

EXAMINATION OF OADBY & WIGSTON LOCAL PLAN
MATTER 8 – CLIMATE CHANGE FLOOD RISK & RENEWABLE ENERGY

Inspector's issues and questions in bold type.

This Hearing Statement is made for and on behalf of the HBF which should be read in conjunction with our representations to the pre submission Local Plan consultation dated 18th December 2017. This representation answers specific questions as set out in the Inspector's Matters, Issues & Questions document.

Issue 1 : Whether Policy 38 is consistent with national policy and effective.

Q1. Is Policy 38 worded to ensure that it will be effective and that it would provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? In particular is the requirement to submit a Sustainability / Energy Statement justified and how will a decision maker know when the reductions of potentially harmful emissions demonstrated in the Sustainability / Energy Statement are sufficient to make the proposal acceptable?

Policy 38 is not worded to be effective and provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal contrary to national policy (NPPF para 154). Initially the Policy repeats the requirement for development to comply with Building Regulations despite NPPG advice to avoid undue repetition (ID 12-010). The requirement to submit a Sustainability / Energy Statement is unjustified, unduly onerous and provides not further clarity for the decision maker.

Q2. Policy 38 requires proposals for development to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation or on-site provision of buildings that reduce the need for non-renewable energy use? Is the requirement justified and could there be circumstances where both could be provided on one site?

The latter part of Policy 38 requires that all developments of 100 or more dwellings incorporate on site renewable energy generation or the provision of buildings that reduce the need for non-renewable energy use. The Policy is ill defined and imprecise indeed there could be situations where both requirements are required on one development. Therefore the Policy is susceptible to wide interpretation making it difficult to effectively implement during the development management process. Furthermore there is no evidence that these requirements have been robustly tested in the Local Plan viability assessment. A wide interpretation of these requirements could have a critical cumulative impact on the viability of new housing development (NPPF para 173 & 174) and its deliverability in the Borough.