

## Inspector's Note

### Context and General Approach

1. Figure 1 and paragraph 1.4 imply incorrectly that the Proposals Map is a Development Plan Document.
2. Page 11-12 not needed in final version of CS?
3. Detailed concerns about chapter 3:
  - It is rather long and repetitive, and confusing in places; it would benefit from some re-writing and editing.
  - Could be structured more clearly so that current circumstances are described in a simple and factual manner first, leading up to the consequent issues and challenges. These can then be set against SCS priorities, leading up to a refined list of the issues and challenges which the CS intends to tackle, via its Spatial Vision and Objectives.
  - The material used in the spatial portrait could be more selective and the section so focused that the District's main issues and challenges are self-evident/ jump out at the reader at the end of the descriptive section.
  - Paragraphs 3.2-3.5 are perhaps introduced too early in the chapter; it would be clearer if the District was described first to give the reader some background.
  - In 3.2 and 3.4, Green Wedges are referenced before any explanation as to what the term means.
  - 3.12 goes beyond the descriptive and seems to offer a possible solution – to provide more business floorspace and infrastructure. This seems premature. 3.13 also goes beyond presenting a spatial portrait of the District, and tells how the Audit has influenced the “Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives”. Perhaps 3.13 could be moved to Chapter 4.
  - Should it be “Spatial Objectives” in 3.13?
  - 3.16 appears to stray away from Population and Demographics into a description of the physical environment. Presumably it's the houses not households that are “constructed to a higher density”.
  - 3.22 repeats 3.16. 3.22-3.26 could be written more concisely so as to describe the local town centre hierarchy clearly, and in PPS4 terms.
  - The meaning and purpose of the first sentence of 3.26 is unclear. This paragraph seems to conflict with 3.10 which suggests that there are high levels of in and out commuting.
  - 3.27 reverts to describing the physical character of the area. Should this section be re-located after 3.6-3.7?
  - 3.29 goes beyond being descriptive and goes into the detailed matter of a shortage of allotments which cannot be met; 3.31 strays into policy making and delivery. (4.26 puts allotments at head of agenda; perhaps the sentences in this paragraph should be reversed?)
  - 3.32 and 3.33 priorities from the SCS are introduced as signalled in 3.5. These paragraphs go beyond describing the existing arrangements or what the priorities are, and say what the CS will do about them. Premature perhaps?
  - The conclusions to be drawn from Figures 2 & 3 are unclear. What is meant by “unconcealed cohabiting couple” and does it have to be distinguished from an “unconcealed married couple” in order to give a general picture of future

**Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy Examination  
Inspector's Note**

District-wide housing requirements? The figures relate to 2016 but CS runs to 2026.

- 3.39 seems to stray into policy matters (RSS is introduced) and 3.42 is aspirational rather than descriptive.
  - 3.43 and 3.44 – same concerns as for 3.32 and 3.33 – premature outline of policy to address SCS priorities?
  - 3.45 – The heading “...and Facilities” is unclear
  - 3.45 onwards repeats some of 3.8 and 3.10
  - 3.51 refers prematurely to policy?
  - 3.54 states a plan objective.
  - 3.56 Should this precede 3.55 as it is more descriptive of the current state of the local economy than a comment on the SCS priorities?
  - “Accessibility and Services” could this be headed “Transport” to give greater clarity?
4. It might help to include a diagram illustrating how the Spatial Portrait leads through issues and the SCS priorities to the Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives.

Jill Kingaby

INSPECTOR