

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OPTIONS AND POLICY OPTIONS - JANUARY TO MARCH 2022

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO Q3

Q3 - DO YOU AGREE WITH THE APPROACH TO LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS VILLAGES? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

A summary of the other comments received are set out below:

Comments	NWL Officer Response
The approach to defining local housing need in paragraph 3.10 of the emerging plan seems at odds with the definition in the Objectives section. This is confusing for users of the plan.	Objective 2 as consulted seeks to “Ensure the delivery of new homes, including affordable housing, which meet local housing needs including in terms of size, tenure and type.” At paragraph 3.10 of the consultation document it is stated that “In terms of Local Housing Needs Villages , housing development in these would be restricted to those that meet the needs of somebody with a demonstrable local connection to the settlement concerned.” As confirmed at paragraph 3.5 of this report , it is proposed to delete the word ‘local’ from objective 2.
Agree with the approach as it would help current residents whose accommodation is no longer suitable to stay in the area.	Comments are noted.
Local Housing Needs Villages are unsustainable locations and rural housing should be directed to the Sustainable Villages. The character of local housing needs villages should be preserved and housing should go to the larger settlements.	The majority of rural housing (i.e. outside of Coalville, Ashby, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth & Measham) will be directed to the Sustainable Villages. Officers are currently undertaking site assessment work to identify suitable housing allocations in the Sustainable Villages. The concept of Local Housing Needs Villages is to provide the opportunity to those with a demonstrable local connection to one of these settlements to build and occupy housing. Any development in such locations will be limited.
There is apparently serious pressure on housing needs in the area so appropriate development should be considered in any existing settlement	The Local Plan will identify the housing need for the District and set out how and where this need will be met over the plan period. Allowing development in all settlements across the district would fail to accord with national planning policy and the principles of sustainability. Based on the above considerations no change recommended
It is not clear whether the development permitted in ‘Local Housing Need Villages’ would be for market sale, for affordable	The purpose of the policy is to enable people who want to build in a Local Housing Needs Village to do so, subject to them meeting the proposed criteria. The policy is not intended to encourage speculative

housing provision, or for self-build plots.	developers to build in the LHNV's; the primary consideration will be whether the applicant can demonstrate a sufficient local connection.
Development in the Local Housing Needs Villages should be matched with appropriate infrastructure.	Given the local needs criteria proposed, the scale of development likely to come forward in the Local Housing Needs Villages is expected to be limited. It is unlikely to be of a significant quantum to generate infrastructure requirements from any proposed development.
It is not clear from the text whether the proposal applies to the 'Other Villages/Settlements' as well.	<p>The criteria is not intended to apply the 'Other Villages/Settlements' (now proposed to be retitled "Small villages or hamlets in the countryside") and this will be made clear when the policy/supporting text is consulted on in full at Regulation 19 stage.</p> <p>Based on the above considerations no change recommended</p>
<p>Local needs housing should be allowed on greenfield sites in all settlements.</p> <p>Local needs housing criteria should apply to all settlements.</p>	<p>All settlements in the top four tiers of the hierarchy (Principal Town, Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres & Sustainable Villages) have Limits to Development. Proposals for housing in the Limits to Development are acceptable in principle regardless of local needs housing criteria.</p> <p>As the District's housing needs cannot be met within the existing Limits to Development / on brownfield sites, the Local Plan will allocate additional greenfield sites in the top four tiers of the hierarchy. This will ensure housing comes forward in the most sustainable locations. Local needs housing criteria is not therefore specifically required in the top four tiers of the hierarchy.</p> <p>Local needs housing is not applied to the 'other villages/settlements' because they are not considered to be sustainable enough to support additional 'market' orientated growth.</p> <p>Based on the above considerations no change recommended</p>
Development [in the LHN Villages] shouldn't be restricted to local needs, more needs to be done to rebalance the age profile in these settlements.	<p>The approach to Local Housing Needs Village is less restrictive than the adopted Local Plan, which restricts development in the Small Villages to conversions of existing buildings or the redevelopment of previously developed land. It is considered an appropriate mechanism to allow a limited amount of development for those with a local connection.</p> <p>Based on the above considerations no change recommended</p>
The 10 year residence requirement (criteria a), b), c), and e) is too onerous	10 years is considered a sufficient period to ensure that there is a local connection without being too onerous.

	Based on the above considerations no change recommended
New-build applications could be open to abuse where life expectancy of those requiring care is very short.	<p>Criterion b) is considered important as it has the potential to affect somebody's way of life.</p> <p>However, this comment does raise an important issue about how criterion c) would be monitored and managed and whether it is necessary.</p> <p>Having considered this matter further, it is recommended that criterion c) is removed from the policy.</p>
<p>Criteria e) could potentially restrict people who lived in a LHN Village for the first 18 years of their life from being able to move back later in life.</p> <p>This could easily be resolved by allowing local needs dwellings for anyone who is currently or has previously resided in the parish for a period of 10 years or more.</p>	<p>This is considered to be a reasonable point and as such it is recommended that the reference to 'within the last 20 years' is removed from criterion e).</p>
<p>Are there any instances where a parish boundary crosses a village and how would the policy deal with this issue?</p> <p>Consideration should be given to whether the policy would work better with a clause that required the occupier to have previously resided within X miles of the village for a period of 10 years.</p>	<p>There are instances where parish boundaries cross the Local Housing Needs Villages (for example, Lount, Sinope and Coleorton). As a result (and having regard to the comments above regarding a 20 year period), it is recommended that criteria a) and e) are amended to read:</p> <p>a) Existing resident in the parish <u>or the Local Housing Needs Village in</u> which the application is located for a continuous period of at least 10 years prior to an application being submitted;</p> <p>e) No longer resident in the parish <u>or the Local Housing Needs Village in</u> which the application is located but has previously resided in the parish <u>or the Local Housing Needs Village</u> for a period of at least 10 years within the last twenty years</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to potentially widen the definition of local connection by incorporating a distance into the criteria. Parishes are a recognised geographical entity in their own right and so are an appropriate reference point for a local connection test.</p>
It is not clear whether under clauses a & e previous residency is intended to apply to people who lived in these villages as children. If so the demand could far exceed the ability of these villages to absorb.	<p>It is considered appropriate to give people who lived in the LHNV as children the opportunity to move back. However, it is considered unlikely that the scenario outlined would be realised in reality.</p>

<p>The policy needs to be clear whether/how the local needs dwelling will be retained in perpetuity.</p> <p>Would the Policy require the local needs dwelling to be retained for a certain period of time or for perpetuity? If the requirement is for perpetuity then how does this relate to those dwellings where permission is granted on the basis of ill health/care and that situation no longer arises?</p>	<p>The dwellings permitted in LHNV's should be retained in perpetuity. However, it is recognised there may be issues with re-selling or re-mortgaging these properties. Other Local Planning Authorities have dealt with this issue by relaxing the rules after specific time periods. It is recommended that policy officers look into this matter when finalising the policy wording.</p>
<p>The proposals limiting development to specific local needs criteria are acceptable but should be caveated in a way that allows small scale infill development within the limits of development to be brought forward on an opportunity basis where no local identifiable local need exists</p>	<p>This proposed caveat would broaden the scope for speculative development and goes against the aims of the policy. It is not recommended that such a caveat is included (in any event, the LHNV's do not have limits to development).</p> <p>Based on the above considerations no change recommended</p>
<p>The policy should be clearer on what would happen if a/to e can't be met.</p>	<p>If a proposal does not meet the criteria at a) to e) then it would be contrary to the development plan and would warrant refusal on this basis. This will be made clear in the final policy wording.</p>
<p>The criteria should be identified as aspiration in the supporting text rather than policy wording.</p>	<p>Identifying the criteria in the supporting text as aspirational is considered to go against the aims of the policy and broadens the scope for speculative development.</p>
<p>People with no previous association with the village should not be precluded from having the opportunity to purchase a new home.</p>	<p>The policy would not preclude somebody with no previous association with a specific village from being able to move in to existing housing, but the suggestion would go against the aims of the policy and broadens the scope for speculative development.</p>
<p>Presumably the wording of Policy S2 will be amended to include reference to the only housing being permitted in Local Housing Needs Villages is those that meet the local connection criteria proposed at paragraph 3.10, and presumably these local connection criteria will form part of a new policy to give them policy support, rather than being supporting text only, which would make it harder to ensure compliance with these criteria.</p>	<p>This will be made clear in the final policy wording.</p>