

MINUTES of a meeting of the LOCAL PLAN COMMITTEE held in the Forest Room, Stenson House, London Road, Coalville, LE67 3FN on WEDNESDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2025

Present: Councillor J G Simmons (Chair)

Councillors M Ball, A Barker, D Bigby, P Lees, J Legrys, R L Morris, P Moulton, C A Sewell, L Windram and M B Wyatt

Officers: Mr I Nelson, Ms S Lee, Mr C Elston, Mr B Dooley, Mrs R Wallace, Mr J Arnold, Ms J Althorpe and Ms A Gibson

8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor S Lambeth.

9 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

In accordance with the Code of Conduct, Members declared the following interests:

All members except Councillor A Barker declared they had been lobbied without influence on all items on the agenda but had come to the meeting with an open mind.

10 PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

The Chair introduced the item by outlining the proceedings: due to time constraints and for efficiency purposes, each question and response would not be read out. Instead, each questioner was given the opportunity to ask a supplementary question, for which the maximum amount of time was adjusted to not exceed two minutes.

There were 11 public questions received.

Question from Mr T Legrys

'The hedgehog is listed as a Species of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. It is also now classified as Vulnerable to Extinction. This Council has a duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity and is required to ensure new developments do not fragment wildlife habitats. Will the Local Plan Committee commit to developing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), in line with the successful East Cambridgeshire Hedgehog Recovery Design Guidance SPD, to make the inclusion of 13cm x 13cm Hedgehog Highways a mandatory planning condition for all new residential developments in North West Leicestershire?'

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'The preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document would require time and resources which are already stretched in order to meet the challenging deadline for getting plan submitted for Examination.

Draft policy En1 (Nature Conservation/Biodiversity net gain) of the emerging Local Plan addresses the need to ensure that new development secures a net gain in biodiversity, with the priority being for on-site provision. This provides a suitable policy hook for considering future developments.'

In response to a supplementary question, it was agreed by the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager that a line could be amended in Draft Policy En1 to include 'species of principal importance'.

Chair's initials

Question from Mr M Elton

'At the last meeting in September, I asked if you were aware that a potential GIN mine has been identified, by a specialist, on C77. I was mistaken and this is actually situated within C47. As you are no doubt aware, GIN mines were created in the 17th century where shallow coal seams are common. This area has very deep compressions with water constantly seeping through which suggests this could have Subsidence issues. A similar Heritage site exists and is open to the public at Hough Windmill in Swannington.

Given the area's historical association with mining activity, there is credible concern that the site may lie above or adjacent to a former gin mine. These vertical shafts, often poorly documented and inadequately capped, pose significant risks to ground stability, public safety, and long-term structural integrity.

In order to develop that site:

- A Coal Mining Risk Assessment (CMRA) would need to be conducted for site C47, which includes specific investigation into the presence of gin mines or shallow workings:
- Contingency measures would need to be put in place should evidence of a gin mine be discovered during pre-development surveys:
- The Council would also need to consider how the potential presence of a gin mine aligns with its duty to ensure safe, sustainable development under national planning policy frameworks.

If it is established that a GIN mine exists on C47, would the Council decide to preserve this rare heritage and make it accessible to the public or decide to build over it anyway?'

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'There is no evidence at the present time which suggest that site C47 is not developable. In response to previous questions regarding potential GIN mines, the site promoter has provided a heritage note which has been shared with Mr Elton. This notes that there are no features which match the description of a GIN mine in the Historic Environments Records and that "even if the remains of a horse gin are present, they would not affect the deliverability of the site for the quantum of development proposed".

There has not been any evidence presented to date that demonstrates that land stability is likely to be an issue of this site. In any event, the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner". Therefore, it will be the responsibility of the developer/promoter to satisfy themselves that there is not likely to be a land stability issue.'

In response to a supplementary question asking whether the Council would reduce Section 106 requirements or financially support developers regarding subsidence or gas hazards, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager replied that this would be justified case-by-case and included in the Local Plan as needed.

Question from Ms G Baker

'100 Treasures of Charnwood Forest

Charnwood Forest Geopark produces the official 100 Treasures of Charnwood Forest. 14 of those treasures are historical sites. The probable Iron Age/Roman monument situated within C47 is listed as one of those treasured sites. It is located close to a current footpath at the top of a hill, commanding stunning views of the local countryside. It is also within easy walking distance of Swannington Incline, the Ivanhoe Way and Meadow Barn café. It has a huge potential as a future tourist attraction and as an asset for the area.

There are numerous planning and legal concerns attached to developing sites of historical significance, which include: Paragraph 194 -208 of the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF), The Ancient monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the Historic Environment Records (HER).

Proceeding with development on the site of probable national importance may expose the Council, reputational damage and potential judicial review.

Practical and development challenges will include design constraints, substantial delays, uncertainty and additional costs. Promoters and Developers are likely to say that these heritage concerns can easily be accommodated, when the reality is that their priority is to maximize profits.

I accept that many of these concerns would normally be addressed at the planning stage. However, when numerous planning issues emerge at this stage of the process, inclusion within your strategy plan must become untenable. I would therefore ask again why this site remain within the plan, when others with far fewer planning issues have been removed or not included in the plan?

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'The Charnwood Forest Geopark identifies a D-Shaped enclosure near Whitwick as one of 100 Treasures of the Charnwood Forest Geopark. No further details are provided. The County Council's Heritage Team Manager has previously advised that he considered that an appraisal undertaken on behalf of the site promoter was satisfactory and that the need for mitigation could be secured by condition on a planning application, consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

In respect of sites where it has previously been decided to not include them in the plan, the reasons are set out in various reports to, and decisions of, this Committee.'

A supplementary question was asked about the historical significance of sites such as the Iron Age monument at C47. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager replied that he was not aware of other sites of similar significance and would have to look into the matter further. In terms of this particular site it was noted that it was not a formally designated heritage asset.

Question from Ms M Baxter

'I would like to put forward a question regarding proposed building off Torrington Avenue/Hall lane will the proposed houses be separate to current housing regarding sewage? We have problems now with smell/ blockages from the drains?'

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'The exact details of how any development will be served in respect of drainage of sewage will be addressed at the planning application stage.'

Question from Mr C Taylor

'At a previous meeting of this Committee in on 16 December 2024, you were asked why C76 Meadow Lane, C 82 Greenhill Farm and C57 Loughborough Road were not included within the plan. Having studied your latest Strategic Housing Availability Document recently, those 3 sites have still have far fewer potential planning issues than West Whitwick. Your response to the question, at the time, was that:

- 1 It was the decision of the Local Plan Committee that C76, Meadow Lane should be removed from the plan. In other words a political decision taken against the advice of your Officer:
- 2 You stated that C57 was situated some distance from the centre of Whitwick at the top of a hill, not accessible for older people. A successful planning application has subsequently been submitted for land opposite the site, which is slightly further from the centre of Whitwick. A bus service now passes close to C57 and I fail to see the difference to the 2 sites:
- 3 You were unable to recall why site C82 had not been included in the plan at the time.

The minutes of that meeting did not reflect all of the above, but the transcript of the live stream does. The committee voted against amending those minutes to reflect the answers above at the subsequent meeting on 29 January 2025.

Are you able to explain to me now why C57 and C82 have not been included within the plan?'

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'Whilst it is recognised that a new bus service now serves part of Loughborough Road there are also ecological and landscape issues associated with site C57, which was partly why it was previously dismissed at appeal. The landscape appraisal prepared to support the Local Plan identifies that this site lies within a parcel that is of high landscape sensitivity and medium-high visual sensitivity. The permission on the opposite side of Loughborough Road was for a small number of dwellings (5) and was to help meet the needs for self and custom build dwellings.

In respect of site C82 this also lies within the Charnwood Forest and is poorly related to services and facilities. It is also necessary to demonstrate likely deliverability of any site. It is some time since this site was promoted and there has not been any representations from the landowner to any recent consultations and nor has the Council been made aware that there is any developer interest in the site.'

A supplementary question was asked about whether discussions with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council could help meet the Council's quota for strategic warehousing and housing. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager confirmed initial conversations had occurred but the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan lacked sufficient information to show that what was proposed was likely to be deliverable.

Chair's initials

Question from Mr A Priestley

'As Chairman of Kegworth Parish council I find it wholly inappropriate and unacceptable that at this very late stage that 40ha of additional employment land (EMP97) can be allocated in our Parish with zero advanced information and zero opportunity for the Parish council to formally apply any consideration or scrutiny. It would seem the lions share of strategic employment land for the entire County in being allocated within or adjacent to the boundaries of our small Ancient village which is rapid becoming encircled by large concentrations of B8 sheds.

Does this Committee believe this employment land allocations without prior consultation is a fair and reasonable process that is not vulnerable to judicial review?'

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'The issue of possible consultation in respect of additional sites for strategic distribution is addressed at paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of item 6 of the Committee Report. As set out in the report there would ideally be some further consultation under Regulation 18. However, the Council is required to submit the Local Plan for Examination by December 2026 and therefore a further additional consultation is not considered to be feasible having regard to resources, if this deadline is to be met.

This is a matter for members of the Committee to debate when they consider Item 6 on the agenda.'

A supplementary question was asked about whether there was an immediate need for development on site EMP97 in Kegworth. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained the importance of meeting Government-imposed deadlines for the submission of the Local Plan and noted the soundness of the site would be further tested.

Question from Mr R Brackenbury

'What evidence demonstrates that the relying solely on the existing "countryside policy" will be sufficient to prevent coalescence between Diseworth and the proposed Isley Woodhouse settlement and Freeport-based industrial shed development?'

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

'The Council has previously resisted development elsewhere in similar situations where it has relied upon the existing countryside policy(S3) which is continued into new policy (S4). For example, a proposed development between Castle Donington and Lockington was successfully defended at appeal with refence to existing policy S3 (17/01136/OUTM).'

A supplementary question was asked regarding the absence of a defined separation area between Diseworth and the proposed new settlement. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager explained that existing policies already ensure adequate separation and therefore a specific designation was considered unnecessary, but the issue was addressed elsewhere on the agenda.

Question from Miss S Rojewska

'In relation to site C19a and further developments on Stephenson Way and Broom Leys Road, there are barn owls nesting in holly hayes wood and swifts/swallows in the meadows. There are also badgers in the location and bats. The proposed site is within a kilometre of this area and would therefore impact on these protected species, What mitigation and protection will be provided as part of the development?'

Chair's initials

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

‘Draft policy En1 (Nature conservation/biodiversity net gain) addresses the need to ensure that new development does not adversely affect known sites of significance for nature conservation value. This will be addressed as part of any future planning applications.’

A supplementary question was asked which questioned whether the Council could guarantee proposed developments would have little impact on biodiversity. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager responded that, while this could not be guaranteed, co-ordination of developments would be sought through policies to minimise impact.

Question from Mr R Pritchard

‘In the light of the proposed designation of sites EMP 73(part) and EMP97 North of Kegworth as strategic warehousing so long after the Regulation 18 consultation on the Draft Local Plan, could the Council tell me what due diligence has been followed in relation to the Kegworth Limits of Development on the North side and specifically the impact of the proposed sites, together, potentially, with the as-yet-undetermined planning application for a strategic warehouse at the former RBS site, on impending M1 Junction 24 development and the viability of housing site K11 which has planning permission for 250 homes and would be encircled by B2/B8 warehouses as a result?’

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

‘Throughout the period that the Local Plan is being prepared it is necessary to have regard to evidence and information that emerges. A failure to do so risks the plan not being found to be sound at Examination. The evidence in respect of the need for large scale warehousing has been in preparation for some time. The planning application south of the A6 on the former RBS site will be judged on its own merits in due course.’

In response to a supplementary question expressing concern about Kegworth being surrounded by large warehouse developments, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager stated that this issue would be addressed through the planning application process rather than the Local Plan.

Question from Mr A Palmer

‘Either end of hall lane is terrible at busy times as it is. More cars will only add to this. Cars from hall lane to city of dan can be queueing up to Varus shop. The opposite end also gets busy. This sends traffic down George Street, which is extremely narrow with poor access onto Hermitage Road. What plans are being developed for managing the extra traffic, such as traffic surveys?’

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

‘Transport modelling is currently being undertaken through work with the County Highway Authority to assess the impact of development and to identify any mitigation measures. The proposed policy considered elsewhere on tonight’s agenda (item 7) requires the provision of a road linking Hall Lane to Stephenson Way to minimise the impact upon the existing road network.’

In response to a supplementary question expressing concern that the proposed policy in item 7 of the agenda in respect of the Coalville Urban Area Strategic Development Area would increase congestion on Hall Lane. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team

Chair’s initials

Manager commented on the importance of waiting for the outcome of ongoing transport modelling work and noted the ease to accommodate for existing roads.

Question from Ms B Whelton

‘Assuming the council have exhausted all of the brown field sites in North West Leicestershire for housing before building on green spaces would the Council consider the land behind Stephenson College as an area for homes given it has access to the A511?’

Response from the Chair of the Local Plan Committee

‘It is not clear as to which exact area is being referred to. However, if it is referring to land to the west of Stephenson College this particular area has not been promoted to the Council as a potential site for development.’

In response to a supplementary question asking if there any were brown field sites being considered for development near the A511, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager responded that the area has not been promoted for development, and that it would be a high risk if this was to be included in the Local Plan at this stage.

11 MINUTES

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2025.

It was moved by Councillor M Ball, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2025 be approved and signed by the Chair as an accurate record of proceedings.

12 TO CONSIDER THE MOTION REFERRED BY COUNCIL ON 4 NOVEMBER 2025

Motion

Following the consideration of a petition at Council on 4 November, the following motion was moved by Councillor L Windram and seconded by Councillor T Gillard:

The Local Plan Committee considers the petition and agrees to remove the land off Torrington Avenue, Whitwick, site reference C19a, to build 242 houses from the Draft Local Plan.

A discussion was had during which members put forward arguments both for and against the petition. Members emphasised the importance of meeting the Local Plan deadlines imposed by the Government and considered the consequences of withdrawing sites at this stage which could lead to ‘developer anarchy’. It was also noted that removing site C19a from the Local Plan would require finding alternative sites and cause delays.

Some members made comments in support of the petition, highlighting the impact that development on site C19a would have on local residents and concern was expressed about ongoing transport modelling work.

The Chair put the motion to the vote. A recorded vote being requested, the voting was as detailed below.

The motion was LOST.

Chair’s initials

To agree to remove the land off Torrington Avenue, Whitwick, site reference C19a to build 242 houses from the draft Local Plan. (Motion)	
Councillor Jenny Simmons	Against
Councillor Mike Ball	Against
Councillor Anthony Barker	Against
Councillor Paul Lees	Against
Councillor Dave Bigby	Against
Councillor John Legrys	Against
Councillor Ray Morris	Against
Councillor Peter Moulton	For
Councillor Carol Sewell	Against
Councillor Lee Windram	For
Councillor Michael Wyatt	For
Rejected	

13 NEW LOCAL PLAN - STRATEGIC WAREHOUSING

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

In response to a question from members relating to site apportionment in North West Leicestershire, the Principal Planning Policy Officer commented that, in the event the apportionment of 44% was not met, conversations would be had with other authorities to find a resolution to the shortfall as part of the Local Plan examination. It was added by the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager that there was a limited number of available sites, and that significant provisions were underway to ensure that as much of the requirement would be met as possible.

Members commented that site EMP97 did not go through a Regulation 18 consultation and therefore did not get full scrutiny from local residents, highlighting the large size of the site and struggling traffic in the area.

Members expressed concern that the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan could be finalised without further consultation on a few sites, and it was asked whether the matter of consultation could be discussed at the next meeting. The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that, due to Local Plan time limitations and as the next meeting was scheduled for January, it would be better to raise any concerns with the report during this meeting.

A discussion was had about site EMP97. Members raised concerns about the adequacy of transport modelling work, especially for Junction 24 of the M1 and Junction 11 of the M42, and the need for infrastructure upgrades. It was stated that Junctions 13 and 14 on the M42 were already suffering from over-capacity, and that additional allocations could cause this to escalate.

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager advised that the transport modelling work had been revisited to incorporate updated assumptions as set out in the report. It was added that previous estimates of the future need for strategic distribution for North West Leicestershire were significantly lower (requiring a step back in the modelling process), and that the revised modelling will take into account all known developments across the wider area but will exclude proposals such as the Norton Juxta new settlement recently proposed in the Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan (Reg 18) , as these are not sufficiently advanced.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer recommended that as many sites as possible should be identified as part of the Local Plan to minimise a shortfall, and that taking site EMP97

Chair's initials

out at this stage would undermine the integrity of the Local Plan. It was added that the decisions made at this meeting were subject to transport modelling work.

It was announced by the Chair that, due to the points raised during discussion, recommendations 4 and 5 would be moved separately.

Recommendation 4 was moved by Councillor R Morris, seconded by Councillor M Ball and

RESOLVED THAT:

- 4) The inclusion of land south of Kegworth Bypass (EMP97) as a strategic warehousing site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.

Recommendation 5 was moved by Councillor M Ball, seconded by Councillor P Moulton and

RESOLVED THAT:

- 5) The inclusion of land at Ellistown Terrace Road and Wood Road (EMP98) as a strategic warehousing site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor M Ball and

RESOLVED THAT:

- 2) The inclusion of land south of East Midlands Airport (EMP90) as a strategic warehousing and general needs employment site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.
- 3) The inclusion of land north of A453 Kegworth (EMP73 (Part)) as a strategic warehousing site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.
- 6) The inclusion of land north of J11 A/M42 (EMP82) a strategic warehousing site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.
- 7) The inclusion of land north east of J11 A/M42 (EMP83/84/94) as a strategic warehousing site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.
- 8) The inclusion of land at Corkscrew Lane (EMP80) as a strategic warehousing site in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, be agreed in principle.
- 9) It be agreed that the inclusion in the Regulation 19 plan of the sites agreed in recommendations 2 to 8 is subject to the outcomes of A) transport modelling; B) viability assessment; and C) infrastructure requirements.

Recommendations 1 and 10 were noted by the Committee.

14 HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN - REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

Chair's initials

A discussion was had during which several questions of clarity were addressed by the planning policy officers. Members commented that there was a disconnect regarding Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council's Local Plan, and that it lacked sufficient information.

It was moved by Councillor D Bigby, seconded by Councillor M Ball and

RESOLVED THAT:

- 1) The Council thanks Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council for consulting this Council on the Regulation 18 Local Plan.
- 2) The Council supports the proposed housing requirement of 743 dwellings each year
- 3) The Council objects to the Plan's proposal for a new settlement at Norton Juxta Twycross in view of the lack of demonstrable evidence in respect of the impact upon this district, including transport, infrastructure and landscape.

15 LONG WHATTON AND DISEWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUBMISSION VERSION - RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

During discussion, members were surprised to hear of the proposal to include the area of separation in the Neighbourhood Plan. It was noted by the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager that it would be up to independent examiners to decide on site allocations within Long Whatton and Diseworth.

In accordance with recommendations 2, 3 and 4, members noted the report.

Recommendation 1 was moved by Councillor R Morris, seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

The Local Plan Committee agrees the proposed response to the submission draft of the Long Whatton and Diseworth Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Appendix A.

16 LOCAL PLAN - POTENTIAL AREA OF SEPARATION DISEWORTH

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

During discussion, members expressed the importance of maintaining an area of separation in the Local Plan to preserve the character of the village and protect the surrounding countryside. Members also highlighted the potential an area of separation has to enforce Policy S2 – Settlement Hierarchy, and Policy S3 – Strategic Policy, in the Local Plan – concerns were raised over the robustness of these policies. It was added that establishing an area of separation in writing would be more effective in enforcing protection.

A few members raised doubts over whether establishing an area of separation was necessary due to the protection offered by policies S2 and S3 in the Local Plan.

A motion was put forward by Councillor P Moulton for an area of separation to not be included in the Local Plan. It was seconded by Councillor A Barker.

Chair's initials

The motion was LOST.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee to put forward an alternative motion.

Councillor R Morris moved that an area of separation at Diseworth be identified as part of the Local Plan on the grounds that it would better preserve the surrounding countryside and the character of the village. It was seconded by Councillor J Legrys and

RESOLVED THAT:

An area of separation at Diseworth be identified as part of the Local Plan to better protect the surrounding countryside and preserve the character of the village.

Councillor J Legrys moved that the meeting be extended by no longer than 30 minutes. It was seconded by Councillor A Barker and

RESOLVED THAT:

The duration of the meeting be extended by no longer than 30 minutes.

17 LOCAL PLAN - HOUSING ALLOCATIONS: OUTSTANDING MATTERS

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

A discussion was had during which members suggested exploring alternative places for housing allocations such as Measham so that fewer controversial sites would be put forward to the Committee. They also noted that restrictions on build-out rates could result in fewer houses being built.

In response, the Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager expressed concern over what this would mean for ongoing transport modelling work, and that referring new sites to Leicestershire County Council at this stage would delay the Local Plan.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor R Morris and

RESOLVED THAT:

Subject to the outcome of further work including transport modelling, viability assessment and infrastructure requirements, the Local Plan Committee agrees that:

- 1) The proposed policy for the Coalville urban area strategic development area be as set out at Appendix A of the report.
- 2) Land south of Ashby Road, Kegworth (K12) be allocated for around 140 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan subject to not receiving any adverse legal advice as outlined at paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7 of the report.
- 3) Land west of Redburrow Lane, Packington (P7) is allocated for around 30 dwellings in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.
- 4) Housing allocation land south of Normanton Road, Packington (P4) includes an additional policy requirement to facilitate vehicular access to P7.
- 5) Land at Spring Lane and rear of 55 Normanton Road, Packington (P5 & P8) is not allocated in the Regulation 19 Local Plan

Chair's initials

18 LOCAL PLAN - POLICIES

The Planning Policy and Land Charges Team Manager presented the report.

Members had a discussion during which several questions of clarity were addressed by the planning policy officers, and it was commented that paragraph 4.9 of Policy AP7 should be altered to make it clearer.

It was moved by Councillor J Legrys, seconded by Councillor D Bigby and

RESOLVED THAT:

- 2) That the Local Plan Committee agrees to Policy AP4 (Reducing Carbon Emissions) as amended in Appendix B for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, subject to the findings of the whole plan viability assessment, subject to the findings of the whole plan viability assessment.
- 3) That the Local Plan Committee agrees Policy AP7 (Flood Risk) as amended in Appendix B for inclusion in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan, subject to the findings of the whole plan viability assessment.

The meeting commenced at 6:00pm

The Chair closed the meeting at 9:18pm

Chair's signature