

## NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

## CABINET – 9 OCTOBER 2018

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Title of report                      | <b>LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE AUTHORITIES' JOINT STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN</b>   |
| Key Decision                         | a) Financial No<br>b) Community Yes  |
| Contacts                             | Councillor Trevor Pendleton<br>01509 569746<br><a href="mailto:trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a><br><br>Strategic Director of Place<br>01530 454555<br><a href="mailto:james.arnold@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">james.arnold@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a><br><br>Planning Policy Team Manager<br>01530 454677<br><a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a> |
| Purpose of report                    | The purpose of this report is to enable Cabinet to consider the revised Strategic Growth Plan (the revised SGP) and to recommend a response to Council. The revised SGP is attached as Appendix A to this report.  |
| Reason for Decision                  | To enable Cabinet to form a view   |
| Council Priorities                   | Participation in the development of the Strategic Growth Plan will support the following priorities:<br>- Building Confidence in Coalville<br>- Homes and Communities<br>- Businesses and Jobs   |
| Implications:<br><br>Financial/Staff | Financial implications are already provided for, with an earmarked reserve to cover the cost of evidence base, administration associated with the consultations and a contribution to the Joint Strategic Planning Manager role.<br>Staffing implications are considered as part of normal workloads and establishment.  |
| Link to relevant CAT                 | None   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Risk Management                        | Risks have been managed by the Joint Strategic Planning Manager   |
| Equalities Impact Screening            | An Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment has been undertaken and forms part of the evidence base for the plan   |
| Human Rights                           | An Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment has been undertaken and forms part of the evidence base for the plan   |
| Transformational Government            | The draft Joint Strategic Growth Plan has been prepared in collaboration between the City and County Councils of Leicester & Leicestershire, as well as each of the District and Borough Councils, and the LLEP.  |
| Comments of Head of Paid Service       | The Report is Satisfactory  |
| Comments of Deputy Section 151 Officer | The Report is Satisfactory  |
| Comments of Deputy Monitoring Officer  | The Report is Satisfactory  |
| Consultees                             | None  |
| Background papers                      | <p>Strategic Growth Plan Consultation Draft – which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.l1strategicgrowthplan.org.uk/the-plan/stage-two/draftplan/">http://www.l1strategicgrowthplan.org.uk/the-plan/stage-two/draftplan/</a></p> <p>Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment</p> <p>A copy can be viewed at <a href="https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/strategic_growth_plan">https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/strategic_growth_plan</a></p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>A copy can be viewed at <a href="https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/strategic_growth_plan">https://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/strategic_growth_plan</a></p> |
| Recommendation                         | <p><b>THAT THE FOLLOWING BE RECOMMENDED TO FULL COUNCIL:</b></p> <p><b>(I) THE REVISED STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN (SGP) “LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE 2050: OUR VISION FOR GROWTH” BE APPROVED; AND</b></p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><b>(II) THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE (OR EQUIVALENT) OF EACH SGP PARTNER AUTHORITY, FOLLOWING CONSULTATION WITH THE LEADER OF THAT AUTHORITY AND THE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER FOR THE SGP, BE AUTHORISED TO AGREE, PRIOR TO PUBLICATION, ANY FINAL MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE SGP WHICH DO NOT SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE THE OVERALL CONTENT OR PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT.</b></p> |
|--|--|

## **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 This Council, working with Leicester City Council, the County Council, and the LLEP has been working on the preparation a Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) for Leicester and Leicestershire.
- 1.2 The abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies by the government in 2010, [CHECK] coupled with the need for local planning authorities to consider strategic planning within the context of the 'duty to co-operate' required by the Localism Act 2011 created the need for a new approach to strategic planning across Leicester & Leicestershire.
- 1.3 In Leicester & Leicestershire, it was decided by the local planning authorities that long term strategic planning would be more effective if undertaken across the City and County and to include the local enterprise partnership, the LLEP, as a partner.
- 1.4 The SGP has therefore been prepared jointly by the eight local planning authorities (the borough and district councils), the County Council as the highway authority, the City Council as a unitary authority with combined planning and highways responsibilities. Each of these is represented on a Members' Advisory Group (MAG) which, supported by senior officers, has overseen the preparation of the Plan. The LLEP attends MAG in the capacity of an observer; Homes England (formerly the Homes & Communities Agency) attends the senior officer group in the capacity of an observer.

## **2.0 THE PROCESS TO DATE**

- 2.1 To date the preparation of the SGP has involved agreeing a Strategic Growth Statement which set out the rationale and proposed process for the preparation of the SGP, identified the defining characteristics of the local area and challenges faced by the partners, outlined the evidence base that would be assembled and the spatial options to be considered in formulating a SGP, and set out initial objectives and ambitions for the future. It was considered by Council on 28 June 2016.
- 2.2 A Consultation Draft SGP was considered and endorsed by the Members' Advisory Group in November 2017. It was subsequently approved for the purpose of public consultation by Cabinet on 14 November 2017 (other authorities also gave approval for the purposes of public consultation). More details of this are set out in section 3 of this report.

- 2.3 A further report which established the Council's formal response to the SGP was considered by Cabinet on 1 May 2018.
- 2.4 The meeting of MAG on 24 September 2018 considered and agreed a revised SGP. A copy is attached at Appendix A of this report.
- 2.5 Each of the local authorities across Leicester & Leicestershire are being recommended to approve the revised SGP during autumn/winter 2018.

### **3.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 A 17-week consultation period took place from 11 January -10 May 2018 and summary documents are available. Activities included:
- press releases, periodic media coverage
  - emails/letters to statutory consultees
  - emails/letters to organisations and groups identified by partners
  - public exhibitions
  - copies of the Draft SGP and summary leaflets
  - paper copies of questionnaires and all evidence at main offices
  - SGP website
  - links to the SGP website from partner websites
  - social media messages
- 3.2 A total of 588 responses were received, 79% of which were from members of the public. These comments have been analysed and considered during the preparation of the revised SGP. A summary of key changes is attached as Appendix B.
- 3.3 In line with the Statement of Community Involvement, those respondents who provided contact details have been informed that a revised plan has been prepared. The opportunity for further comment will take place during governance and/or the preparation of Local Plans.

### **4.0 THE REVISED STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN**

- 4.1 The SGP will:
- Support partners to plan effectively for the future, giving Local plans a consistent framework and helping to make decisions on infrastructure and secure Government funding;
  - Give some control over accommodating and supporting future growth and help to protect and enhance environmental assets;
  - Provide confidence to the market, the Government, local businesses and residents that the local councils and the LLEP are working together to improve the area.
- 4.2 There are risks in not having a SGP and these are summarised in Appendix C.
- 4.3 As the SGP has been developed, a number of events have been held for Members to keep them advised of progress. This has included all-Member briefings on the SGP at various stages in its preparation.

### *Key elements of the SGP*

- 4.4 The SGP sets out a strategy for the growth and development of Leicester & Leicestershire in the period to 2050, enabling partners to consider the longer term needs of the area and opportunities which extend beyond the conventional timeframe of a Local Plan. MAG considered the distribution of housing and employment land over the period 2011-31 and 2011-36 in the context of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (January 2017) in order to give a more detailed framework for shorter term Local Plans.
- 4.5 There have been on-going discussions with organisations such as Network Rail and Midlands Connect to ensure that their emerging policies and proposals are incorporated in emerging plans, strategies and funding programmes where necessary.
- 4.6 The SGP proposes that most development will take place in major strategic locations with less development happening in existing towns, villages and rural area, in so doing it allows new development to be focussed along transport corridors and close to employment centres.
- 4.7 The five building blocks that have been used to prepare the Plan are an understanding and appreciation of:
- the existing settlement pattern
  - national policies, particularly in relation to planning, housing and infrastructure provision
  - the local economy and how it is supported by the Midlands Engine Strategy (March 2017)
  - road and rail networks and the proposals and priorities of the Midlands Connect Strategy (March 2017), and
  - the area's environmental, historic and other assets.
- 4.8 Four priorities are identified in the SGP:
- creating conditions for investment and growth
  - achieving a step change in the way that growth is delivered
  - securing essential infrastructure
  - delivering high quality development.
- 4.9 Analysis has indicated that through existing and emerging Local Plans and planning permissions provision can be made for the amount of new housing needed in the area to 2031. This will be achieved through a mixture of major strategic sites already identified in Local Plans (approximately 40%) and smaller scale growth on non-strategic sites (approximately 60%). The proposed new spatial distribution of strategic development, therefore, does not need to focus on this time period but it remains an important part of the plan e.g. we wish to accelerate the delivery of consented and allocated sites and we need to secure the infrastructure which is essential to their success.
- 4.10 Beyond 2031, the SGP proposes that more growth should be directed to strategic locations. This requires new strategic infrastructure to open up land for development and

the Midlands Connect Strategy (setting out key transport priorities for the East and West Midlands) lays the foundations for this.

#### *Proposed Growth Areas*

- 4.11 The proposed growth areas are:
- Leicester City
  - The A46 Growth Corridor
  - The Leicestershire International Gateway
  - The A5 Improvement Corridor
  - The Melton Mowbray Key Centre for Regeneration and Growth
- 4.12 Coalville, Hinckley, Loughborough, Lutterworth and Market Harborough are identified as areas where growth would be managed in Local Plans.
- 4.13 In the villages and rural areas, the SGP proposes that there will be limited growth consistent with providing for local needs.

### **5.0 EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 By seeking to ensure that economic growth is secured, and appropriate provision for market and affordable homes is made, the implementation of the SGP can contribute to meeting the needs of disadvantaged groups across Leicester & Leicestershire.
- 5.2 An Equalities & Human Rights Impact Assessment (EqHRIA) has been undertaken. The outcomes of the assessment are available to view in a report which supports the SGP. The assessment considers a number of options for the spatial distribution of growth within Leicester & Leicestershire, including that of the SGP. It is clear that different options have the potential to impact, in different ways, on matters such as age, disability, race, religion or belief (some positive, some negative and some neutral). Other matters are not likely to be affected.
- 5.3 As this is a high-level strategic plan, however, the responsibility for mitigating any adverse impacts upon individuals or community groups will fall to subsequent statutory plans, primarily Local Plans prepared by individual authorities. In most cases, it will be important to ensure that specific infrastructure and services are planned effectively to deal with the specific needs of these groups. The EqHRIA ensures that the partner organisations are aware of the various impacts of the SGP and enables them to put in place any necessary mitigating measures and/or enhancements.

### **6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) (SEA) has been undertaken together with a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). These can be viewed at [www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/strategic\\_growth\\_plan](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/strategic_growth_plan)
- 6.2. The SA concludes that the SGP has the potential to deliver significant positive effects in relation to health and well-being; housing; and economy and employment. Minor positive effects are reported in relation to climate change and cultural heritage (although, in the

case of the latter, minor negative effects are also reported as well). Minor negative effects are reported in relation to water; and moderate negative effects in relation to landscape and land. Mixed effects are reported in relation to transport and travel i.e. significant positive effects in relation to the focusing of development in strategic locations and minor negative effects in relation to potential congestion on nearby routes. Uncertain negative effects are recorded in relation to biodiversity and minerals. Where significant effects are identified, measures to mitigate these have been suggested, if possible. Further measures to enhance the positive effects have also been suggested, where possible.

- 6.3 The SA reports that the findings broadly support the preferred strategy as it would generate the most benefits in terms of employment and housing growth. It reports that the focus of growth at key areas of economic growth and infrastructure capacity is also likely to reduce the length of car trips, and encourage sustainable modes of travel (particularly where there are strong rail and bus links into the City of Leicester). It also states that, in terms of environmental effects, the preferred approach does not generate any major negative effects and performs better or the same as the alternatives in this respect.
- 6.4 The SA acknowledges the role of the SGP in establishing broad preferred locations for longer term growth to provide a framework for statutory Local Plans. It states that the broad locations would evidently be able to accommodate a range of different growth levels so, if subsequent work based on updated evidence confirms that a higher level of growth ought to be pursued in certain locations, then this can be considered at that stage. A higher level of growth (than the notional projected housing requirement) will have largely negative impacts. This is supported by the SA findings which suggest that the negative effects for every option would be likely to increase and this could lead to major negative effects on the built and natural environment, water and transport infrastructure.

## **7.0 WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE OF THE CHANGES?**

- 7.1 In terms of North West Leicestershire the following changes are highlighted:
- The Northern Gateway which covered the northern part of the district and Charnwood has been redefined as “The Leicestershire International Gateway”;
  - For the period 2031 to 2050 the number of dwellings to be provided has been increased by 1,200 to 9,720;
  - There is explicit support for the re-opening of the Leicester-Burton railway to passenger traffic; and
  - Explicit support for the regeneration of Coalville
- 7.2 An additional 1,200 dwellings for the period 2031-50 would increase the total figure from 8,520 to 9,720 which equates to 68 extra dwellings every year. The annual requirement would increase from 448 dwellings to 511 dwellings. This is marginally more than the annual requirement in the adopted Local Plan (481 dwellings) up to 2031. This should be seen in the context that the scale of growth envisaged in NWL by the SGP so far is no higher than the requirement identified by the HEDNA, whereas most other authorities have significantly more growth than identified in the HEDNA. For example, Blaby is expected to take an additional 155%, Harborough 63% (allowing for a reduction of 2,000 dwellings) and Hinckley 17%. The comparable figure for NWL would be 14%.

- 7.3 Furthermore, such an increase is not considered to represent a challenge as our current Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies the potential for just 22,000 dwellings over the next 20 years.
- 7.4 It is considered, therefore, having regard to the above that an additional 1,200 dwellings for the period 2031-50 is not unreasonable.
- 7.5 The support for both the re-opening of the Leicester-Burton railway and the regeneration of Coalville are to be particularly welcomed. The inclusion of the former is the first time that such support has been given in strategic plans.

## **8.0 WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?**

- 8.1 The immediate next step for this Council is for the Strategic Growth Plan to be presented to full Council for approval in accordance with the Recommendations above. It will also be reported to the meeting of the Local Plan Committee on 7 November 2018.
- 8.2 Subject to the SGP being approved by each of the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities as outlined at paragraph 2.5 of this report, the SGP will be used to guide the preparation of local plans.
- 8.3 Through the work of the Strategic Planning Group discussions have started in terms of additional work to help ensure the delivery of the plan, not only the housing and employment development, but also the key infrastructure that is required. These discussions will need to involve a range of partners including government agencies and the private sector.
- 8.4 A programme for this work will need to be developed when a new Joint Strategic Planning Manager is in post.



## **APPENDIX A**

**Joint Strategic Growth Plan is attached at appendix 2**

## APPENDIX B

### Key changes made following consultation on the Draft SGP

| Matter   | Explanation   |
|--|---|
| <b>Chapter 3: Accommodating our Growth</b>   |   |
| Ch 3: Title changed from ' <i>Accommodating Our Growth</i> ' to ' <i>Planning for Our Growth and Infrastructure</i> '.                 | Emphasises relationship between growth and infrastructure.  |
| Ch 3: Re-drafted to bring together two time periods 2011-31 and 2031-50 (housing numbers as before).                                   | Provides clarity on scale of growth over long term; better support for funding bids.  |
| Ch 3: New text on aligning growth, infrastructure and services; focus on delivery, removing barriers to development; increasing speed. | Emphasises need for infrastructure to support committed and new development; identifying other infrastructure needs and priorities.   |
| <b>Chapter 4: The Building Blocks for our Plan</b>   |   |
| Ch 4: New text added on emerging National Planning Policy Framework.   | Explains how we will address changing government policy.  |
| Ch 4: New text and plan relating to environmental, historic and other assets.  | Emphasises that such assets are an important consideration.   |
| <b>Chapter 5: Our Overall Approach</b>   |   |
| Ch 5: New text on ' <i>Investment and Growth</i> '   | Recognises that L & L will continue to grow so we have to plan for this; links to the LLEP's emerging Local Industrial Strategy; local aspirations.                               |
| Ch 5: New text on ' <i>Securing essential Infrastructure</i> '   | States that wide range of infrastructure is needed; promised infrastructure needs to be provided; much of this from the public sector but also collaboration with private sector. |
| Ch 5: Text on garden cities agenda brought forward.  | To emphasise the way in which this agenda will lie at the heart of our proposals to give social, economic and environmental focus.  |
| <b>Chapter 6: Our Spatial Strategy</b>   |   |
| Ch 6: New text to emphasise that the SGP will be delivered via Local Plans   | To emphasise that LPAs intend to be in control of the delivery process  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Ch 6: A46: identified as the <i>'The A46 Priority Growth Corridor'</i>  | Reinforces the message that the A46 is a critical element of the strategy without which growth on the scale/speed proposed would not be possible.                  |
| Ch 6: <i>Northern Gateway'</i> : Re-defined and identified as <i>'The Leicestershire international Gateway'</i>   | Recognises the increasingly international importance of this area with East Midlands Airport, East Midlands Gateway, HS2 station, major employers, new roads, etc. |
| Ch 6: <i>'Southern Gateway'</i> deleted; replaced with <i>'A5 Improvement Corridor'</i>   | Emphasises the importance of the A5 improvements to the delivery of committed growth   |
| Ch 6: Lutterworth deleted as <i>'Key Centre for Growth'</i> ; re-designated as an <i>'Area of Managed Growth in Local Plans'</i>  | Allows the local planning authority to focus on current proposals for growth and control future development in Local Plans   |
| Ch 6: Melton Mowbray renamed <i>'Key Centre for Regeneration and Growth'</i>  | Better reflects the aspirations of the local authority for growth and regeneration supported by new infrastructure   |
| Strategy Plan revised   | Amended in line with changes.  |
| Housing Numbers   |  |
| Housing numbers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced by 2,000 dwellings in Harborough DC</li> <li>• Increased by 800 dwellings in Melton BC</li> <li>• Increased by 1,200 dwellings in North West Leicestershire DC</li> </ul> | Reflecting agreements by local planning authorities  |
| <b>General changes to the text in various places</b>  |  |
| Explicit support for public transport enhancements; including radial routes and railways not in Midlands Connect Strategy e.g. Leicester-Burton Line and around Melton Mowbray.   | Better reflects the aspirations of the partners in terms of public transport improvements and aspirations.   |
| Recognition of the need for public transport to support growth.   | Amended to emphasis aspirations for improved public transport as part of a sustainable transport strategy.   |
| Importance of infrastructure to support committed development.  | Emphasises that infrastructure is need to support both long term growth and sites which already have consent.  |
| Emphasis on relationship/dependency   | Recognises that improvements to the  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| between strategic and 'lower order' infrastructure           | wider network will be needed to support the strategic road and rail improvements highlighted in the Plan.                |
| Emphasis on delivery.  | Emphasises that development in the period 2011-31 needs to be accelerated.   |
| Align homes and jobs; recognising LLEP priorities.           | Recognises the desire to reduce levels of commuting and the relationship between major employment centres and new homes. |
| Explicit support for regeneration e.g. Coalville Town Centre | Acknowledges that growth can take the form of regeneration and redevelopment of brownfield sites.                        |

## Risk Assessment

| Risk                                 | Specific issue  | Response  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Joint working</b>                 | The revised NPPF makes it very clear that government wants LPAs to work together, specifically preparing joint statutory Local Plans. | <p>The SGP is clear evidence of joint working albeit on a non-statutory basis. The work has made steady progress over the last three years with no interruption, signs of hesitation or withdrawal of support. Failure to agree at this late stage would signal a major break-up in the partnership putting at risk all of the attendant benefits which could be delivered through continued joint working (notably access to funding and the ability to resist unwanted development pressures).</p> <p>Joint working has also raised the profile of the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire partners with statutory agencies and has contributed to a positive outcome on a number of funding applications.</p> |
| <b>The 'Duty to Co-operate'</b>      | The revised NPPF strengthens the requirements of the 'Duty to Co-operate', effectively turning it into a 'Duty to Agree'.             | If approved by all partners, the SPG will be a clear statement of co-operation and agreement. It highlights the issues, identifies a strategy and, in its final form, will be a clear statement of agreement by the partners. This is a powerful statement and a good collaborative position for the partners which can be clearly demonstrated.  |
| <b>Statement of Common Ground</b>    | The revised NPPF establishes a mandatory requirement for a Statement of Common Ground and sets out a timetable for its preparation.   | The SGP provides much of the information needed for a Statement of Common Ground. The Statement of Common Ground will set out the agreement on housing numbers including a recognition on behalf of the partners that they will need to accommodate any demonstrated unmet need arising from Leicester City (and Oadby & Wigston Borough if necessary).   |
| <b>Reputational damage if one or</b> | Clear demonstration of failure to work co-operatively, lack of  | Withdrawal of support by a number of partners would signal clear failure in   |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>more partners does not approve the Plan</b></p>              | <p>strategy to address acknowledged development requirements and no framework for Local Plan. Consequential, ad hoc and piecemeal development pressures which would be difficult to resist.</p>  | <p>attempts at joint working. This would be likely to result in a position that would probably be worse than if the SGP process had not started. Intense pressure from development interests would be likely to arise across the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA), in all likelihood targeting the types of site that the SGP is attempting to protect (e.g. development in villages and rural areas).</p>   |
| <p><b>Delay in the preparation of Local Plans</b></p>              | <p>The SGP is intended as a framework for Local Plans. If this does not exist, then the Duty to Co-operate will need to be re-cast in a different form.</p>  | <p>Possibility of delay rather than rapid progression towards Statement of Common Ground being agreed across the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA and in the preparation of Local Plans.</p>   |
| <p><b>Failure to deliver new housing at the pace required.</b></p> | <p>Local Planning Authorities will have to return to relying on disaggregated and piecemeal ways of securing infrastructure.</p>   | <p>Government is committed to the delivery of new housing and accelerating the speed of delivery. Work on the SGP has already supported applications for funding (which have been successful). Homes England have expressed a willingness to support the partners in accelerating growth, bringing other government departments into the process. This is a good collaborative position for the partners to be able to demonstrate as they go forward.</p>   |
| <p><b>Delivering new infrastructure</b></p>                        | <p>Different mechanisms to make the case for arguing for strategic infrastructure would have to be devised. Returning to disaggregated and piecemeal means of doing this might not deliver provision at the scale and pace required.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure is currently delaying the delivery of some growth that already benefits from planning permission and, as a result, pressure continues to be exerted on other sites.</p> | <p>Government's view is that infrastructure and growth are closely aligned. Those authorities which best demonstrate joint working and a commitment to growth will access the greatest Government funding. Leicester &amp; Leicestershire has had some significant funding successes already e.g. the Melton Mowbray Relief Road; progress to Stage 2 of the Housing and Infrastructure Fund both the South-West Leicestershire package of improvements and the final section of the Melton Mowbray Relief Road.</p> |
| <p><b>Accelerating the</b></p>                                     | <p>The SGP demonstrates to</p>   | <p>Leicester City Council has secured</p>  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>pace of housing delivery</b></p>  | <p>Government the effort that has already been made by the partners to accommodate development via existing Local Plan allocations and planning permissions. This provides a good platform to negotiate infrastructure funding and other work with Government in order to accelerate delivery.</p>   | <p>Marginal Viability Funding to accelerate the pace of delivery at the important Ashton Green site. The Leicester &amp; Leicestershire partnership is recognised by Homes England who have offered support in a variety of forms. Accelerating the delivery of consented schemes allows local people to see how growth can support the local housing market and to see the merits of growth.</p>                                      |
| <p><b>Loss of confidence in the ability of the partners to plan pro-actively.</b></p> | <p>Powers exist already for the government to transfer control to the County Council if the partners fail to co-operate and manage growth positively and proactively through a plan-led approach.</p>  | <p>The SGP is an excellent example of collaborative working across organisations with responsibility for the whole range of local government functions. It could be an exemplar of how to balance competing interests and thereby maximise funding opportunities.</p>  |
| <p><b>The scale of growth will not reduce</b></p>                                     | <p>There is intense pressure for development in the logistics sector in the Leicestershire and Leicestershire area. Both the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (January 2017) and the new standard methodology for calculating housing needs (set out in the revised NPPF) indicate a similar scale of housing need across the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire housing market area.</p> | <p>The SGP does not promote growth above objectively assessed needs. That being the case, even if the SGP were to be abandoned, Local Plans would have to plan for the same scale of growth but with no over-arching strategy in place. The development industry could target particularly vulnerable authorities e.g. those whose five-year housing land supply is marginal.</p>  |
| <p><b>Deletion of the A46 Expressway ( Southern/Eastern Leicester Bypass</b></p>      | <p>Growth likely to gravitate towards existing infrastructure and major employment centres. Continued pressure also in villages and rural areas across the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire area.</p>  | <p>The SGP does no more than accommodate the objectively assessed needs of Leicester &amp; Leicestershire. That being the case, if the new A46 Expressway were to be deleted from the plan, some 38,000 dwellings would have to be provided in other locations. Conventional sustainability criteria are likely to support the notion that new growth should gravitate towards places with infrastructure and economic generators.</p> |