy (December 2009);
 - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (July 2016)
 - Hinckley Town Centre Area Action Plan (March 2011); and
 - Earl Shilton and Barwell Area Action Plan (September 2014).
- 1.2 Work on preparing a replacement Local Plan began in 2018. The plan has now got to Regulation 19 stage which represents the final plan which Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC) proposes to submit for Examination.
- 1.3 The Local Plan can be viewed at <https://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/localplanreview>
- 1.4 The consultation closes at 5pm on 23 March 2022. As this is before the meeting of this Committee, officers have submitted comments based on the contents of this report subject to them being agreed by this Committee.
- 1.5 Members will be aware that Local Plans have to be found ‘sound’ as part of the Examination process. There are four tests of soundness. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that this means that plans must be:
- a) **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs²¹; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
 - b) **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
 - c) **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
 - d) **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.
- 1.6 These terms are used when framing the suggested response of this Council.

2.0 OVERVIEW OF THE HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH LOCAL PLAN

- 2.1 The plan is split in to 14 chapters covering a range of subject areas, with each chapter setting out a number of relevant policies. The subject matters covered include:
- Vision and Objectives
 - Spatial Strategy;
 - Climate Change
 - Place Making and Design;
 - Housing
 - Economic Prosperity and
 - Town Centres
- 2.2 It is proposed that the plan should cover the period 2020-2039. The current timetable envisages that the Plan will be adopted in March 2023. 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. If the plan is adopted in accordance with the current timetable, then this aspect of the NPPF will have been satisfied as there would be 16 years

remaining. However, any slippage would potentially reduce this closer to the NPPF requirement. This is something that HBBC needs to be aware of, but from this authority's perspective it is not an issue.

- 2.3 The Plan identifies 13 objectives under People, Places and Prosperity. These objectives are used to frame the specific policies included in the Local Plan and are designed to ensure that the vision for the plan area is achieved.
- 2.4 Policies tend to either be very place specific (e.g. Strategy policies for Hinckley and Burbage, Sustainable Urban Extensions at Barwell and Earl Shilton) or more generic and apply across the borough (e.g. policies on climate change, preventing pollution, community facilities etc). This report concentrates on those matters which be of particular significance to North West Leicestershire. The matters considered in the following section of this report follow the structure of the Local Plan itself.

3.0 KEY MATTERS

Policy SS02 – Development Strategy

- 3.1 This policy proposes that new development should be directed in accordance with the proposed settlement hierarchy, with the Urban Areas of Hinckley, Burbage, Barwell and Earl Shilton at the top followed by Key Rural Centres, Rural villages and Rural hamlets.
- 3.2 It identifies a housing requirement of 8,436 dwellings during the plan period and proposes a provision of 9,124 dwellings. The requirement is based on the use of the government's standard method of 444 dwellings per annum.
- 3.3 In terms of employment needs, a local study identified a need for 35.30 to 46.8 hectares. The identified supply exceeds this at 105.95 hectares. The supply includes allocations which policy SS02 suggests equates to 32.1 hectares. The plan notes (paragraph 4.19) that *"Further work is underway on a strategic distribution needs study and a Leicestershire wide employment land study which will provide updated evidence on employment land needs, and this is anticipated to be finalised in Spring 2022. We will consider the latest evidence on employment land needs in the next iteration of the draft Local Plan"*.

Comments

- 3.4 In terms of the issue of the housing requirement, this is based on the government's standard method and is consistent with the NPPF. It is noted the HBBC does not consider that it is necessary to increase the requirement over and above the standard method due to economic circumstances or the need for affordable housing. The plan notes that Leicester City has declared an unmet need but does not propose to address this as part of the proposed allocations. Instead, the issue is addressed in policy SS03 which is considered below. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the supply exceeds the requirement by about 8%, which provides some flexibility in the event that not all sites come forward as predicted.
- 3.5 In terms of employment land, there appears to be a discrepancy between the policy which refers to 32.1 hectares as being allocated in the plan, and Table 3 (Employment Land Need and Supply) which identifies a figure of 43.1 hectares. This is also quoted in policy EP01 (Scale and Distribution of New Employment Sites). The plan should be amended to include only one figure. This is reflected in the recommendations above.
- 3.6 On the issue of strategic distribution members will be aware that as part of the work on this Council's new Local Plan it has proposed to make some provision for strategic distribution to address some of the unmet needs identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Distribution Study. It is disappointing that HBBC has not taken a similarly positive approach. Indeed, paragraph 8.26 make states that *"The borough has currently met its current need for large scale distribution, so will not be allocating further sites until the cross-boundary employment work and agreement on distribution of needs has concluded"*.

- 3.7 Furthermore, the reference in paragraph 4.19 of the plan (and quoted above) is somewhat confusing, as it suggests that the issue of strategic distribution will be considered in “*the next iteration of the draft Local Plan*”. However, Regulation 19 is supposed to represent the plan which HBBC wishes to submit for Examination; there are no further opportunities for a further iteration. It is recommended that an objection be made to the lack of positive planning and a lack of clarity as to how this issue will be addressed.

Policy SS03 – Local Plan Review

- 3.8 This policy is, in effect, a trigger policy and it provides a commitment to undertake a review of the plan within 6 months of the publication of Statement of Common Ground for the apportionment of unmet housing and employment needs.

Comment

- 3.9 HBBC has been preparing its Local Plan in the context of a known unmet need for housing and employment from Leicester City and ongoing joint work by all of the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities to address this issue. It is currently anticipated that this work will be completed in spring 2022. Whilst the proposed Local plan does include a higher provision for housing, the level of over provision (8%) is not that significant in the context of unmet need. It is disappointing that HBBC has not taken a more positive approach to address this issue head on.
- 3.10 In an ideal world HBBC would wait for the matter of unmet need to be resolved. However, HBBC does not have an up-to-date Local plan and nor does it have a 5-year housing supply. This means that it is vulnerable to unwanted planning applications. Therefore, HBBC are, understandably, keen to push on with their local plan as a matter of urgency. To enable this to happen the trigger policy has been proposed. It has been subject of discussion with all the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities through both the Member Advisory Group (MAG) and also the Strategic Planning Group (SPG).
- 3.11 The trigger policy provides a reassurance to the other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities that HBBC will, in the event of any unmet need being directed to Hinckley and Bosworth, address the matter. A failure to do so would mean the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities would not be meeting all the identified Housing Market Area housing and employment needs and so would leave each authority vulnerable to speculative planning applications.
- 3.12 The trigger policy helps HBBC to demonstrate that it is complying with the Duty to Cooperate. A failure to do so would be catastrophic for the plan.
- 3.13 Notwithstanding the discussion and agreement at both MAG and SPG, now that we have had an opportunity to see the plan in its entirety, it is considered that greater clarification is required as to whether the reference in the policy to “employment need” includes that arising in respect of strategic distribution as well as general employment. This is reflected in the recommendations above.

Policy HO01 – Provision of New Housing

- 3.14 This policy identifies a number of housing sites which it is proposed be allocated for development. The following sites are located within less than 5 miles of the border with this district:

Site Allocation	Settlement	Site	Minimum housing
------------------------	-------------------	-------------	------------------------

Reference			to be delivered
BARL01H	Barlestone	Land at Barton Road., Osbaston	55
BARL02H	Barlestone	Land at Spinney Drive	49
MKBOS01M	Market Bosworth	Land south of Station Road	100
MKBOS2H	Market Bosworth	Phase 2 of Land south of Station Road	243
NEW01H	Newbold Verdon	Land east of Brascote Lane	221
BAG01H	Bagworth	The Silk Forest, Barlestone Road	7
BAG02H	Bagworth	Land at Station Road	17
STA01H	Stanton Under Bardon	Land off Main Street	56
THO1H	Thornton	Thornton Nurseries, South of Reservoir Road	21
THO2H	Thornton	Land off Warwick Close, St Peters Drive and Sharp's Close	53
THO3H	Thornton	Manor Farm, Main Street	17

Comment

- 3.15 None of these sites are located such that they would have a visual impact upon this district. Whilst it is understood that a transport assessment has been commissioned, this has not been published alongside the Regulation 19 plan on the HBBC website. Without this evidence it is not possible to be sure that these developments either individually, or more likely cumulatively, will not have an impact upon the highway network in North West Leicestershire. Therefore, it's considered that an objection should be raised to policy HO01 as not being justified due to the lack of any published transport evidence.

Policy HO07 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- 3.16 This policy sets out the considerations which will apply when determining proposals for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. It proposes to prepare a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Development Plan Document and to “*work with partners to identify and allocate suitable sites to meet the identified pitch needs as contained in the latest Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment*”. A needs assessment was undertaken for the borough in 2016 and identified a need for 53 households to 2039. Despite undertaking three separate call for sites exercises no suitable sites were identified.
- 3.17 Additional evidence has been commissioned to look at other potential options, including extending existing sites. The text at paragraph 7.29 of the plan states that “*In order to identify suitable sites to meet these identified needs, the Council will need to work with partners across Leicestershire and with its neighbours along its Warwickshire border and produce a separate Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD)*”.

Comments

- 3.18 Members will be aware of the difficulty of trying to identify suitable and deliverable sites for gypsies and travellers. Members will also be aware that this Council has worked with all of the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities to identify the needs for gypsies and travellers. However, HBBC were not part of this work.
- 3.19 As currently worded, the text at paragraph 7.29 (referred to above) it appears that HBBC has decided that it will not be able to make any provision for gypsies and travellers. However, this is somewhat at odds with the policy itself which includes a clear commitment to preparing a DPD to identify sites.
- 3.20 It is also not clear what is meant in the policy when it refers to “*work with partners to identify and allocate suitable sites*”. Is this just within HBBC area or further afield?

- 3.21 If HBBC considers that it cannot accommodate its needs for gypsies and travellers, then HBBC should be formally approaching authorities such as North West Leicestershire District Council under the Duty to Cooperate. In doing so there would need to be demonstrable evidence that HBBC cannot accommodate its needs. No such evidence appears to have been published at this time.
- 3.22 The policy, as currently drawn does not comply with the DCLG Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (April 2015) and particularly Policy D of that document.
- 3.23 As currently worded it is considered that the policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective.

CLT04 – Twycross Zoo

- 3.24 This policy provides support for proposals at Twycross Zoo which are directly related to the Zoo as a visitor and tourist facility and/or for animal conversation and research.

Comment

- 3.25 Twycross Zoo is a major tourist destination which is very important to the local economy. The Zoo is located adjoining the A444 which as members will be aware passes through part of North West Leicestershire. The policy does not include any reference to any other criteria. However, policy HT01 requires all development proposals to be supported by an Appropriate Transport Assessment, which includes ensuring that new development would not have a significant adverse impact upon the highway network. It is generally recognised that it is not necessary for a generic policy or parts of it be repeated as part of site specific policies as all policies in the plan have to be read together. It is considered that the application of policy HT01 should ensure that any potential impacts upon this district are adequately addressed.

Policy NAT04 – National Forest

- 3.26 The policy provides support for proposals which contribute towards the delivery of the National Forest Strategy and the 25-year Vision for the National Forest. New development will be required to include on-site or nearby woodland planting.

Comment

- 3.27 This policy is consistent with that in this Council’s Local Plan and is supported.

Policy NAT05 – Charnwood Forest Regional Park

- 3.28 This policy provides support for proposals within the Charnwood Forest area that comply with a range of criteria.

Comment

- 3.29 The various criteria are very similar to those in this Council’s Local Plan and are to be welcomed and supported.

Policies and other considerations, as appropriate	
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 Regulation 19 Hinckley and Bosworth Borough 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 ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank