

## RESPONSES TO PROPOSED ALLOCATIONS

EMPLOYMENT	OTHER MATTERS
------------	---------------

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>The consultation and Call for Sites focus solely upon 'general' employment needs. It defers consideration of 'strategic' employment needs until the evidence has been produced. This limited scope could be prejudicial to some landowners / developers (e.g. Prologis/MAG) because:</p> <p>1) It does not address the full objectively assessed employment need as it relegates the scale and subsequent identification of 'strategic' employment sites to the later Regulation 19 consultation.</p> <p>2) It focusses solely upon 'general' employment needs and sites and excludes the possibility of identifying new mixed 'strategic' and 'general' employment needs sites as part of this consultation (e.g. the Prologis site) and though the Call for Sites.</p> <p>3) Draft allocation EMP98 (Wood Road, Ellistown) is identified as potentially accommodating both 'general' employment needs and future</p>	<p>The preparation of a Local Plan is an iterative process. A draft Plan's content gets refined as information comes forward at different times and from varied sources, including consultations and evidential studies.</p> <p>The Regulation 18 stage of consultation is an informal stage; a Local Planning Authority can utilise this stage as much or little as it wishes. A Regulation 18 consultation can relate to a complete draft plan (like the 2024 Reg 18 consultation on this Plan) or be limited to certain aspects (like this most recent Regulation 18 consultation).</p> <p>Strategic B8 evidence has been considerably delayed. In the Council's view this should not mean that progress with other aspects of the plan, most particularly other employment</p>	No change.	60	Prologis & MAG

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>'strategic' employment needs. The proposed draft allocation is contrary to the limited nature of this consultation and prejudicial to the subsequent Regulation 19 consultation which is the only opportunity for other developers to promote such mixed 'general' and 'strategic' employment sites.</p> <p>With respect to the Tests of Soundness:</p> <p>1) Restricting the consultation to 'general' employment needs whilst identifying a draft allocation (EMP98) that has the potential to meet 'strategic' employment needs confirms the consultation is not "positively prepared". The NPPF requirement to meet all objectively assessed employment needs should be met.</p> <p>2) An appropriate strategy for 'general' employment needs employment taking account of reasonable alternatives (i.e that mixed use sites may be able to contribute to general and strategic needs) is not being progressed. The Plan does not meet the 'justified' test.</p> <p>3) At this time, as strategic-scale sites have not been assessed, and as such, a clear economic vision and strategy has not been put forward, the Plan and consequent draft allocations have not</p>	<p>aspects, should also be delayed, including through consultation.</p> <p>Further, reports to the Council's Local Plan Committee have clearly stated the intention that strategic B8 requirements will be addressed in the Local Plan.</p> <p>In respect of the Prologis/MAG site and the risk of prejudice:</p> <p>1) Land south of the airport (EMP90), of which MAG/Prologis land forms part, was included in Reg 18 consultation in 2024.</p> <p>2) There is a current application on the site. It is clearly a site which is known to the Council.</p> <p>3) In the employment land supply assessments for its Local Plan, some general needs employment is ascribed to EMP90 of which the MAG/Prologis land forms part.</p>			

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL RESPONSE	ACTION	RESPONDENTS ID	RESPONDENTS NAME
<p>been made to meet this vision, and hence the Plan is not 'consistent with national policy'.</p> <p>The current consultation should have either included the Prologis site as a draft allocation to in part meet the 'general' employment needs or should be withdrawn until the full objectively assessed needs are identified and consequential draft allocations are made to meet the whole of these needs.</p>				
<p>Supports the principle of extending the Plan period. However, given the current consultation's limited scope it is likely that further consultation will be required. This could have implications for the overall plan-making timetable and the ability to meet the revised end date.</p>	Noted	No change	60	Prologis & MAG
<p>Strongly support the inclusion of the East Midlands Freeport as a key element of the future employment supply for North West Leicestershire but consider that at present the strategy and sources of supply in the consultation lack transparency and consistency.</p>	Noted. See response above.	No change	60	Prologis & MAG