

## Matter 1: Context and General Approach

27 April 2010, starting at 1000 hours

*Chapters 1-4; Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy*

1. Inspector's Opening
2. Council's introductory remarks (regarding preparation of Core Strategy and its soundness)
3. Whether the Core Strategy satisfies the legal requirements
  - Local Development Scheme
  - Statement of Community Involvement and Regulations
  - Sustainability Appraisal
  - Consistent with national policy (but see item 7 below)
  - In general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)
  - Appropriate Assessment under Habitats Regulations
  - Superseded policies in the Local Plan
  - Regard for Sustainable Community Strategy
4. Schedule of Changes (Core Document [CD] 14/12)
5. Whether the Core Strategy includes an appropriate spatial portrait, overall vision and strategic objectives
  - Proposed revisions to Chapter 3
  - Coverage of the green environment
6. Whether the Key Diagram and references to the Proposals Map in the Core Strategy are satisfactory
  - Key diagram
  - Proposals Map
7. Whether there is any conflict with very recently issued national planning policy (See Inspector's Preliminary Note)
8. Any Other Business
9. Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

*Discussion on all items should focus on whether the Core Strategy is sound or unsound; and if it is unsound, exactly how it might be changed to achieve soundness.*

## Matter 2: The Spatial Strategy for Development

27 April 2010, following Matter 1

### *Chapter 5, CS Policy 1; Policy 3*

1. Whether the Spatial Strategy for Development in Core Strategy Policy 1 is sufficiently spatial? Whether it sets out clearly how much development is intended to happen where and when? Whether it is founded on a credible evidence base?
  - On the second question, does the Policy comply with paragraph 4.5 of PPS12 and the general principle that the Core Strategy, and not a subsequent DPD, should take the tough decisions? Is the status of the Core Strategy and other future DPDs correctly represented?
  - Should more be included in Policy 1 on the quantity and distribution of new development between the 3 centres and/or the scale and location of employment land provision in the Direction for Growth?
  
2. Whether Core Strategy Policy 1 sets out the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives?
  - Whether there is a need for a Direction for Growth to meet RSS housing requirements, having regard for the Regional Assembly's letter of 23 November 09, paragraph 3?
  - Whether the proposed Direction for Growth to the south-east of Wigston is the best option having regard for the following:
    - At options' stage, were areas of suitable size considered?
    - Was the Sustainability Appraisal of alternative areas fit for purpose?
    - Is the selected Direction for Growth preferable to the alternative area south of Oadby off the A6, having regard for: relationship to the PUA; transport; proximity to sites of importance for geology and biodiversity and land susceptible to flooding; land ownership and control; and capacity of schools and colleges?
  - The requirements for development after 2026?
  - The likely pattern of development in Harborough District and its impact on the A6?
  - Is the difference between the two areas such that selection of the area south-east of Wigston as a Direction for Growth is unsound?
  
3. Whether the proposal to hold back development of the Direction for Growth to 2017 is justified and in accordance with national planning policy in PPS3?
  - Likely impact of an early start to the Direction for Growth on other aspects of CS Policy 1, notably development in the centres of Wigston, Oadby and South Wigston?
  - Would a balance of developing greenfield and previously developed land bring benefits, such as a broader mix of housing development and more affordable housing?

*Discussion on all items should focus on whether the Core Strategy is sound or unsound; and if it is unsound, exactly how it might be changed to achieve soundness.*

**Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy Examination  
Agenda for Hearing Session**

- Is the Council suggesting in section 7 of its 'Further Representations' that it would be relying on windfalls in 2015/16 to maintain a 5 year supply of housing land?
4. Whether the references to an Eco Town are justified? Whether Appendix 4 and other references are compatible with the Eco-Towns Supplement to PPS1, the Location Decision Statement and plans of neighbouring Authorities?
    - Does paragraph 3.46 of the revised Chapter 3 provide justification for the inclusion of Appendix 4?
  5. Whether Core Strategy Policy 3 is justified? What "regeneration" schemes might arise other than those identified in Policy 2?
    - Is it a development management rather than a strategic policy, and is it needed?
  6. Any Other Business
  7. Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

*Discussion on all items should focus on whether the Core Strategy is sound or unsound; and if it is unsound, exactly how it might be changed to achieve soundness.*

## Matter 3: Housing

Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> April, Starting at 1000 hours

*Chapter 5, CS Policy 1; Policy 11, Affordable Housing; Policy 12, Housing Needs of the Community; Policy 13, Provision of Gypsy & Traveller Sites; Appendix 1 of the Core Strategy*

8. With reference to PPS3, Housing, whether the Core Strategy is likely to deliver a flexible, responsive supply of housing land over the plan period?
  - Figure 4 of the Core Strategy and the SHLAA
  - Housing trajectory (Figure 5 and Appendix 1)
  - Effect of economic uncertainty
  - Sufficient specific deliverable sites for the next 5 years
  - Overall adequacy of housing provision thereafter
  
9. Whether the expectations for delivery of housing opportunities in (a) the town/district centres and (b) the proposed Direction for Growth are reasonable and clearly expressed?
  - (a) the town/district centres Justification for figure of 393 new dwellings in the centres (Figure 4) and distribution shown in Chapter 8, Pages 99-102, of the Core Strategy
  - Deliverability
  - (a) the town/district centres and (b) the proposed Direction for Growth Whether the amount of new housing planned in each centre and the DfG should be made clear in Chapter 5?
  - Flexibility of the DPD to deal with changing circumstances
  
10. Are the policies for re-use of previously developed land, and for housing density, appropriate?
  - Re-use of pdl (and former employment sites)
  - Approach to windfalls
  - Housing density – clarity of the Core Strategy’s Policy 1; case for a lower density than 40dph in the Direction for Growth area
  
11. Does the Core Strategy provide satisfactorily for affordable housing, setting appropriate targets and thresholds, and proportions for social rented and intermediate housing, which relate to considerations of both local need and likely economic viability?

Evidence of a high level of need for affordable housing in the Borough (CDs 3/01 and 9/02) is not disputed.

  - Adequacy of economic viability assessment (CD9/01)
  - Absence of an overall target for affordable housing from Policy 11
  - References to “minimum thresholds” in Policy 11 and taking targets as a minimum in paragraph 7.18 of the Core Strategy
  - Responding to economic uncertainty
  - Location of Direction for Growth and numbers of affordable units
  - Site size threshold for providing affordable housing (10 dwellings)
  - Justification for 80/20% social rent and intermediate housing

*Discussion on all items should focus on whether the Core Strategy is sound or unsound; and if it is unsound, exactly how it might be changed to achieve soundness.*

**Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy Examination  
Agenda for Hearing Session**

- Approach to off-site contributions to affordable housing
  - Funding/ developer contributions
12. Is Policy 12 sufficiently clear and robust to deliver new residential development which will address “the need for differing household sizes and for diverse groups”?
- Compliance with PPS12, 4.30-4.33
  - Implications for future provision of flats/apartments, 2,3,4 bed & larger dwellings
  - Means of delivery
13. Is Policy 13 to provide for gypsies & travellers reasonable, fair and in accordance with national and regional policy?
- A “minimum level” of 1 residential pitch by 2012?
  - Are the criteria reasonable or too onerous, with particular reference to having adequate sewerage connections, not adversely affecting environmentally sensitive areas?
  - Is reference to proposals being “in accordance with National design guidance” fair and reasonable?
  - Application of Policy 8, Climate Change and Renewable Energy to gypsies and travellers.
14. Any Other Business
15. Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

*Discussion on all items should focus on whether the Core Strategy is sound or unsound; and if it is unsound, exactly how it might be changed to achieve soundness.*

## Matter 4: Economic Development

Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> April, Starting at 1000 hours

### *Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the Core Strategy*

1. Is it clear how the Core Strategy will make provision for the local economy to grow and prosper?
  - Role of the Core Strategy and other planning documents (paragraphs 4.1 and 4.5 of PPS12)
  - Existing economic situation, and employment land requirements as described in Core Strategy – 3.27 to 3.36 of revised chapter, 5.10 to 5.11 and 5.16 to 5.20
  - Amount of new employment land and premises planned (Core Strategy 5.12 to 5.14 and Policy 1)
  - Existing employment areas (Core Strategy 5.21 to 5.26)
  - Direction for Growth (balancing homes and jobs)
  - Policy EM1 of the Local Plan, Identified Employment Areas and Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy
  - Delivery partners for future economic growth including the LSP sub-group and the Universities
  
2. Is Core Strategy Policy 2 for the centres of Wigston, Oadby and South Wigston founded on good evidence of town centre hierarchy, and the need for retail and other town centre uses including leisure & office development, and does it describe the future for each centre clearly enough?
  - Consistency in the use of language to describe the main centres in the Borough in line with PPS4
  - Hierarchy of centres and Glen Road/Highcroft Avenue
  - Policy 2 and the amount of new development for the various town centre uses (retail, office, leisure) in each of the 3 main centres
  - Deliverability of Policy 2, with particular reference to the economic downturn
  - Reference to cultural activities including the theatre, museums and libraries
  - Wording of Core Strategy Policy 2 and reference to the sequential approach
  
3. Whether the Core Strategy takes sufficient account of the future plans for development of the University of Leicester (the “Development Framework Plan” mentioned in paragraph 5.87)?
  
4. Any Other Business
  
5. Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

## Matter 5: Climate Change and Renewable Energy; Flood Risk and the Water Environment

4<sup>th</sup> May 2010, starting at 1300 hours

### *Policies 8 & 9 of the Core Strategy*

Whether the policies in the Core Strategy on climate change and renewable energy accord with and add to national and regional policy?

The Council's further written representations helpfully elaborate on the links between strands of national policy, including emerging policy, and Core Strategy Policy 8. Outstanding points requiring discussion are:

1. Code for Sustainable Homes (reflection of national timescales, ability of Policy 8 to deliver, and flexibility in the light of changing national policy)
2. Details of any consequent changes to Policy 8
3. New development incorporating energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources (Policy 8, paragraph 6 and supporting paragraph 6.14) – compliance with PPS1 Supplement Planning and Climate Change, paragraphs 26-29.
4. The Council's further representations suggest potential for changes as follows:
  - A cross-reference from Policy 8 to Policy 1 (see 1.7 of further reps)
  - Reference to other local authority areas /clarification to paragraph 6.24 (4.1 of further reps)
  - Adding reference to the role of sustainable transport to tackling climate change (5.3 of further reps).

Whether Policy 9 is compliant with PPS25? Whether the Core Strategy should be amended to refer to the Water Cycle Study and/or the links between Green Infrastructure policies and flood risk?

5. Changes proposed by the Environment Agency and commented on in the Council's further reps.

Any Other Business

Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

## Matter 6: Countryside, Open and Green Spaces

4<sup>th</sup> May 2010, following Matter 5

### *Policies 5, 6, 7 & 17 of the Core Strategy*

Whether policies for green infrastructure, green wedges, the countryside, open space, facilities for leisure, recreation and tourism comply with national planning policy in PPS7, PPS9, PPG17, Tourism Good Practice Guide, PPG2 and RSS policies?

Also, whether they are supported by robust evidence and capable of delivering the desired outcomes in a flexible and responsive manner?

1. Proposed revision to Chapter 3 – adequacy of coverage of The Environment?
2. Green wedges – are they justified, and are their status and purposes clearly defined in Policy 6? See:
  - Local Plan Chapter 3 (3.34 onwards)
  - Regional Plan, especially paragraphs 4.2.10 & 4.2.18 and Policy Three Cities, SRS5
  - Landscape character assessment (CD11/16)
  - Management strategies (CD11/14 & 15)
3. Green wedge boundaries and the proposed Allocations DPD
4. Green wedge and Direction for Growth – Policy 1 & paragraph 6.5.
5. Definition of countryside and the Direction for Growth - Policy 7
6. Kilby Bridge – balance between new residential, leisure and tourism development and protection of biodiversity, historic assets, avoidance of development in area at risk of flooding and the rural character of the area.
7. Whether a sensitive and viable way forward is a realistic prospect, with reference to stakeholder support and potential funding
8. Away from Kilby Bridge, the means by which Policies 5 and 17 will deliver “new multifunctional areas of green space” and “the provision or improvement of open space, sport and recreational facilities.”
9. Any Other Business
10. Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

## Matter 7: Transport

5<sup>th</sup> May 2010, starting at 1000 hours

### *Policy 4 of the Core Strategy, and elements of Chapter 8*

Whether the Core Strategy sets out clearly the implications of its development proposals for the transport network, and is focused on promoting sustainable transport?

1. The Direction for Growth and the transport implications:
  - Potential benefits and disbenefits of Options B and C (CD6/01, 14/01, 14/02, 14/07)
  - Possible tram link (paragraph 8.11 of Core Strategy and table following) – justification and prospects for delivery. If soundly based, reasons for not including in Policy 4 of the Core Strategy.
2. Proposed public transport interchange in Wigston (paragraph 5.98) – justification and prospects of delivery. If soundly based, reasons for not including in Policy 4 of the Core Strategy.
3. Eastern District Distributor Road and final paragraph of Policy 4 – justification and prospects for delivery in the time period of the Core Strategy
4. Policy 4 and the Core Strategy as a whole – addressing the impact of population and employment growth on the transport network, identifying essential and affordable/deliverable infrastructure
5. Provision of safe cycling routes, and the promotion of cycling and walking in the green wedge/ rural areas
6. Car parking – Fourth paragraph of Policy 2, concerns of Oadby Trinity Methodist Church and case for a parking management policy
7. Any Other Business
8. Summary and Detail of any Changes Required

## Matter 8: Infrastructure and Delivery

5 May 2010, starting at 1400 hours

*Policy 1 & 2, 10, 14, 15, Chapter 8 and App 2 of the Core Strategy*

Having regard for PPS12 (paragraph 4.4 advises that the delivery strategy is central in a Core Strategy and 4.45 expands on the notion of deliverability), whether the Core Strategy focuses enough on delivery and implementation. Whether it is realistic about delivery, and whether the links between Chapter 5, Chapter 8 and Appendix 2 are sufficient to give a clear picture of intentions for delivery?

1. Chapter 8 tables
2. Policy 10 and supporting text
3. Appendix 2
4. Police Infrastructure and possible changes to the Core Strategy
5. Community Infrastructure Levy
6. Monitoring arrangements
7. Any other business
8. Summary and detail of any changes required.

*Discussion on all items should focus on whether the Core Strategy is sound or unsound; and if it is unsound, exactly how it might be changed to achieve soundness.*

## Wash-up Session

6 May 2010, starting at 1100 hours

1. Inspector to confirm possible changes to the Core Strategy which she wishes to be subject to advertisement and public consultation.
  
2. Review of the Hearings:
  - Venue
  - Programming
  - Pre-Hearing Meeting
  - Written material
  - Hearing sessions
  - Other matters
  - Lessons for the future

*Please note that the wash-up session will not be an opportunity to re-visit the substance of the matters covered in the 8 main sessions*