

**Representations received during the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation November to December 2017 (with Officer responses)**

<b>Consultation response received (date)</b>	<b>Representation received from</b>	<b>Comment raised</b>	<b>Response given by Council Officers</b>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p><b>Chapter One - Introduction</b> Para 1.1.1 (Page 4)</p> <p>It is welcomed that the plan recognises the strong spatial relationship between the Borough and the City. The two authorities share many planning issues such as green infrastructure, economic and housing growth, retail provision and local services etc. The City wishes to continue to work collaboratively with the Borough on cross boundary planning matters.</p>	Comment of support noted.
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para 1.1.2 (Page 4)</p> <p>This paragraph states that: 'Leicester City Council is <b>the only two tier</b> unitary authority situated within Leicester and Leicestershire area;'</p> <p>The City Council is a unitary authority and the reference to 'the only two tier' should be deleted.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicester City Council for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>For clarity, the final sentence of paragraph 1.1.2 will be amended to –</p> <p><i>'Leicester City Council is the only <del>two-tier</del> unitary authority situated within...'</i></p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para 1.1.3 (Page 4)</p> <p>The plan recognises the strong strategic planning relationship across the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA). The City Council is committed to working with Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough Council and all the other authorities within the HMA on HMA wide strategic planning issues, including the emerging Strategic Growth Plan.</p>	Comment of support noted.
15.12.17	Sport England	Sport England supports the corporate priorities around	Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor

		<p>health, wellbeing and other priorities which support sport and active recreation.</p> <p>We also support the vision but perhaps would add 'active' to the line,..... high quality, healthy and active lifestyles...</p>	<p>modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Sport England for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to amend the third paragraph of the Vision, to take account of Sport England's comment. The proposed wording is as follows –</p> <p><i>'Residents in the Borough will have the opportunity to enjoy peaceful, harmonious, high quality and healthy <b>active</b> lifestyles...'</i></p>
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Strategic Context</p> <p>The University has significant economic, social, cultural and environmental roles and impacts within the Borough and it is important that the Local Plan acknowledges both these existing impacts and roles and the scope for the University's growth and investment to reinforce and enhance these. The University's land holdings combined with investment in the Borough has the potential to be a major contributor towards meeting some of the strategic needs identified by the Council in the PSLP.</p> <p>The spatial strategy for the PSLP takes into account the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA). This is obviously important as whilst the University's physical campus is located within the neighbouring authorities, the University owns and manages significant land holdings within the planning jurisdiction of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council. Most notably this includes the halls of residence and sports grounds located within the north of the Borough, along Stoughton Drive South, Manor Road and Stoughton Road.</p>	Comment noted.
18.12.17	Gladman	Duty to Cooperate	Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.

		<p>It is accepted that Oadby and Wigston have fulfilled the legal requirements on the Duty to Cooperate as they have been working alongside the other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities commissioning joint evidence base work and assisting in the preparation of the Strategic Growth Plan (SGP).</p> <p>However, there are some concerns over the Duty to Cooperate when it comes to the soundness of the OWLP.</p> <p>Many local authorities across the country are currently working at a rate of knots to submit their Local Plans before March 2018 in order avoid potential issues with the standardised approach to housing needs. Whilst the importance of having local plans in place is acknowledged, it is vital that this is not at the expense of the proper planning for areas and communities. These representations highlight some of our concerns regarding the Pre-Submission Draft of the Plan, in particular regarding the absence of a strategic approach to the distribution of housing needs across the HMA and how the anticipated needs of people and families living in the HMA may otherwise go unmet without practical solutions to such issues being secured through positive cooperation.</p> <p>The need to positively plan to meet full housing needs across housing market areas should not be underestimated. It is all too easy for the duty to cooperate to be seen as an administrative exercise, however the fundamental social and economic need to ensure a supply of good quality housing to meet the homes and employment requirements across the wider area is a key issue that must be addressed properly through the plan making process. Whilst it may be the case that a local planning authority has sought to work</p>	<p>The Council would like to reiterate that the Local Plan process for all of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA authorities is different to the process of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan.</p> <p>In December 2017, the Council approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes.</p> <p>In addition, all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. The relationship of the Strategic Growth Plan to Local Plans is set out at paragraph 1.5.2 of the Local Plan, which states <i>'although the Strategic Growth Plan deals with the time period up to 2050, it treats the period's pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan's. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a 'notional housing need'. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA'</i>.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>positively with its neighbours, the extent to which a plan tackles strategic priorities that arise from the strategic cross-boundary evidence base are an issue to be considered in assessing the soundness of that plan.</p> <p>Although the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities continue to work on the SGP, there has been considerable slippage in the timetable for the preparation of this document which has meant many of the authorities within the HMA have either submitted or are about to submit their plans before the SGP is adopted. This is obviously an unsatisfactory position for the HMA, particularly as Leicester City has identified housing needs which cannot be met within its own boundaries. In the case of Leicester City, the level of unmet housing need is likely to be considerable. In fact, it is anticipated that the next stage of consultation on the SGP will not take place until early 2018, so adoption of the document is unlikely to take place until late early summer 2018 or later, well after the submission of the OWLP.</p> <p>If Local Plans in the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA are adopted prior to completion of the SGP, even with early review policies included within those plans, it will still take the authorities a considerable length of time to prepare plans which are in accordance with the SGP and deal with the issue of unmet housing need across the HMA. This means that the real housing needs of those unable to access the housing market will continue to go unmet for many years, a situation that the current Government consider unacceptable.</p> <p>The OWLP refers to a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which is being prepared by the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities and is likely to be completed in January 2018. With unmet need</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan. In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan policy.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>having already been identified within the HMA, the distribution of this unmet need will need to be addressed through both the SGP and updated MOU. There are therefore still considerable uncertainties regarding the distribution of housing growth across the HMA and Oadby and Wigston may still be required to accommodate a proportion of the identified unmet housing need. As the OWLP is being advanced before these issues have been fully resolved, this is considered to be an unsound basis upon which to prepare the Local Plan.</p>	
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>Duty to Co-operate</b>  The Duty to Co-operate (S110 of the Localism Act 2011 which introduced S33A into the 2004 Act) requires the Council to co-operate with other prescribed bodies to maximise the effectiveness of plan making by constructive, active and on-going engagement. The high level principles associated with the Duty are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paras 156, 178 – 181) and in twenty three separate paragraphs of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). In determining if the Duty has been satisfactorily discharged it is important to consider the outcomes arising from the process of co-operation and the influence of these outcomes on the Local Plan. One of the required outcomes is the delivery of full objectively assessed housing needs (OAHN) for market and affordable housing in the housing market area (HMA) as set out in the NPPF (para 47) including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with sustainable development (NPPF para 182).</p> <p>The Borough is entirely within the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA) and is bordered by three neighbouring authorities of Leicester City Council, Blaby and Harborough District Councils. It has been</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Throughout the production of the Local Plan, the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate. All local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) have good working relationships and a common goal, which is meeting the HMA's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) in both housing and employment. The Duty to Cooperate Statement document illustrates how the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate throughout Local Plan production.</p> <p>The Council would like to highlight that it has clarified and set out how it is to meet its OAN for both housing and employment over the Plan period up to 2031. The Council <u>does not</u> have a declared unmet need for housing or employment.</p> <p>In addition to the Council meeting its own OAN for housing, the Local Plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need.</p>

		<p>determined that Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough Council is a constituent part of the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA together with Leicester City Council, Blaby, Charnwood, Hinckley &amp; Bosworth, North West Leicestershire, Melton and Harborough District Councils. The Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HEDNA 2017 identifies an OAHN for the HMA of 4,829 dwellings per annum between 2011 – 2031 or 4,716 dwellings per annum between 2011 – 2036.</p> <p>It is understood that Leicester City Council and Oadby &amp; Wigston District Council have both formally written to other HMA authorities declaring unmet needs amounting to as at February 2017 a shortfall of 8,834 dwellings up to 2031 in Leicester and as at March 2017 161 dwellings up to 2031 or 1,076 dwellings up to 2036 in Oadby &amp; Wigston. Although the Council now states in the pre submission Local Plan that its own needs will be met in full. The Council should clarify whether or not the Borough’s own OAHN will be met in full before the Local Plan is submitted for examination.</p> <p>Currently there is no Duty to Co-operate Statement. It is understood that a Statement of Co-operation and Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) will be prepared and signed by the HMA authorities (see para 1.5.3) but the absence of such documents at the time of the pre submission consultation is a serious omission. It could be considered that the Council has co-operated on an on-going basis with its neighbouring authorities in the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA thereby complying with the legal requirements of the Duty the outcomes from that process in particular meeting unmet needs in the HMA are not yet concluded which is an unsound basis on which to prepare a Local Plan. The Local Plan should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet OAHN (para 182) based on evidence (para 47) with emphasis</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Borough has worked proactively and positively to meet its OAN for housing, particularly as it has been a huge ‘step’ change. The Local Plan period target of 2960 over the 20 year plan period is a 60 per cent increase on the Core Strategy target of 1800 new homes (over a similar 20 year period).</p> <p>In December 2017, the Council approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes.</p> <p>It should be noted that page 8 of the Council’s Local Plan sets out the relationship of the Strategic Growth Plan with Local Plans. Paragraph 1.5.2 of the Local Plan states <i>‘although the Strategic Growth Plan deals with the time period up to 2050, it treats the period’s pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan’s. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a ‘notional housing need’. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA’.</i></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>on joint working on cross boundary issues where housing needs cannot be wholly met within individual Council administrative areas (para 178 – 181). As the Oadby &amp; Wigston Local Plan has been prepared within a context of uncertainties this should be considered an unsound basis for plan making because the Plan cannot be positively prepared, effective or consistent with national policy. Whilst there are benefits for development management purposes of having an adopted Local Plan these benefits should not outweigh the requirements for a sound Plan. The approach of deferring into the future via Local Plan Reviews the solution to identified unmet housing needs should not be condoned. These are not just arbitrary numbers but represent households in need of housing now which should not be ignored and “kicked into the long grass”.</p> <p>It is also understood that the HMA authorities and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) are working on a non-statutory Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan on which a consultation was expected in summer 2017 (now overdue). This Plan will set out in broad terms the amount and location of housing, economic and infrastructure growth until 2050. It is proposed that this strategic framework will be taken into account by Local Plans which will include an agreed spatial distribution, a housing land strategy to boost the speed of housing delivery and a refresh of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) incorporating the Midlands Engine for Growth proposals. The precise relationship between the Local Plan and this non-statutory document is not clear.</p> <p>By the time of the Local Plan Examination a Statement of Common Ground explaining cross boundary working as proposed in the recently published Housing White Paper (HWP) “<i>Fixing The Broken Housing Market</i>” and</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>"<i>The Right Homes in the Right Places</i>" consultation may be required. If a Statement of Common Ground is prepared the HBF may wish to submit further comments on the Council's legal compliance with the Duty to Co-operate and any implications for the soundness of the Local Plan in further written Hearing Statements and during oral discussions at the Examination Hearing Sessions.</p>	
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>The University supports the duty-to-cooperate and suggests that the borough continues to explore how housing demands from across the HMA can be accommodated within suitable areas in the Borough across the period of this Local Plan.</p> <p>The University has significant land holdings within the Borough and is willing to explore with it and other HMA partners how this land could potentially be used to help address housing and other strategic needs. This is discussed further under Chapter Six (Housing Delivery) below.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>Local Plan Review</b></p> <p>Paragraph 1.5.5 proposes a review of the Local Plan but this commitment is not set out in Policy. As currently worded the HBF is concerned that this text is not a firm policy commitment to an early review. There is no specified timescale for review. There is always the concern that a Council will not deliver in a timely manner on its commitment to an early review even if set out in a Local Plan policy. It is suggested that the any commitment is set out in Policy including a specific timetable for the commencement (within 3 months of adoption) and submission for Examination (within 2 years). Such a Policy will ensure consistency with the North West Leicestershire Local Plan which also dealt with the same issue of unmet needs in the Leicester &amp;</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the levels of development proposed will come forward within the Plan period as expected and illustrated within the Local Plan housing trajectory. As with any trajectory, the further into the future it forecasts, the (potentially) less reliable it becomes. In the short to medium term the Council are confident that the trajectory is accurate and robust and the 'buffer' is unlikely to be required. Up to 2031, as illustrated, the Borough area can just provide (from a transport and highway network capacity point of view) the required housing need. Post 2031, the Strategic Growth Plan has the potential to 'unlock' further land within the Borough through its</p>

		<p>Leicestershire HMA and was modified accordingly in its recently concluded Examination.</p> <p>The final version of the MoU anticipated to be signed in January 2018 should set out the declared unmet housing needs in the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA together with the proposed re-distribution of these unmet needs. This should be set out in the Local Plan Review Policy.</p> <p>It is also known that an early review is not the optimum policy mechanism by which to resolve unmet housing need because of the slow response time of such reviews. Therefore ahead of any early review the Council should provide a greater contingency within its overall Housing Land Supply (HLS) together with reserve sites subject to appropriate release mechanisms to give additional flexibility and speed to meeting these identified unmet housing needs.</p>	<p>proposed provision of large scale highway and transport infrastructure that would relieve the pressures on the transport and highway network within the Leicester Principal Urban Area, particularly Leicester City and the Borough of Oadby and Wigston.</p> <p>In addition, the Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan. In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan policy.</p>
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>The Strategic Growth Plan</p> <p>One of the key elements of the Strategic Growth Plan, which deals with the time period up to 2050, is the potential delivery of a vehicular expressway to the south and east of Leicester that links the M1 motorway with the A6, the A47 and the A46 (the Eastern District Distributor Road). The Council acknowledge that the expressway will significantly improve access to the motorway network, unlock new land for development and reduce the high levels of traffic and congestion in both the borough and the City of Leicester.</p> <p>It is not clear from the Evidence Base currently available how the Council or its HMA partners have reached this conclusion on the deliverability of the expressway, or what efforts have been made to</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Eastern District Distributor Road (EDDR) does not comprise the vehicle expressway that is proposed within the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. They are two very separate entities, one local in its impact (the EDDR / potential transport route), and one very strategic in nature (the vehicle expressway linking the M1, A6, A46 and A47). It should also be noted that the EDDR / potential transport route is safeguarded for utilisation in the Local Plan period up to 2031 and the vehicle expressway proposed within the Strategic Growth Plan is relevant to development delivery post 2031.</p> <p>The vehicle expressway proposed within the Leicester</p>

		<p>progress the scheme. This is somewhat surprising given the significant opportunities it could deliver in terms of housing, transport and delivery of strategic priorities both for the Borough and the wider Housing Market Area (MHA).</p> <p>We note that the Council propose to commit to a review of the Local Plan within 5 years of the date of its adoption by which time it considers the proposals for the new expressway will be at a more advanced stage, and therefore its effects within the Borough will become a policy consideration. Again the evidence base for this assumption has not been provided and given that policies within the new Local Plan will mean that the expressway is a material consideration (e.g. Policy 18 Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth area and Oadby Cemetery Allocation) from adoption we consider that this evidence should be prepared and available for consideration at this stage. This is important because the consequences of not progressing it are significant in relation to long term housing delivery and also the ability to address any shortfall in both the Borough and the HMA in the medium term.</p>	<p>and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan is not a material consideration, nor is it a policy consideration within the Council's Local Plan.</p> <p>The Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan is being consulted on publicly between the 11<sup>th</sup> January and the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2018.</p> <p>It should be noted that the housing delivery proposed within the Local Plan is not reliant on the delivery of the EDDR / potential transport route. The delivery is also not dependant on any proposals set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan due to the growth plan considering growth post 2031 only.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Page 8 - The Leicester and Leicestershire Statement of Cooperation and Strategic Growth Plan</p> <p>Paragraphs 1.5.1 – 1.5.4</p> <p>Page 8 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan sets out how the Council considers it has fulfilled its Duty to Co-operate, as set out in S110 of the Localism Act 2011, which introduced S33A into the 2004 Act. In addition to the legal requirement in respect of the Duty to Co-operate, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides guidance on how this should be undertaken and what should be incorporated so as to ensure that the duty is fully</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Borough area of Oadby and Wigston is unique in England and comprises a small compact urban area, adjacent to the major City of Leicester. The Borough area is constrained by a number of factors, including land availability; however its key constraint is its severely congested transport and highway infrastructure network. As illustrated by the South East Leicester Transport Study, the scale of development identified within the Council's Local Plan up to 2031 can just be accommodated, however with required mitigation. Additional development over and above that</p>

		<p>discharged.</p> <p>Paragraph 179 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. Paragraph 181 continues that Local Planning Authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination.</p> <p>Paragraph 182 of the NPPF makes clear that a plan should be positively prepared in order to be 'sound', i.e. it should be prepared to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, <i>"including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development."</i> This is also reflected in paragraph 47 in respect of housing, which requires Local Plans to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.</p> <p>Considered in the context of this clear framework for cross boundary working, Oadby and Wigston is one of the Leicestershire planning authorities, which, together with Leicester City, form the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA). Oadby and Wigston Borough in its entirety is also a component part of the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA).</p> <p>There has been a long history of co-operation amongst the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities in respect of strategic matters. This extends to housing, and the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic</p>	<p>identified within the Local Plan could seriously undermine the deliverability of the development identified in the Plan.</p> <p>Throughout the production of the Local Plan, the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate. All local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) have good working relationships and a common goal, which is meeting the HMA's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) in both housing and employment. The Duty to Cooperate Statement document illustrates how the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate throughout Local Plan production.</p> <p>The Council's Local Plan allocates sufficient land to meet its own Objectively Assessed Needs in full.</p> <p>In addition to the Council meeting its own OAN for housing, the Local Plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need. It should be noted that Leicester City is the only authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA to declare an unmet housing need. All other authorities can (at least) meet their own identified need.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Borough has worked proactively and positively to meet its OAN for housing, particularly as it has been a huge 'step' change. The Local Plan period target of 2960 over the 20 year plan period is a 60 per cent increase on the Core Strategy target of 1800 new homes (over a similar 20 year period).</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Development Needs Assessment 2017 (HEDNA) sets out the identified objectively assessed housing needs (OAHN) for the HMA: 4,829 dwellings per annum 2011 – 2031 and 4,716 dwellings per annum between 2011 – 2036.</p> <p>It is apparent from Leicester City Council’s own work on their emerging Local Plan that there is an acknowledged shortfall in Leicester’s capacity to meet its own OAHN to 2031 within its administrative boundaries. The City Council’s Local Plan ‘Emerging Options’ Consultation Paper states at paragraph 3.7 that there is a shortfall of around 15,000 dwellings to 2031 but potential housing capacity within the City’s boundaries of only an additional 7,100. Consultation on this paper closes on 17th December 2017.</p> <p>It is logical that as a directly adjoining authority area that also forms part of the PUA, Oadby and Wigston Borough should be considering the serious likelihood that it will need to accommodate additional land within the Borough to meet the unmet needs identified in Leicester City and addressing this, even in the most flexible terms, within this pre-submission stage of the Local Plan.</p> <p>At present, Oadby and Wigston are proceeding towards examination of a Local Plan against this backdrop of uncertainty, with no agreement yet in place between the various authorities in respect of housing distribution. Indeed it is set out in paragraph 1.5.3 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan that a Statement of Cooperation and subsequent Memorandum of Understanding are yet to be produced and signed. Of great concern is the fact that this agreement is critical to meeting OAHN up to 2031, i.e. the same plan period</p>	<p>In December 2017, the Council approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes.</p> <p>In addition, all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. The relationship of the Strategic Growth Plan to Local Plans is set out at paragraph 1.5.2 of the Local Plan, which states ‘although the Strategic Growth Plan deals with the time period up to 2050, it treats the period’s pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan’s. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a ‘notional housing need’. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA’.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>as the emerging Oadby and Wigston Local Plan, not some distant, theoretical prospect. The absence of any such co-operation statement fundamentally undermines the ability of the Plan to meet the requirements set out in paragraphs 47, 178 – 181 and 182 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Whilst Oadby and Wigston may have co-operated with other authorities on a superficial level, the lack of effective and meaningful outcome to this collaboration has serious implications for the soundness of the emerging Local Plan. It is difficult to see in this context how a plan could be considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>It is our view that in order to be considered sound, there must be a Memorandum of Understanding in place between the authorities in the Leicestershire HMA and recognition of the requirements of this in the emerging Oadby and Wigston Local Plan.</p>	
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para 1.5.2 (Page 8)</p> <p>Paragraph 1.5.2 of the plan refers to the Strategic Growth Plan, noting that it will treat the period up to 2031 and then from 2031 to 2050 differently. In terms of housing need, in the period to 2031 it is recognised that there is sufficient capacity within the HMA to meet the overall housing needs of the HMA albeit that the actual distribution of the HMA wide housing need will need to be considered through individual local plans.</p>	Comment noted.
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Paragraph 1.5.5.</p> <p>The Council states in paragraph 1.5.5 that it is committed to a review of the Local Plan in 5 years. However, this commitment is made in the context of addressing post-2031 development needs as will be set</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2017, national government requires local planning authorities to</p>

		<p>out in the yet to be published Strategic Growth Plan. The plan does not make any commitment to a review of the plan to ensure that more immediate housing needs across the HMA can be met, either in the text or policy.</p> <p>Delaying review of the Plan until a third of the way into the plan period could significantly undermine housing delivery across the HMA and is no more in any case than is required by National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) to keep plans up to date. It is certainly not sufficient to deal with the particular circumstances of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, where there is known unmet need in Leicester that will need to be accommodated in adjoining authority boundaries.</p> <p>Given the timescales often involved in a review of the local plan, it is considered that the Local Plan should contain a formal policy commitment to specific timescales to ensure that the review takes place in a timely manner.</p> <p>It is also our view that in order to comply with the requirement for a Plan to be positively prepared (and thus meet the tests of 'soundness') and in recognition of the evidence base regarding unmet housing need in Leicester, it would be prudent for the Plan to make provision for 'reserve' housing sites that could be released as future growth requirements arise. This approach would accord with the approach set out in paragraph 157 of the NPPF that states that Local Plans should take account of longer term requirements, i.e. beyond a 15-year time frame. It would also aid the speed of local plan review and provide the flexibility to deal with changing circumstances as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>review the Local Plan every 5 years from date of adoption.</p> <p>In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan (not the Strategic Growth Plan) no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan.</p> <p>In addition it should be noted that the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has specified the introduction of regulations that require local authorities to review Local Plans at least every five years. DCLG suggest (in a letter dated 21st December 2017) that, every 5 years from adoption, authorities must carry out an assessment of whether the Plan remains relevant and effectively addresses the needs of the local community or whether policies need updating. Depending on the assessment outcome, the local authority will publish their reasons for not updating policies, or update their Local Development Schemes to set out the timetable for updating their Plan (and then should update their Plan). The Council is not aware of any recent DCLG statement that suggests that local authorities should set out Local Plan review completion / end dates within its Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council's Local Plan allocates sufficient land to meet its own Objectively Assessed Needs in full. The Local Plan also identifies a residential 'buffer' of approximately 400 new homes, which would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites in the</p>
--	--	--	--

		The site north of Newton Lane at Seven Oaks Farm in which Davidsons Developments Ltd has an interest, would be an appropriate reserve site which, together with the site to the west of Seven Oaks Farm (which also has developer interest), would relate well to the Wigston Direction for Growth Area. Further consideration is given to this site later in these representations.	future, but also could help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's unmet need.
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para 1.5.6 (Page 8)</p> <p>The plan includes a mechanism at (para 1.5.6) where a review of the plan would commence when a 'local authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA has an evidenced unmet need, which cannot be met by the other local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA and / or within the flexibility allowed within this Plan'.</p> <p>Whilst we support the principle of such mechanisms, we would question the wording of the trigger where it states that Oadby and Wigston would only consider the issue of unmet need if the other authorities in the HMA cannot fully address the unmet need between them. We would suggest that the redistribution of any unmet need should be approached jointly between all authorities in the HMA, so that any outstanding unmet need is redistributed sustainably and to an agreed strategy.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The statement made within paragraph 1.5.6 does not exclude Oadby and Wigston Borough Council. The wording – '<i>...which cannot be met by other local authorities</i>' is relevant to the each of the HMA local authorities equally.</p> <p>The Council is committed to working with all other local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area on all Duty to Cooperate issues / topics, specifically unmet housing and / or employment need.</p>
15.12.17	Gordon White and Hood	<p><u>Chapter 2 - Spatial Portrait Comments – GWH (Ellis Farm, Kilby Bridge)</u></p> <p>Section 2.3.12 – Tourism plays a small yet important role in the area – this would and could be enhanced by opening up the lake and public open spaces as shown on the drawing for inclusion within an amended local plan. The change to a conservation area within private ownership would not be beneficial to the local</p>	Comments noted.

		<p>community and tourism. A small car park would aid the traffic and parking issues in the area.</p> <p>Section 2.4.3 – makes reference to the SSSI, with the new proposal as shown this area could be opened up to the public and extended into a new managed area. This would be made possible with the addition of a small scale residential extension as indicated within the report.</p> <p>Section 2.5.1 refers to areas of flooding to Kilby Bridge, this site is not part of the flood zone this is to the south of the canal.</p> <p>Section 2.6.1 refers to tourism, which would be enhanced by our proposals. Protection of the environmental and biodiversity would be enhanced by managed extensions to the SSSI and possible public access to areas currently in private ownership. Potential flooding issues, see above. The settlement is a gateway to the borough from the south, the current amenity is poor and lacks any coherent design, small scale development and enhancement to the existing buildings on the main road with new residential and possible nursing / assisted living properties would enhance the views into the area. The parking of cars on the verges and land in front of our site is currently detracting from the Gateway to the area.</p>	
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Chapter Two – Spatial Portrait</p> <p>The University welcomes the statement at paragraph 2.3.11 (Social Characteristics) of the PSLP that the University of Leicester currently acts as one of the major land users, employers and catalysts (in Oadby) for inward investment in the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA), as well as within Oadby itself.</p>	Comment of support noted.

		The PSLP recognises that the University has had a presence in the Borough for over 50 years and during this time has expanded its facilities which now provide student accommodation, conferencing and sports facilities. The sports facilities are considered to be used and enjoyed by local clubs and groups. The University acknowledges as correct the statement in paragraph 2.3.11 that it <i>"plans to continue improving and expanding its facilities and replacing outdated accommodation"</i> .	
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>Key Focus Areas</u></p> <p>Bullet 11 should be updated to include reference to settings in order to reflect the NPPF and ensure a sound plan, such as:- "Conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings."</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the Historic England for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council propose to add <b>'and their settings'</b> to bullet 11 of the Key Focus Areas section of the Plan. It is considered that the wording would better reflect that of the NPPF.</p>
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 20 - Key Focus Areas</u></p> <p>The recognition of the need to provide sufficient land to meet objectively assessed housing needs (OAHN) as a key focus is welcomed as is the need for house types and tenures that meets the needs of all the community.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wigston Direction for Growth area)	<p>These representations are made on behalf of David Wilson Homes East Midlands who have interests in the proposed Wigston Direction for Growth. David Wilson Homes worked closely with the Borough Council on the adopted Core Strategy and the promotion of Phase 1 of the Wigston Direction for Growth. This first phase of the Direction for Growth is due to start onsite imminently following approval of the first reserved matters application.</p> <p>The following comments are made in relation to the</p>	Comment of support noted.

		<p>Submission Draft Plan proposals to identify the Wigston Direction for Growth as one of three key strategy sites to deliver the Borough's housing requirements over the plan period and the identification of Phase 3 as a buffer to provide flexibility in the Council's housing land supply to deal with changing circumstances.</p> <p><u>Spatial Objectives, Paragraph 3.2.1</u></p> <p>The Spatial Objectives for the plan include Spatial Objective 2, Wigston Town Centre, which aims to reinforce Wigston's role as the Borough's main town and one of only a small number of town centres in the Leicester PUA, and Spatial Objective 7 aiming to establish a number of directions for growth adjacent to the Leicester PUA, located to reinforce Wigston's main town centre role.</p> <p>These Spatial Objectives are supported and reflect and carry forward the key spatial objectives set out in the adopted Core Strategy. At the examination into the Core Strategy, the Inspector fully endorsed this key spatial strategy. The provision for the expansion of the Wigston Direction for Growth through additional phases of development will play an important role in supporting the Council's strategy to reinforce Wigston's role as a Main Town. The Wigston Direction for Growth is well located in relation to Wigston Centre and future residents will enjoy easy access to the centre by sustainable modes.</p>	
15.12.17	Sport England	Support para 3.1.9, 3.1.10, 5.2.1 and 5.2.8 and <u>spatial objectives 6 and 9</u> also policies 5 and 6 – Sport England believes Active design can support these objectives and help to create sustainable communities by the delivery of policy objectives.	Comment of support welcomed.
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<u>Page 24 – Spatial Objective 7 (Growth of Leicester PUA)</u>	Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.

		<p>This objective is supported, however, reliance on the Leicester Principal Urban Area (PUA) as a driver for growth harks back to the approach of the now superseded Regional Plan. This reference should be replaced with an intention to support sustainable development that relates to the expansion of the urban areas of Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston rather than a need for these developments to be 'directly adjacent to the Leicester PUA'.</p>	<p>Spatial Objective 7: Growth of the Leicester PUA does not state a reliance on the Leicester PUA as a driver for growth. The Spatial Objective seeks a number of growth areas that are directly adjacent to the existing Leicester PUA that are logically and well connected.</p> <p>The Council considers locating planned growth adjacent to existing well connected urban areas is considered sustainable, when compared to disconnected standalone growth.</p>
13.12.17	Tetlow King	<p>The Plan recognises in <b>Chapter Three</b> "<i>the need for a diverse mix of housing types and tenures that are accessible to all will mean that all residents will have a safe and secure home to live in.</i>" We note that there is an identified need for 148 affordable housing units to be delivered per annum within the Borough to 2031 (paragraph 2.3.8). <b>Spatial Objective 8</b> seeks a mix of housing opportunities to meet local housing needs, including a mix of type, tenure and affordability. Rentplus would make a positive contribution to the affordable housing offer within the Borough, offering affordable rented properties with the long term aim of home ownership.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>For clarity, paragraph 2.3.8 of the Plan does not state that the annual affordable housing need for the Borough is 148 dwellings. The text states –</p> <p><i>'the most up to date Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) illustrates an Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the Borough of 148 new homes per annum up to 2031. This OAN figure includes the need for affordable housing.'</i></p>
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>The Spatial Objectives, page 25</u></p> <p>Spatial Objective 12: Enhancing local heritage In order to more closely reflect the NPPF and ensure a sound plan, reference to 'settings' should be included and 'preservation' substituted for 'conservation', such as:- "To encourage the enhancement and <b>conservation</b> <del>preservation</del> of historically significant buildings and heritage assets <b>and their settings</b>, archaeological sites, conservation areas, parks ..."</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the Historic England for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council propose to amend the text of Spatial Objective 12 as suggested by Historic England as it is considered that the wording would better reflect that of the NPPF.</p>
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 25 – Spatial Objective 13 (Green Wedges)</u></p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>

		<p>This objective should re-iterate the purpose of Green Wedges and the role that they perform rather than emphasising their 'blanket' protection from anything other than exceptional development. Recognition that not all of the new development required to meet the housing needs of the Borough can be accommodated within the existing urban areas is supported. However, it is clear that additional greenfield land releases will be required.</p>	<p>Due to the Borough's predominant urban nature, green open spaces, in particular green wedges, are extremely important for biodiversity as well as the local (human) communities. Spatial Objective 13 illustrates the Council's desire to protect these green wedge areas from inappropriate development. The detail of how and why these are should be protected (from inappropriate development) and enhanced, and their purpose and roles are set out within Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges. It should also be noted, that one of the Council's Corporate Priorities illustrated on page 6 of the Council's Local Plan, states that the Council will deliver 'Green and Safe Places'.</p> <p>In addition, the Council has undertaken a Green Wedge Review. The purpose of the Council's Green Wedge Review is to assess the boundaries of the existing green wedge designations, as defined on Council's Saved Local Plan Proposals Map and the Council's Adopted Policies Map. The review took into account the Broad Location for Growth Areas identified within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the options for greenfield release sites identified within the Council's Preferred Options Local Plan consultation document.</p>
15.12.17	Gordon White and Hood	<p>Section 3.1.13 refers to increased opportunity to access open countryside in Kilby Bridge, this is currently not possible due to the lack of pathways and parking areas, our proposed scheme allow for the possible rebuilding of the bridge across the canal and the use of some of the private land for public access.</p> <p>Section 3.2.1 objective 14 – refers to regeneration of the settlement of kilby bridge, but without additional areas capable of being developed this is hard to achieve, our small scale development allows for the enhancement of the area and better access enhancing</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope states that the Council will consider small scale development proposals within the defined Settlement Envelope of Kilby Bridge. The policy makes provision for up to 40 new additional dwellings within the defined settlement envelope.</p> <p>The extent of the settlement envelope defined within the Local Plan consists of the existing brownfield areas</p>

		the environmental and heritage access.	of Kilby Bridge settlement, part of which is designated conservation area. The Council considers that the existing brownfield elements of the Kilby Bridge are capable of delivering each element of the policy and there is not a need to extend the defined settlement envelope beyond the existing brownfield areas into open countryside.
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wheatcroft Properties)	<p>Spatial Objective 14</p> <p>Spatial objective 14 advises that the settlement of Kilby Bridge would benefit from small scale development, consisting of residential, commercial and tourism. This spatial objective is supported.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Chapter Four - Sustainable Places</p> <p>The PSLP recognises that much of the University of Leicester's student accommodation, conferencing facilities and sports and recreational facilities are based at their campus in Oadby.</p> <p>The University is committed to investment in their Oadby campus towards further education, skills, enterprise and academic growth. The information provided at the beginning of this letter and set out in Table 1 provides an indication of the University's expected growth, some of which will be diverted towards Oadby.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.3 states that the Council "<i>continues to support the general principle of enhancement of the University of Leicester's Oadby Campus, however would encourage the preparation of a long term framework for its future development</i>".</p> <p>The University is committed to liaising and consulting with the Borough Council in relation to any future developments. As our previous representations have</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council would always encourage the production of a Masterplan for development that seeks more than small scale change, however it is aware that not all development proposals are subject to a Masterplan.</p>

		<p>highlighted, small scale investment in the campus could be undertaken on a piecemeal basis or through the development and/or redevelopment of individual buildings. We consider that in those cases, the requirement for a masterplan or development brief as stated under emerging Policy 7.6 would not be applicable and the other emerging policies within the LPPPO would be considered instead. Furthermore, we consider a bespoke policy supporting clearly defined objectives would be useful in this regard. This would afford the Council control over such matters. The University would welcome the opportunity of discussing such a policy with the Council.</p>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>Gladman are supportive of the inclusion of the policy on Sustainable Development. The ethos of sustainable development is key to assessing planning proposals and is the golden thread running through the NPPF.</p> <p>However, Gladman object to the working of the final paragraph of Policy 1 as it is written in a negative fashion and does not reflect the positive nature of the Framework. The whole of the final paragraphs should be reworded to reflect the model policy on Sustainable Development, emphasizing the positive nature of the Framework.</p> <p>The final paragraph should therefore read:</p> <p>“Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>The Council would not object to the wording of the final paragraph of Local Plan Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development being reworded subject to the intention / objective of the policy remaining the same.</p>

		<p>1. Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>2. Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.</p>	
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p><b>Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</b></p> <p>Paragraph 14 of the NPPF establishes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', the wording of which is now well-established and recognised. Paragraph 15 of the NPPF directs that policies in Local Plans should, "<i>follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should [have] clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally</i>".</p> <p>Draft Policy 1 of the Pre-Submission version of the Local Plan seeks to establish a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The final part of proposed Policy 1 states that, "<i>should there ever be a time when the Plan is deemed absent or silent or out of date, the Council will not look upon development proposals positively, where the proposal is deemed unsustainable, and / or the adverse impacts associated with the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits...</i>".</p> <p>In our view, this wording is excessively negative, and fails to capture the positive thrust of Paragraph 14, which directs that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or policies in the Framework indicate that development should be</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council would not object to the wording of the final paragraph of Local Plan Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development being reworded subject to the intention / objective of the policy remaining the same.</p>

		<p>restricted. Put another way, it fails to recognise that where Paragraph 14 is engaged, a 'tilted balance' is to be applied, as established in <i>Cheshire East Borough Council versus the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Renew Land Developments Ltd.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, we conclude that the final paragraph of draft Policy 1 is inconsistent with the NPPF and requires amendment in order to accurately reflect the 'presumption' in Paragraph 14.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p><i><b>On behalf of our client, we conclude that Policy 1 is unsound because it is inconsistent Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. The Council should amend the wording of Policy 1 in order to be consistent with the NPPF.</b></i></p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough</p> <p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>Policy 2 of the draft Local Plan identifies a requirement to allocate land for 2,960 homes over the plan period (148 per annum). This seeks to deliver the full objectively assessed need of 148dpa [see paragraph 4.2.5] as identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA, January 2017.</p> <p>The overall approach of the HEDNA broadly reflects the approach advocated in the NPPG. However, a number of the specific assumptions would either benefit from clarification or are not supported as described below:</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p>

		<p>Concerns about the HEDNA</p> <p>1) Table 1 of the HEDNA identifies that the population growth of the HMA was consistently under-estimated during the intercensal years, owing to un-attributable population change (UPC). This is broadly recognized as being attributable to two factors, namely a potential misenumeration in one or other of the Census's (with either the 2001 Census under-estimating the actual population or the 2011 Census over- estimating the actual population) or an error in the estimated migration flows during the intervening years. It is impossible to attribute the UPC to one or the other of these factors, and so a large number of consultants preparing HEDNA's (including Neil McDonald who is quoted as a reliable source within the HEDNA) assume that 50% of the UPC is attributable to each factor. Such an approach has also been supported by numerous Local Plan Inspectors (including Inspector Pratt at the Stroud Local Plan examination). If such an approach was applied in Leicestershire, then this would uplift the population growth across the HMA by circa 742 people per year. However, the current approach of the HEDNA is equivalent to assuming that 100% of the UPC is attributable to errors within one of the Census's without any justification in support of this.</p> <p>2) In paragraph 2.26 of the HEDNA , a number of sensitivity tests are identified. The first relates to rebasing the projection to 2015 and the second relates to applying a longer term migration trend. It is however, unclear whether the second sensitivity test also rebases the projection to 2015, which is required in order to align with the most recent evidence as required by the NPPG (2a-017).</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>3) In paragraph 5.15, it is identified that changes are made to the commuting rates identified by the 2011 Census. However, the HEDNA does not identify which source (if any) the data comes from to make such an adjustment. It only alludes to "published data on jobs and population growth". This cannot be relied upon without the necessary reference as it is not justified in any way. Furthermore, data on jobs and population growth does not provide the necessary information about how those people and jobs interact through commuting. The only publicly available information on commuting rates is taken from the Census and this has the added advantage of being comprehensive as all households are legally required to submit returns. It would be virtually impossible to justify any adjustment from the comprehensive and robust figures provided by the Census in the absence of a comprehensive collection of primary data such as a survey with a high response rate (i.e. a new local Census).</p> <p>4) In paragraphs 5.18 to 5.32, various sources for the employment rates are considered. It is identified that the OBR rates take account of the participation rates of different cohorts. These cohort-specific participation rates are a key determinant of the likely future workforce owing to the significant variance in participation of various cohorts (for example, a 16 or 64 year old is far less likely to be in full time employment than a 45 year old). The OBR rates also estimate the impacts of specific policy factors such as the change to retirement ages. These therefore provide robust and credible rates as relied upon by the Government. However, the HEDNA dismisses these and instead relies upon Experian rates which simply assume 80% participation without any justification and without taking any account of the participation rates of different cohorts, all of which is inconsistent with the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Government's analysis (prepared by the OBR). Such an assumption relies upon a fundamental change in participation rates across all cohorts. In particular this requires that older people continue to work for a far longer period, regardless of their health and their ability to undertake more manual tasks. This departure from current rates is clearly a policy-on adjustment which should not be used to inform the objectively assessed need.</p> <p>The preceding analysis suggests that the objectively assessed need of 148 homes per annum, identified by the Council is not robust and that it should be increased.</p> <p>It is recognised that the DCLG have recently published the "Planning for the right homes in the right place" consultation which suggests that the objectively assessed need for Oadby and Wigston should be 133 homes per annum. However, a potential flaw with the standardised methodology is that because it projects forward past growth trends they will often result in a low OAN where growth has in the past been constrained. It should be noted that the housing requirement of the Oadby and Wigston Core Strategy was only 90dpa. In any event this document is still subject to consultation and as such cannot be afforded significant weight.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>Unmet Housing Needs</p> <p>The draft Local Plan does not allocate any housing sites to act as a contingency to address the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities or to ensure that the objectively assessed need is delivered, and to provide</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council's Local Plan allocates sufficient land to meet its own Objectively Assessed Needs in full. The Local Plan also identifies a residential 'buffer' of</p>

		<p>choice and flexibility to the market.</p> <p>The unmet needs of neighbouring authorities are unknown at present, although a final Memorandum of Understanding is due to be published in January 2018 which will detail the distribution across the authorities. This will be necessary to demonstrate that the duty to cooperate has been met. Pegasus Group therefore reserve the right to make further representations once this is available.</p> <p>However, in the interim, the Emerging Options consultation for Leicester City identifies a housing requirement which produces a shortfall of between 7,900 and 15,000 homes (or 395 to 750 per annum). The draft Oadby and Wigston Local Plan acknowledges that the LPA is aware of the fact that Leicester City has declared an unmet need and that it will need help from other HMA partners to deliver its unmet needs up to 2031 [paragraph 4.2.5].</p> <p>These unmet needs of Leicester City are likely to be most sustainably met within the authorities which neighbour the City, namely Blaby, Oadby &amp; Wigston, Harborough and Charnwood. If as a broad proxy it was assumed that each of these were required to meet a quarter of the unmet needs of Leicester City, this would produce an additional requirement for 99 to 188 homes per annum in each authority which the draft Local Plan does not allow for. This alone (although based on a very crude distribution) suggests that the housing requirement proposed in the draft Local Plan will be insufficient to meet the identified objectively assessed needs (which in themselves are under-estimated) including the unmet needs of Leicester City across the HMA.</p>	<p>approximately 400 new homes, which would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites in the future, but also could help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's unmet need.</p> <p>The Borough area of Oadby and Wigston is unique in England and comprises a small compact urban area, adjacent to the major City of Leicester. The Borough area is constrained by a number of factors, including land availability; however its key constraint is its severely congested transport and highway infrastructure network. As illustrated by the South East Leicester Transport Study, the scale of development identified within the Council's Local Plan up to 2031 can just be accommodated, however with required mitigation. Additional development over and above that identified within the Local Plan could seriously undermine the deliverability of the development identified in the Plan.</p> <p>The Council considers that the suggestion of up to 188 additional new homes per annum in addition to the 148 new homes per annum identified in the Local Plan is unfounded. As the Council has mentioned, the Borough's transport and highway infrastructure network can just meet (with required mitigation) the 2960 over the Plan period (up to 2031) (148 per annum), let alone an additional (up to) 188 new homes per annum. Such levels of development suggested by Pegasus, for the size of the Borough would just not be deliverable or appropriate.</p>
18.12.17	Pegasus Group	Housing Delivery and Contingency	Comment noted.

	(Oadby Grange)	<p>Table 1 of the draft Local Plan identifies past completions and commitments and deducts these from the Housing Requirement of 2,960 to establish a residual requirement of 1,614 homes which need to be allocated. However, this takes no account of lapse rates for current commitments or future allocations. It would be unrealistic to assume that all of these sites will deliver in their entirety. The LPA is therefore trying to be overly precise and it would be sensible to identify additional allocations to provide greater certainty.</p> <p>At paragraph 4.2.11 the draft Local Plan indicates that there would be a "buffer" of approximately 400 dwellings if there were any deliverability problems and this could also help fulfil a "small" proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the draft plan does not actually allocate any of these sites and it does not therefore provide any such contingency.</p> <p>With regard to the 40 homes that could be delivered within Kilby Bridge, this would normally be considered as windfall development within the settlement boundary of a rural settlement.</p> <p>If the 40 dwellings are to be dispersed across a number of small sites then it is unlikely to deliver affordable housing. Moreover, Kilby Bridge is a rural settlement, constrained by floodplain and is at the southernmost part of the District [see para 7.1.1]. If other sites fail to deliver, then housing at Kilby Bridge is not going to meet those needs in the most sustainable location.</p> <p>Reference to the windfall allowance is noted but this is expected to come forward anyway and should be read alongside the fact that the housing requirement is</p>	<p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission..</p>
--	----------------	---	--

		<p>expressed as a minimum in any event. It is noted that reference is also made to a possible Phase 3 at Wigston Direction for Growth Area but paragraph 4.2.12 indicates that this has not been tested and it is envisaged that it would come forward post 2031 at paragraph 4.3.6. Therefore, even if this site does deliver it will not contribute to the housing requirement.</p> <p>Given the concerns already identified above about the OAN and unmet needs it is anticipated that more land will be required than the unallocated buffer of 400 units that the draft plan alludes. The Local Plan itself also appears to recognise that this buffer would only help to fulfil a "small" amount of Leicester City's unmet needs, all of which indicates that there is a need for additional sites.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wigston Direction for Growth area)	<p><u>Housing Growth, Paragraph 4.2.11</u></p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.11 indicates that in addition to the various components of housing supply set out in Table 1 to the Submission Draft Plan, there is an additional number of new homes that could be delivered up to the end of the Plan period 2031 and beyond. Reference is made to Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth with the scope to provide approximately 300 additional homes. The Draft Plan explains that the identified additional new homes figure of approximately 400 homes in total allows the Council a 'buffer' against the Plan period target of 2,960 homes to address any delivery issues on allocated sites and help to fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need.</p> <p>The identification of a buffer including Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth is supported. This approach is advice to Government from the Local Plans</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Upon the publication of the HEDNA in January 2017, the Council has had to work extremely proactively and positively to meet its illustrated housing OAN. The housing OAN illustrated within the HEDNA (and subsequent Plan target) is a huge 'step change' for the Council. From planning for 90 dwellings per year, the Council has had to plan for 148 dwellings per year to fulfil its own OAN.</p> <p>The huge change / shift in housing requirement has meant that the Council has had to identify and allocate over 60 per cent more land than it would have been required to identify should the requirement have remained at 90 dwellings per year. The Council however, has managed to identify such required land.</p> <p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study assessed</p>

		<p>Expert Group who recommend that local planning authorities include in their local plans a mechanism to provide for reserve sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement. The DCLG, in a presentation to the HBF Planning Conference in 2015 identified the need for a 10-20% non-implementation allowance and a 15-20% lapse rate.</p> <p>The Council's suggested buffer of some 400 dwellings would provide a 13.5% buffer against the overall housing requirement. To provide a 20% buffer would require an additional reserve provision of around 590 dwellings.</p> <p>As drafted, the Council's approach to the identification of a proposed buffer is not expressed in a specific local plan policy. In addition, whilst specific locations are identified, such as Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth, these reserve sites are not identified on the Submission Draft Plan Proposals Map.</p> <p>In order to boost significantly the supply of housing, the NPPF, paragraph 47 advises that local planning authorities should identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.</p> <p>It is considered that the Plan's approach to the provision for a buffer could be strengthened by the inclusion of a specific policy setting out the Council's proposals to provide for a buffer/reserve sites. For Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth, for clarity this broad location for additional growth could be identified on the Proposals Map. It is noted that one of the reasons for the identification of the buffer is provide for Leicester's identified unmet need over the plan period to 2031. This is a further reason why it would be</p>	<p>the highway and transport network within the Borough up to 2031 taking account of the land identified and allocated within the Local Plan. The assessment concluded that the levels of development proposed could be accommodated, however highway mitigation works would be required. Any development over and above that proposed within the Plan is likely to have significant further impacts on the local highway network.</p> <p>The 'buffer' identified within the Plan of approximately 400 new homes would be subject to appropriate testing, in particular highway and transport infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>The Council notes the representation that states that 'Phase 3' of the Wigston Direction for Growth has capacity for a further 200 new additional homes, therefore increasing the potential capacity from 300 to 500.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>appropriate to identify the broad location for Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth more clearly.</p> <p>To provide for a 20% buffer as recommended by the Local Plans Expert Group would require the identification of an additional 190 dwellings on top of the 400 identified in the Submission Draft Plan. There is the scope if required to provide for an additional 500 dwellings on land at the Wigston Direction for Growth within the control of David Wilson Homes.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wigston Direction for Growth area)	<p><u>Policy 2, Spatial Strategy</u></p> <p>Policy 2 sets out the proposed spatial strategy to provide for at least 2,960 new homes over the plan period, with the three Direction for Growth areas providing for at least 1,159 additional homes and 5 hectares of employment land. The spatial strategy is supported. The Direction for Growth is a key component of the proposed strategy. Through its work on Phase 1 of the Wigston Direction for Growth, David Wilson Homes has demonstrated that the Direction for Growth is a sustainable and deliverable development opportunity. With the double outlets of Barratts and David Wilsons, the Direction for Growth can deliver the rates of development envisaged in the Draft Plan.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Turley Planning	<p>Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough</p> <p>Policy 2 states that in order to achieve the required levels of growth to meet the Borough’s needs up to 2031, the Local Plan will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• allocate sufficient land to provide at least 2,960 new additional homes;</li> <li>• allocate sufficient land to provide at least 8 hectares of employment use development; and</li> <li>• identify sufficient land to provide up to 2,974 sq m of new additional retail floorspace.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response set out in further responses to Turley Planning.</p>

		<p>To achieve this growth, the plan identifies and allocates land within Wigston town centre, Oadby district centre, South Wigston district centre, the Borough's designated local centres, areas within the Leicester PUA and the three Direction for Growth Areas. Our client considers that Policy 2 of the Pre-Submission Plan fails to plan for the levels of growth actually required over the plan period, particularly in respect of housing and the provision of new retail floorspace. In doing so, the Pre-Submission Plan therefore fails to allocate sufficient land to meet the Borough's actual need over the plan period.</p> <p>In terms of residential development, Paragraph 4.2.4 confirms that the Council considers its Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing to be 2,960 for the period to 2031. This figure is taken from the Housing &amp; Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) (January 2017).</p> <p>The HEDNA confirms that the OAN figures presented "do not represent plan targets", instead they "represent the starting point for considering housing provision within local plans" (Paragraph 12.42). This is recognised in the Pre-Submission Plan, which also states the OAN should be the starting point for the Council's target over the plan period (Paragraph 4.2.4). Paragraph 4.2.6 and Policy 2 confirm that the spatial strategy set out in the Pre-Submission Plan only seeks to deliver 2,960 new homes across the plan period.</p> <p>Whilst this figure is in line with the claimed OAN, our client is concerned that the level of new homes planned for is not sufficient.</p> <p>As recognised by the Council, the OAN should be seen</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>as a starting point only when determining the appropriate housing requirement. Other factors must also be taken into account, which should include the need to meet unmet need in Leicester City.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3.1 of the Pre-Submission Plan acknowledges the importance of the Borough of Oadby and Wigston recognising that it shares a strong spatial relationship with Leicester City - given that the Borough is located immediately adjacent to the City and located predominantly within the Leicester PUA.</p> <p>The Pre-Submission states that the Council can meet its OAN in full, without the need to rely on any other Local Authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area to help meet its own need.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.5 accepts that, however, that the City of Leicester has an identified unmet need and will require help from other HMA partners to deliver its unmet need up to 2031. Despite this, and the clear spatial relationship between the two authorities, the Pre-Submission Plan seeks to meet its own OAN only. The Pre-Submission Plan (Paragraph 4.2.7) claims that the proposed "spatial strategy for housing growth allows sufficient flexibility to ensure that the Plan aligns with national policy and guidance". We would disagree with this statement.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.11 of the Pre-Submission Plan does identify that "there is an additional number of new homes that could be delivered up to the end of the Plan period or beyond". It claims that the additional homes allow the Council a 'buffer' of approximately 400 homes against the plan target of 2,960 (the OAN), which would "negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites". It continues by stating that the additional homes</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>figure could help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's unmet need".</p> <p>Whilst the Council refer to the c.400 homes as being 'additional', it is noted that the 2,960 requirement is set out as a minimum 'at least' figure. Any homes above this figure are therefore not additional. The Pre-Submission Plan also recognises the importance of delivering above the OAN figure given the nature of strategic sites (e.g. the associated lead in times and upfront infrastructure requirements). It is therefore considered unlikely that the level of housing planned for in the Pre-Submission Plan will provide any meaningful contribution to the identified unmet need of Leicester City.</p> <p>Turning to new retail provision, Policy 2 states that the Local Plan will identify sufficient land to provide up to 2,974 sq m of new additional retail floor space. This provision is broken down to 1,169 sq m at Wigston Town Centre, 1,351 sq m at Oadby District Centre and 454 sq m at other areas within the Leicester PUA. The policy provides no further breakdown as to what whether this floorspace provision relates to convenience or comparison goods.</p> <p>Our client is strongly of the view that the retail provision planned for through Policy 2 is insufficient to meet the actual qualitative and quantitative convenience need over the plan period. The full reasoning behind this position is returned to below in Policy 22, which deals specifically with 'delivering retail'. In light of the above (and the points made below in relation to Policy 22), the Pre-Submission Plan is not considered 'sound' given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not positively prepared – given that the spatial</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>strategy set out in Policy 2 fails to meet the full development requirements of the Borough, together with unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities (Leicester City);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not justified – given that Policy 2 does not represent the most appropriate strategy, on the basis that it fails to provide for sufficient levels of residential and retail growth in particular;</li> <li>• It is not effective – given that it does not adequately reflect cross-boundary strategic priorities.</li> </ul>	
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>Policy 3</u></p> <p>The second bullet point to ‘conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings’ is strongly welcomed.</p>	Comment of support noted.
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>Smaller sites</u></p> <p>A site specific policy would be helpful for the following sites due to potential impact upon the significance of heritage assets:-</p> <p><u>Off Long Street</u></p> <p>The site is within The Lanes Conservation Area, with numerous other heritage assets within the vicinity including Grade I and II* Listed buildings. As such, the development will require particularly careful design in relation to heritage assets; a site specific policy would help to ensure this.</p> <p><u>Off Station Street</u></p> <p>The site is within South Wigston Conservation Area, with other heritage assets close by, including the Grade II* Church of St Thomas. The office section of the depot, an attractive feature within the Conservation</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>All development proposals on the ‘smaller site’ allocations will need to conform to relevant policies set out within the Local Plan. Due to the location of the Long Street and Station Street allocations, both Local Plan Policy 40 Culture and Historic Environment Assets and Local Plan 41 Development in Conservation Areas will apply. The Council considers that these policies provide sufficient wording for the management, conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings for any development proposed within such locations.</p>

		Area, should be incorporated into the scheme if possible – a site specific policy is therefore suggested.	
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 27 paragraph 4.2.7</u></p> <p>The implicit recognition that greenfield land releases are required in order that the authority meets it's OAHNA is welcomed and this reflects representations made on behalf of Bowbridge Land (and others) in respect of the previous Local Plan consultation. As I indicated in these representations, my clients feel that the land at Sutton Close should be considered as an option for greenfield land release either as a separate Direction for Growth (DfG) or as an extension of the Cottage Farm Residential Allocation, to which Policy 21 refers.</p>	Comment of support noted.
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 28 Table 1: Housing delivery for the Plan period</u></p> <p>As indicated above, my clients support the need for further greenfield land releases but feel that there is scope for these to be increased to include the land at Sutton Close. The suggested 'allocation' of 205 homes on unidentified sites within the town centre of Wigston and/or the district centre of Oadby and 250 homes on unidentified sites elsewhere provides no certainty in respect of delivery for developers, the authority or for prospective residents. It is suggested that categories F and H are combined and reduced by 200 dwellings (i.e. to 255 dwellings) and the figure within category G be increased by 200 dwellings to 1359 dwellings to allow the allocation of the Sutton Close site. It is unclear how the projections for category F and H sites set out in Figure 1 (page 29 of the consultation) have been arrived at so it is assumed that these have been extrapolated from previous performance within the Borough.</p> <p>It is clear from the annual dwelling totals in Figure 1</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Table 1: Housing delivery for the Plan period, sets out the how the Council proposes to fulfil the Plan period (up to 2031) target of 2960 additional dwellings. The Council considers that the levels of development proposed within the table and the subsequent housing trajectory are developable and deliverable over the Plan period. It would be inappropriate of the Council to include sites or development opportunities that were deemed undevelopable or undeliverable.</p> <p>Row F of the table specifies the remaining number of new homes allocated through the Council's adopted Town Centres Area Action Plan (205). With the Council owning the majority of the sites allocated within the Area Action Plan and it having recently set up an housing delivery company, the Council is confident that such levels of development will be fulfilled within the Plan period. It should also be noted that the Council has an adopted Local Development Order for town</p>

		<p>that the Borough needs a 'step-change' in housing delivery in 2018/19 onwards to meet its OAHN. That being the case, it is even more important that the authority allocates sufficient land for development that will definitely be delivered rather than relying on identified sites that may or may not come forward for development.</p> <p>The land at Sutton Close Road, Oadby (page 46 of the 2012 SHLAA) was considered unsuitable and unachievable in this assessment but this appears to be solely in respect of its designation as Green Wedge. The release of the site for residential development would be an environmentally appropriate and sustainable development. As indicated above, the site at Sutton Close represents an opportunity to deliver a sustainable residential development of approximately 200 dwellings (the site size is approximately 9 hectares, although part of the site would be given over to amenity and other open space – see below). Vehicular access to the land could be provided via either Sutton Close and/or Tilton Drive.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the requirements for any local plan to meet the tests of soundness (in particular, the requirement for the plan to be positively prepared and justified), it is considered that the inclusion of the land at Sutton Close would ensure that the plan is founded on the most appropriate strategy.</p>	<p>centre sites within Wigston.</p> <p>Row H of the table relates directly to the small sites allocations specified within Local Plan Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough. All of the sites allocated have been subject to recent SHLAA assessment and have been found developable and deliverable within the 5 year period. It is also worth noting that a number of the sites allocated are currently progressing through the planning application submission process and the Council is a landowner of the certain sites specified. The Council is therefore confident that the 250 units specified within row H will come forward within the Plan period up to 2031.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the Council (within Local Plan Policy 2) has identified land for up to an additional 400 units as a 'buffer' should growth over the Plan period not come forward as expected.</p>
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 32 – Direction for Growth Areas</u></p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.31 details the three Direction for Growth areas that the Council have chosen to accommodate the bulk of the housing growth over the Plan period. Whilst the Wigston and Cottage Farm DfGs are robust as they are essentially based on committed sites, the Stoughton Grange DfG is a new proposal. This DfG is</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 18 Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth area and Oadby Cemetery Allocation requires that the route of the former Eastern District Distributor Road (EDDR), now Potential Transport Route is safeguarded.</p>

		<p>envisaged to accommodate approximately 300 new dwellings yet it contains a new transport route connecting Gartree Road with Leicester Road (the A6). This transport route was previously referred to as the Leicester Eastern District Distributor Road (LEDDR) and it has been a 'bottom drawer' plan that Leicestershire County Council have had a desire to deliver for many decades. It is unclear whether the development of the Stoughton Grange DfG relies on the delivery of this transport route but this is considered highly questionable for a number of reasons. These include it's lack of funding, the need for compulsory purchase of the rear gardens of a number of residential properties at Meadowcourt Road, Wych Elm Road, Holly Close and Ringers Spinney, the significant adverse environmental impact of the new road on a large number of existing properties along the route as detailed above and also including Southmeads Close, Southmeads Road, Manor Close and Manor Road. If the delivery of the DfG is not reliant on the LEDDR, it is unclear why it is referred to in the allocation and on the Adopted Policies Map.</p>	<p>The safeguarding of the route in this instance, is only relevant to the land area contained within the Borough and does not extend beyond the Borough boundary. As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, the Council, in collaboration with Leicestershire County Council, Harborough District Council and Leicester City Council, commissioned Edwards and Edwards Consultancy Ltd to produce the South East Leicestershire Transport Study. Part of the remit of the study was to assess the likely impact of the potential transport route should it be built out.</p> <p>The study concluded that, should the route be built out, there would be likely benefits to traffic undertaking orbital movements linking the Fosse Park industrial / commercial areas and the M1 junction with the PUA area to the East of Leicester City. The results also show that traffic from Oadby and Wigston would potentially make use of the scheme using Brabazon Road to access the A6 rather than using the B582 through New Street in Oadby.</p> <p>It should be noted that the delivery of the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth Area is not dependant on the delivery of the safeguarded potential transport route. The Local Plan safeguards the route.</p>
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 34 – Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough</u></p> <p>As indicated above, my clients are concerned about the strategy for the delivery of the required number of houses as this relies upon identified sites in the within the town centre of Wigston and/or the district centre of Oadby and 250 homes on unidentified sites elsewhere. My clients are also concerned about the delivery of the Stoughton Grange DfG for the reasons set out above.</p>	Comment noted.

		The 250 additional homes detailed in Policy 2 are existing commitments rather than meeting residual needs. This could be positively addressed with the allocation of the Sutton Close land for c200 dwellings as indicated above.	
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p><b>Plan Period</b></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') provides guidance on the preparation of Local Plans. At Paragraph 157, the second bullet states that Local Plans should be "<i>drawn up over an appropriate timescale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date</i>".</p> <p>The Pre-Submission version of the Plan proposes a plan period extending from 2011 to 2031. The Council's most recent Local Development Scheme, published in 2017, states that the Council expects the Plan to be adopted in 2018. If that were the case, then the Plan would be due to expire within 13 years of adoption, and so would not look across a fifteen year timeframe as preferred by the NPPF. It would also be incapable, in our view, of taking account of longer term requirements. Consequently, we conclude that the proposed plan period is in conflict with Paragraph 157 of the NPPF, and is therefore not sound on this basis.</p> <p>It is worth also noting, though, that when the Council published the Local Plan 'Key Challenges' document for consultation in November 2015 (in other words, its 'Issues and Options' document), it invited consultees to comment on a proposed housing target of 95 dwellings per annum up to 2036. Similarly, the 'Preferred Options' document, published in November 2016, assumed a 20 year plan period, with a base year of 2016 and an expiry year of 2036. In other words, it is evident that</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p>

		<p>the Council was seeking to plan for the period up to 2036. At that time, up-to-date evidence on housing need in Leicestershire was not available.</p> <p>However, the Pre-Submission version of the Plan now only proposes a plan period extending to 2031, with the base year rolled back to 2011. Paragraph 1.2.6 of the Pre-Submission version states that the plan period extends to 2031 <i>"in order to align with the Strategic Growth Plan and to enable effective co-operative working with other local planning authorities in the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA over Plan periods"</i>. It goes on to say, with specific reference to the Strategic Growth Plan, that, <i>"the Strategic Growth Plan... focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a 'notional housing need'. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA [Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment]"</i>.</p> <p>At Paragraph 1.5.3, the Council states that, <i>"to ensure that the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA housing and employment OAN is fulfilled up to 2031, a Statement of Cooperation and subsequent Memorandum of Understanding will be produced..."</i>.</p> <p>We understand that the Strategic Growth Plan is a document being prepared jointly by the Leicestershire authorities and the Leicestershire Local Enterprise Partnership. Its purpose, among other things, is to give consideration to the distribution of housing growth across the Leicestershire housing market area, particularly in the light of Leicester City Council being unable to meet its objectively-assessed need within its administrative area (see subsequent Sections). We</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>have reviewed a 'Consultation Draft' version of the Strategic Growth Plan dated 7 November 2017. This too considers housing needs issues from a baseline of 2011 to both 2031 and 2036, in order "to align with the different time periods for which Local Plans are currently being prepared" (Appendix A of the Strategic Growth Plan, page 21).</p> <p>The quotes from the Pre-Submission version of the Local Plan given above would appear to be at odds with the latest version of the Strategic Growth Plan, which states that (our emphasis added),  <i>"For the period beyond 2036, there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, nor economic forecasts, but we need to have some understanding of how much growth we might be expected to accommodate in future"</i> and that, <i>"the agreed distribution for the period 2011-36 will be set out in a Memorandum of Understanding which will be published in early 2018. This will be used as the basis for preparing or reviewing Local Plans with 2036 as an end date"</i>.</p> <p>It appears, from our reading of the Strategic Growth Plan, that there is no reason why the Council cannot promote a plan period extending up to 2036. Indeed, we note that the Melton Borough Council Local Plan, which is currently being subject to Examination (and so is an emerging plan being prepared by another Leicestershire authority), proposes a plan period up to 2036.</p> <p>We also note that the Council's principal source of evidence in relation to housing need (the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment, or 'HEDNA', prepared by GL Hearn, and others, on behalf of the Leicestershire authorities, and published in January</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>2017), reaches conclusions on objectively-assessed housing need up to both 2031 and 2036, with a base date of 2011 in each case. Paragraph 1.4 of the HEDNA main report states that two timeframes were used “<i>to reflect plan periods used in different authorities</i>”.</p> <p>As such, we do not accept the Council’s contention that the plan period must only extend to 2031 in order to align with the Strategic Growth Plan and plans being prepared by other Leicestershire authorities. The Strategic Growth Plan, and the HEDNA, both address the time period up to 2036, and so if the Council proposed a plan period to that year, as it contemplated doing in 2015 and 2016, then it would, we conclude, be aligned with those documents.</p> <p>We note that the consultation draft of the Strategic Growth Plan from November 2017 refers, at Appendix A, to a declaration made by Oadby and Wigston Borough Council that it would be unable to meet its objectively-assessed need for the period up to 2036 identified by the HEDNA. This is also reported in a Joint Statement of Co-Operation prepared by the Leicestershire authorities in November 2017; this latter document suggests that the Oadby and Wigston Borough Council reported this position in March 2017.</p> <p>On this basis, our client is concerned that the Council has sought to purposely reduce the plan period from 2036, as it previously proposed at the Preferred Options stage, to 2031, in order to avoid having to grapple with the housing need arising in that longer timeframe. This is further evidenced by the spatial strategy that the Council has proposed (and which we comment on in subsequent sections). In our view, this means that the Plan has not been positively prepared, and nor is it justified, because it does not deliver “<i>the</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>most appropriate strategy'</i> as required by Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. In other words, the Plan fails these tests of soundness.</p> <p>We conclude that the Council could remedy these issues by reinstating the plan period to 2036 that it originally proposed at the Preferred Options stage.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p><b><i>On behalf of our client, we conclude that Chapter 1 of the plan is not positively prepared because it is not based on a strategy that seeks to meet objectively-assessed need. We also conclude that it is not justified because it does not deliver the most appropriate strategy. Finally, we conclude that it is inconsistent with national policy, as the NPPF directs that plan periods should be 15 years in length.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>We are of the view that the Council must revisit its proposed plan period and should look to prepare a plan which extends up to 2036.</i></b></p>	
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p><b>Housing Need and Delivery in Oadby and Wigston</b></p> <p>We have noted in Section 3 that the NPPF places at its heart the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that, for plan-making, the 'presumption' means, among other things, that "<i>Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change</i>" (our emphasis added). In our view, this requirement is critical in the context of the direction at Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, that local authorities should "<i>boost significantly the supply of housing</i>". In other words, when preparing Local Plans, authorities should</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p>

		<p>ensure that there is sufficient flexibility in their housing policies and allocations to enable objectively-assessed needs to be met within the plan period.</p> <p>The Pre-Submission version of the Plan states, at draft Policy 2, that the Plan will allocate "<i>sufficient land to provide at least 2,960 new additional homes</i>". This equates to a housing target of 148 dwellings per annum between 2011 and 2031. The Council has stated at Paragraph 4.2.4 of the consultation document that this is taken from the 'Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment ('HEDNA') prepared by GL Hearn, Justin Gardner Consulting and Oxford Economics, and which was published in January 2017. The HEDNA was prepared on behalf of the Leicestershire authorities and addresses housing need across the housing market area. Jelson welcomes the Council's decision to propose a housing target which reflects the objectively assessed need identified in the HEDNA.</p> <p>Table 1 on Page 28 of the consultation document states that between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2017, 578 dwellings had been completed, while a further 768 dwellings were committed. Although this is not explicitly stated, we assume this means sites which benefitted from an extant planning permission at 31 March 2017.</p> <p>Consequently, the Council concludes that it only needs to provide 1,614 dwellings by 31 March 2031 in order to meet its objectively-assessed need. The remainder of Table 1 goes on to state that those 1,614 dwellings will be delivered through:-</p> <p>i) the allocation of 205 dwellings on land in Wigston Town Centre and Oadby District Centre;</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>ii) the allocation of 1,159 dwellings on sites in 'Direction for Growth' areas; and  iii) the delivery of 250 dwellings on "<i>smaller allocation sites</i>" (that is, those which might accommodate between 11 and 99 units).</p> <p>Cumulatively, dwellings in those three categories add up to 1,614, and so balance the residual housing requirement up to 2031. This is in contradiction to the proposed wording of Policy 2, which states that the Council will allocate land to provide "<i>at least 2,960 dwellings</i>" (our emphasis added). From our reading of Table 1, the Council is seeking to allocate only enough land to provide no more than 2,960 dwellings.</p> <p>We note that later sections of the Pre-Submission document identify the following new Direction for Growth sites, along with notional capacities, as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wigston Direction for Growth Phase 2 – 600 dwellings;</li> <li>• Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Phase 2 – 250 dwellings; and</li> <li>• Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth – 300 dwellings.</li> </ul> <p>Together these total 1,150 dwellings, and not 1,159 as stated in the Council's Table 1. Therefore, if the figure in Table 1 were accurately stated, then the Council would be 9 dwellings short of meeting its objectively assessed need up to 2031. Accordingly, on the face of it, it appears that the Council has, contrary to what it states in the Plan, not identified sufficient land to meet its objectively-assessed needs up to 2031.</p> <p>Moreover, even if the figures in Table 1 were correct, in</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>order for the Council to meet its objectively-assessed housing need up to 2031, it will need all of the sites which had an extant planning permission at 31 March 2017 to be developed. The Council will also need all of the proposed allocations in the town and district centres, on the proposed Direction for Growth sites, and on the 'smaller allocations' to be developed over the plan period, and to deliver the number of units expected by the Council. The corollary of that is that non delivery of any site with an extant planning permission, any failure of the proposed allocations to be developed, or delivery of fewer dwellings on the proposed allocations than the Council expects, will result in the objectively-assessed need for the Borough not being met. As a matter of principle, Jelson is of the view that this represents a highly inflexible approach, and means that the Plan is not positively prepared as a result.</p>	
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p>Notwithstanding the above points, the Council goes on to state, at Paragraph 4.2.11, that "<i>there is an additional number of new homes that could be delivered up to the end of the Plan period 2031 [sic] or beyond</i>". The Council states that these additional dwellings comprise:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 dwellings within the settlement boundary of Kilby Bridge;</li> <li>• "<i>approximately</i>" 300 new dwellings on a potential Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth site; and</li> <li>• an assumed 70 windfall dwellings over the plan period.</li> </ul> <p>The Council goes on to conclude that this "<i>buffer</i>" of circa 400 dwellings "<i>would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites</i>".</p> <p>While draft Policy 17 addresses itself to Kilby Bridge,</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Upon the publication of the HEDNA in January 2017, the Council has had to work extremely proactively and positively to meet its illustrated housing OAN. The housing OAN illustrated within the HEDNA (and subsequent Plan target) is a huge 'step change' for the Council. From planning for 90 dwellings per year, the Council has had to plan for 148 dwellings per year to fulfil its own OAN.</p> <p>The huge change / shift in housing requirement has meant that the Council has had to identify and allocate over 60 per cent more land than it would have been required to identify should the requirement have remained at 90 dwellings per year. The principal constraint for the Council, has always been its highway and transport infrastructure and network. The highway</p>

		<p>and seeks to provide policy support for the development of up to 40 dwellings in the village, we note that the Council does not seek to formally allocate specific sites in that location to accommodate new dwellings. In our view, this raises uncertainty over the extent to which 40 dwellings might be delivered in Kilby Bridge over the plan period. This is the reason, we presume, that the Council has not made an allowance for those 40 dwellings in its Table 1.</p> <p>The second component of the 'buffer' is a potential third phase of the Wigston Direction for Growth site. We understand that Phase 1 comprises the allocation in the adopted Core Strategy (which now benefits from planning permission) and Phase 2 is proposed for allocation in the new Plan. However, it is apparent that the Council is not looking to allocate Phase 3 in the Plan. Moreover, at Paragraph 4.2.12, the Council states (our emphasis added), "<i>Should evidence suggest a need for further development at the Wigston Direction for Growth area (Phase 3), it would be subject to appropriate testing, in particular, highway and transport infrastructure capacity, and liaison with the Borough Council and Leicestershire County Highways department. Any proposal would also be subject to the development being sensitive to the countryside areas that surround it and sustainable and appropriate in size and facility provision. This will be Plan led and will be considered through a future review of the Plan</i>".</p> <p>From our reading of this statement, it is apparent that the potential for a third phase of development at the Direction for Growth site has not been subject to any robust testing in relation to its suitability or deliverability, and so there is no certainty that it is capable of making any contribution to the delivery of housing in the Borough. Moreover, the Council has</p>	<p>network within the Borough is currently severely congested along both its routes and its junctions; the levels of growth identified and allocated only exacerbate this further.</p> <p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study assessed the highway and transport network within the Borough up to 2031 taking account of the land identified and allocated within the Local Plan. The assessment concluded that the levels of development proposed could be accommodated, however highway mitigation works would be required. Any development over and above that proposed within the Plan is likely to have significant further impacts on the local highway network.</p> <p>As suggested by the representation, in addition to the Council meeting its own OAN for housing, the Local Plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes up to 2031. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need. It should be noted that Leicester City is the only authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA to declare an unmet housing need. All other authorities can (at least) meet their own identified need.</p> <p>The 'buffer' identified within the Plan of approximately 400 new homes would be subject to appropriate testing, in particular highway and transport infrastructure capacity, should it be in addition to the Plan period target of 2,960. The 'buffer' identified would only come forward should an allocated site fail to deliver, therefore requiring buffer sites to be released. Due to the buffer release being in place of an existing allocation (which has been tested), the impact on the</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>stated that, if a third phase were to be contemplated, it could only be achieved through a review of the Plan. In a situation where the Council needed to identify additional sites because its allocations were not delivering, relying on a review of the Plan to rectify the shortfall in delivery would only add further delay. For these reasons, we conclude that no reliance can be placed on a potential third phase at the Wigston Direction for Growth site in order to provide a 'buffer' against under-delivery. If such a review were to take place then this should in any event consider all potential development options, not just the suggested third phase to the Direction for Growth. The site promoted by Jelson / Davidsons is in a broadly similar location to the Direction for Growth and could equally form an effective third phase, but potentially with greater benefits. These need to be properly tested in order that the most appropriate strategy can be identified. As things stand, we conclude that the Council is seeking to delay undertaking such an assessment now, but at the same time is pre-determining what the solution to under-delivery of the proposed allocations might be.</p> <p>When taken with the uncertainty over the delivery of 40 dwellings at Kilby Bridge, we conclude that the only source of alternative development which the Council can rely on, if its committed sites or proposed allocations fail to deliver, is windfall development. The Council has assumed that 70 windfall dwellings might be delivered over the plan period, equating to just 2.3% of the proposed housing target.</p> <p>A buffer which comprises such a small proportion of the Borough's housing need does not, in our view, represent sufficient flexibility that would enable the Council to respond to "<i>rapid change</i>" as required by</p>	<p>highway and transport infrastructure capacity would not be worsened, as its cumulative impact has in essence been tested. Through the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation, the Council has been made aware of the potential for 200 further new homes at the Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth Area. As suggested earlier, due to the constrained and congested nature of the Borough's highway network <u>any</u> development over and above that allocated within the Local Plan (up to 2031) would be subject to highway testing that took account of cumulative impact and not just site specific impact.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that the levels of development proposed will come forward within the Plan period as expected and illustrated within the Local Plan housing trajectory. As with any trajectory, the further into the future it forecasts, the (potentially) less reliable it becomes. In the short to medium term the Council are confident that the trajectory is accurate and robust and the 'buffer' is unlikely to be required. Up to 2031, as illustrated, the Borough area can just provide (from a transport and highway network capacity point of view) the required housing need. Post 2031, the Strategic Growth Plan has the potential to 'unlock' further land within the Borough through its proposed provision of large scale highway and transport infrastructure that would relieve the pressures on the transport and highway network within the Leicester Principal Urban Area, particularly Leicester City and the Borough of Oadby and Wigston.</p> <p>The Council would like to note, that although the two sites are in similar locations, there is a fundamental difference relating to site access and site testing. The Wigston Direction for Growth Area has been subject to cumulative transport testing and importantly has two</p>
--	--	---	---

		Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. Again, this leads us to conclude that the Pre-Submission version of the Plan is not positively prepared.	main site access points directly onto Newton Lane to the north and the main arterial route (A Road) of Welford Road (A5199) (significant to Leicester and Leicestershire also) to the south west. The land to the North of Newton Lane does not have a main site access point that is directly onto a main arterial route, for example a route classified as an A Road or B Road. The site also did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, therefore has not been taken account of from a cumulative transport / highway testing perspective. It should also be highlighted that part of the land promoted through the representation is situated on designated green wedge.
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p>At Paragraph 4.2.11 of the Pre-Submission version of the Plan, the Council states that its proposed buffer of circa 400 dwellings could "<i>help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need</i>", as well as off-setting any under-delivery or delay on its own allocated sites (see below for further commentary on Leicester's unmet need). In our view, this is unreasonable because:-</p> <p>a) for the reasons we have explained, the Council's buffer is, in our view, only approximately 70 dwellings rather than 400;</p> <p>b) it potentially pre-judges the outcomes of any work to determine how the shortfall arising from Leicester City is going to distributed elsewhere within the housing market area; and</p> <p>c) we don't believe that any 'buffer' should perform a dual function – it is in our view necessary for the Council to build in sufficient flexibility in relation to its own housing needs, and then make, separately, an allowance for meeting its share of the shortfall in Leicester City, once there is clarity about the number of</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Upon the publication of the HEDNA in January 2017, the Council has had to work extremely proactively and positively to meet its illustrated housing OAN. The housing OAN illustrated within the HEDNA (and subsequent Plan target) is a huge 'step change' for the Council. From planning for 90 dwellings per year, the Council has had to plan for 148 dwellings per year to fulfil its own OAN.</p> <p>The huge change / shift in housing requirement has meant that the Council has had to identify and allocate over 60 per cent more land then it would have been required to identify should the requirement have remained at 90 dwellings per year. The principal constraint for the Council, has always been its highway and transport infrastructure and network. The highway network within the Borough is currently severely congested along both its routes and its junctions; the levels of growth identified and allocated only exacerbate this further.</p>

		<p> dwellings from Leicester which may have to be accommodated in Oadby and Wigston.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p><b><i>Table 1, Paragraphs 4.2.4 to 4.2.12 and Policy 2 fail to identify any flexibility in the delivery of housing to respond to rapid change. There are therefore inconsistent with the NPPF and are not justified, because the strategy is not appropriate. It is also apparent that the contents of Table 1 are incorrect, so that the Council does not actually have sufficient supply to meet its needs up to 2031, and so the Plan is, as a consequence, not positively prepared. These matters lead to a conclusion that the Plan is unsound.</i></b></p>	<p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study assessed the highway and transport network within the Borough up to 2031 taking account of the land identified and allocated within the Local Plan. The assessment concluded that the levels of development proposed could be accommodated, however highway mitigation works would be required. Any development over and above that proposed within the Plan is likely to have significant further impacts on the local highway network.</p> <p>As suggested by the representation, in addition to the Council meeting its own OAN for housing, the Local Plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes up to 2031. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need. It should be noted that Leicester City is the only authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA to declare an unmet housing need. All other authorities can (at least) meet their own identified need.</p> <p>The 'buffer' identified within the Plan of approximately 400 new homes would be subject to appropriate testing, in particular highway and transport infrastructure capacity. Through the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation, the Council has been made aware of the potential for 200 further new homes at the Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth Area. As suggested earlier, due to the constrained and congested nature of the Borough's highway network <u>any</u> development over and above that allocated within the Local Plan (up to 2031) would be subject to highway testing that took account of cumulative impact and not just site specific impact.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>In addition, the Council is confident that the levels of development proposed will come forward within the Plan period as expected and illustrated within the Local Plan housing trajectory. As with any trajectory, the further into the future it forecasts, the (potentially) less reliable it becomes. In the short to medium term the Council are confident that the trajectory is accurate and robust and the 'buffer' is unlikely to be required. Up to 2031, as illustrated, the Borough area can just provide (from a transport and highway network capacity point of view) the required housing need. Post 2031, the Strategic Growth Plan has the potential to 'unlock' further land within the Borough through its proposed provision of large scale highway and transport infrastructure that would relieve the pressures on the transport and highway network within the Leicester Principal Urban Area, particularly Leicester City and the Borough of Oadby and Wigston.</p>
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p>We have commented in Section 3 on the Council's proposed plan period, which extends only until 2031. We have also noted that the emerging Strategic Growth Plan, and the Joint Statement of Co-Operation prepared by the Leicestershire authorities, both state that Oadby and Wigston Borough Council has "<i>declared</i>" that it cannot meet its objectively-assessed need up to 2036. In our view, this only serves to highlight the fragility of the Council's approach to housing delivery in the emerging Plan; if it believes it cannot meet its objectively-assessed needs by 2036, which only exceeds the need up to 2031 by 915 dwellings, then this points to a conclusion that there is very limited flexibility for other sites to come forward if the proposed allocations are delayed, or under-deliver.</p> <p>The inflexibility of the Plan in its current form is highlighted further still in the light of ongoing issues</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p> <p>In addition, the Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan. In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate</p>

		<p>around the ability of Leicester City Council to meet its own objectively-assessed housing needs. The HEDNA concluded that Leicester’s housing need is 1,692 dwellings per annum (in a plan period to 2031) or 1,668 dwellings per annum if a plan period were extended to 2036. These equate to totals of 33,840 dwellings up to 2031 and 41,700 dwellings up to 2036.</p> <p>In a Joint Statement of Co-Operation prepared by the Leicestershire authorities, ‘theoretical housing capacities’ for each local authority were set out, alongside the HEDNA need figures. For Leicester City Council, the theoretical capacity given is 26,230. As such, it appears that there is a potential for an unmet need of 7,610 dwellings in Leicester to arise at 2031, rising to 15,470 by 2036.</p> <p>Oadby and Wigston Borough Council has stated, at Paragraph 4.2.5 of the Pre-Submission version of the Plan, that “<i>it is aware that the City of Leicester has declared an unmet need and will need help from other HMA partners to deliver its unmet need up to 2031</i>”. In other words, the Council has expressly recognised that it will likely have to accommodate some of the unmet need from its neighbouring authority. However, as we have explained above, the Council has only proposed allocations sufficient to meet its own objectively assessed needs, and no more. There is no allowance made in proposed Policy 2, or Table 1, for potential development required to contribute to Leicester City Council’s needs.</p> <p>The Council does say, though, at Paragraphs 1.5.6 and 1.5.7, that it will undertake a review of the Plan where one of three triggers is engaged, or, and in any event, no later than five years from the date of the adoption of the Plan. The first trigger for a review of the Plan is</p>	<p>manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan policy.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>where annual monitoring shows that the Plan is not delivering against its targets.</p> <p>The third trigger is where components of the Strategic Growth Plan are delivered earlier than expected.</p> <p>The second trigger is where, <i>"a local authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA has an evidenced unmet need, which cannot be met by the other local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA and / or within the flexibility allowed within this Plan. In this instance, a review will begin with the preparation of evidence to establish whether the unmet need can be met within the Borough"</i>.</p> <p>We are concerned that, in the second trigger, the Council is attempting to require that a review is only commenced where: a) an authority cannot meet its objectively-assessed need; and b) none of the other authorities in the HMA are able to accommodate that need. In other words, it appears that the Council might be seeking to establish a sequential approach whereby it will be necessary for other authorities in the HMA to demonstrate that they cannot accommodate another authority's unmet need, before the Council begins a review of the Plan. In our view, this is inappropriate; the NPPF requires authorities to work collaboratively on such cross-boundary issues. Therefore, it is inconsistent with national policy for the Council to suggest that the onus should be on other authorities in the HMA to meet any shortfalls elsewhere before it considers undertaking a review of the Plan.</p> <p>On a more general point, and without prejudice to the above, we consider that it is a weakness of the Plan that the undertaking to carry out a review is not enshrined into a policy. We are of the view that the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>obligation to undertake a review should be built into a policy, if the Plan is to be progressed in advance of clarity on how the shortfall in Leicester City is going to be addressed.</p> <p>In relation to the third trigger, we also note that the Strategic Growth Plan contemplates significant potential for growth as a spin-off from an upgraded A46 corridor. The Growth Plan states that the 'expressways' which form part of those infrastructure improvements will be delivered by "the early 2030s". Figure 5 of the Strategic Growth Plan shows that the 'growth corridor' which will be created by enhanced infrastructure, and which might accommodate "about 40,000 new homes and additional new jobs" washes over much of Oadby and Wigston. In other words, it is apparent that, in the early 2030s, the Borough will be located within an area of strategic growth. Whilst the Pre-Submission Local Plan notes the intention for infrastructure improvements, it is of the view that there is "<i>insufficient certainty</i>" around the delivery of infrastructure for the growth corridor to influence the spatial strategy in the Plan. However, the Council proposes that one of its triggers for undertaking a review will be delivery of the new infrastructure in the growth corridor "<i>at a faster rate than is currently anticipated</i>".</p> <p>Because of the potentially significant implications of the growth corridor being delivered earlier than expected, we believe that this further emphasises the need for the review mechanism to be enshrined into policy.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p><b><i>As a consequence of these matters, we reiterate that Paragraphs 4.2.5 and 4.2.6, and Policy 2,</i></b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b><i>are not consistent with national policy because they fail to demonstrate flexibility to respond to rapid change. There are also not positively prepared because they do not seek to meet unmet requirements arising elsewhere in the housing market area. They are not justified because they do not propose an appropriate strategy. They are also not effective because they are not based on effective working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Furthermore, Paragraphs 1.5.6 and 1.5.7 should form a policy, rather than a monitoring trigger being left to supporting text. Until such a change is made, we conclude that the Plan is not positively prepared.</i></b></p>	
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p>In order to achieve a much greater degree of flexibility in the Plan, we conclude that the Council must allocate additional sites to deliver new residential development. With that in mind, the land which Jelson is promoting in conjunction with Davidsons is deliverable and has the potential to provide up to an additional 600 dwellings up to 2031. Alternatively, if the Inspector concludes that the Council should adopt a plan period up to 2036, and should look to meet its objectively-assessed need (155 dwellings per annum / 3,875 dwellings in total) up to that point in time, then the land promoted by Jelson could make a significant contribution towards meeting that need.</p> <p>We have explained in Section 2 that Golby and Luck have prepared a Landscape Framework plan, which demonstrates how the site could be delivered without adversely affecting the separation between Oadby and Wigston, and with appropriate mitigation to retain a sensitive relationship between the extended urban edge and the countryside which lies beyond. In Section 6, we</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Upon the publication of the HEDNA in January 2017, the Council has had to work extremely proactively and positively to meet its illustrated housing OAN. The housing OAN illustrated within the HEDNA (and subsequent Plan target) is a huge 'step change' for the Council. From planning for 90 dwellings per year, the Council has had to plan for 148 dwellings per year to fulfil its own OAN.</p> <p>The huge change / shift in housing requirement has meant that the Council has had to identify and allocate over 60 per cent more land than it would have been required to identify should the requirement have remained at 90 dwellings per year. The principal constraint for the Council, has always been its highway and transport infrastructure and network. The highway network within the Borough is currently severely congested along both its routes and its junctions; the</p>

		<p>go on to further explain the merits of the site as a location for residential development.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p> <p><i>In order to remedy the matters we have identified above in relation to the soundness of the Plan, we conclude that the Council must revisit its spatial strategy and ensure that it has allocated sufficient sites to provide flexibility in its approach to the delivery of housing. Accordingly, we conclude that the land which is being promoted by Jelson in conjunction with Davidsons provides an opportunity to allocate additional land for this purpose.</i></p>	<p>levels of growth identified and allocated only exacerbate this further.</p> <p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study assessed the highway and transport network within the Borough up to 2031 taking account of the land identified and allocated within the Local Plan. The assessment concluded that the levels of development proposed could be accommodated, however highway mitigation works would be required. Any development over and above that proposed within the Plan is likely to have significant further impacts on the local highway network. Therefore any significant developments over and above this planned growth would require further assessment. This assessment should be done through the process of preparing subsequent Local Plans which extend beyond 2031 and with reference to the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan which contains proposals that are likely to relieve existing pressures on the Local Highway Network across the south east Leicester Principal Urban Area (e.g. the A46 Expressway).</p> <p>In December 2017, the Council approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes. In addition, all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. The</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>relationship of the Strategic Growth Plan to Local Plans is set out at paragraph 1.5.2 of the Local Plan, which states <i>'although the Strategic Growth Plan deals with the time period up to 2050, it treats the period's pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan's. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a 'notional housing need'. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA'.</i></p> <p>The Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan. In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan policy.</p>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE BOROUGH</b></p> <p><i>Plan Period</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Specific Council responses to comments will be set out</p>

		<p>The proposed plan period for the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan extends to 2031. It is currently anticipated that the Local Plan will be adopted by June 2018. However, on that basis there will be a 15-year horizon to the end of the plan period. This does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that local plans should <i>"be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date"</i> (NPPF, paragraph 157, point 2). Given that objectively assessed development needs (OAN) have been assessed for the period to 2036, the plan period should be extended to ensure that the Local Plan has a time horizon in excess of 15 years and longer term development requirements, including an adequate level of future housing and the infrastructure required to support that, can be provided for.</p> <p><b>Housing Land Supply</b></p> <p>To accord with the NPPF (notably paras 14 &amp; 47), the Local Plan must facilitate a continual supply of both market and affordable housing from a "portfolio" of deliverable development sites based on a robust spatial development strategy, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. That will ensure a rolling 5 year housing land supply is maintained, that the overall housing requirements are met within the plan period and that everyone actually has the opportunity of a decent home.</p> <p>The Local Plan's proposed spatial strategy is, therefore, supported in principle. Developments within the town centres and wider urban area, and on strategic greenfield allocation sites are all required to come forward immediately to ensure that the identified development needs are addressed within the plan period. In that context the proposal to allocate the</p>	<p>below, however those relating to the Local Plan spatial strategy and housing requirements will be set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p> <p>Throughout the production of the Local Plan, the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate. All local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) have good working relationships and a common goal, which is meeting the HMA's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) in both housing and employment. The Duty to Cooperate Statement document illustrates how the Council has met the Duty to Cooperate throughout Local Plan production.</p> <p>In addition to the Council meeting its own OAN for housing, the Local Plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need. It should be noted that Leicester City is the only authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA to declare an unmet housing need. All other authorities can (at least) meet their own identified need.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Borough has worked proactively and positively to meet its OAN for housing, particularly as it has been a huge 'step' change. The Local Plan period target of 2960 over the 20 year plan period is a 60 per cent increase on the Core Strategy target of 1800 new homes (over a similar 20 year period).</p> <p>In December 2017, the Council approved the Joint</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>land at Cottage Farm, Oadby as a Direction for Growth is very much welcomed.</p> <p>It is inevitable, however, that there will be a delay to at least some of the identified development sites in the Local Plan coming forward and/or the rate of their delivery will not be high as currently anticipated. Therefore, the Local Plan housing requirement and land supply should also include a “contingency buffer”.</p> <p><b><i>Unmet Need &amp; the Duty to Cooperate</i></b></p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate (DTC), introduced by the Localism Act 2011, requires the Council to engage “<i>constructively, actively and on an on-going basis to maximise the effectiveness of Local and Marine Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters</i>” (NPPG). The NPPF requires (para 181) that authorities “<i>demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts</i>”. The demonstration of effective cooperation in reality means a <i>positive outcome</i> to these strategic planning discussions, even if agreement is not secured on all issues. Compliance with the duty to cooperate is critical to ensure that a Council delivers sustainable development (NPPF paras 150-151) and meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the HMA (NPPF para 47), including the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with sustainable development (NPPF para 182).</p> <p>The Local Plan refers to the unmet need arising in Leicester (para 4.2.5), but makes no comment on how that need will be addressed in the HMA. The Borough’s role in addressing that unmet need may well be limited, but the Borough Council’s position is unclear as the Duty to Cooperate Statement referred to in the</p>	<p>Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes. In addition, all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. The relationship of the Strategic Growth Plan to Local Plans is set out at paragraph 1.5.2 of the Local Plan, which states “<i>although the Strategic Growth Plan deals with the time period up to 2050, it treats the period’s pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan’s. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a ‘notional housing need’. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA</i>”.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan. In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance)</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Local Plan has not actually been made available.</p> <p>That is of great concern as this is clearly a matter that all of the Planning Authorities in the HMA need to address as part of their obligations under the DTC through the preparation of their Local Plan Reviews. It is not appropriate to seek to defer this issue to a future review of the Local Plan as it is understood that the intention is to agree a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the HMA Authorities as early as January 2018 to address the unmet needs arising in the period to 2031. Nor is it necessary to wait for the preparation of the Strategic Growth Plan, as that is a non-statutory plan that will consider options for guiding growth in the HMA over the period 2031 to 2050.</p> <p>The identified unmet need in Leicester is arising now and needs to be addressed now in this Local Plan, and the others currently being prepared around the HMA. A short delay in the submission of the Local Plan will allow the distribution of the development needs to be understood and then agreed ensuring that the unmet needs that are already arising in Leicester are appropriately provided for within the HMA, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. A failure to do so will only continue the great uncertainty going forward as to how much development should take place and where, and ultimately lead to a situation where housing needs in the City continue to be ignored.</p> <p><b>Local Plan Review</b></p> <p>The positive statement in the Local Plan to undertake a review of the Local Plan at least every 5 years and in the stated circumstances (para 1.5.6) is welcomed. However, the commitment to a review itself is not an</p>	<p>and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan policy.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>adequate response to the matters set out above that should be addressed now. Moreover, the “commitment” to a Review is not embedded within an actual policy, and cannot be enforced if the Council decide, for whatever reason, not to honour the commitment. The consequence of that is that the identified development needs will not then be addressed. An additional specific Local Plan Review policy is, therefore, required.</p> <p><b><i>Housing Enabler</i></b> The Council’s commitment within the policy to act as a housing enabler, notably in facilitating the provision of the required supporting infrastructure, is very much welcomed.</p> <p><b><i>Soundness:</i></b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 2, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- has not been <b>positively prepared</b> as it is not based on a strategy that will ensure that the objectively assessed housing needs, including unmet development requirements arising in Leicester, will be met within the plan period;</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government’s priorities and policies in terms of enabling sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing to meet identified needs.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Proposed Change:</i></b> To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy 2 should identify a housing requirement for a plan period to 2036 (to</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>provide a 15-year time horizon).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That requirement should reflect the up to date, full and objectively assessed needs for housing within the Borough and wider HMA, based on the findings of the HEDNA and the Final MOU between the HMA Authorities that addresses the likely unmet need arising in Leicester City.</li> <li>- The Local Plan should then identify sufficient deliverable and developable supply of housing land with a robust contingency to meet that need in sustainable locations in the Borough.</li> <li>- Provide a Local Plan Review Policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The proposed plan period for the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan extends to only 2031, which means there will not be a 15-year horizon to the end of the plan period by the time it is adopted. That does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework. The minimum housing requirement in Policy 2 should, therefore, also be increased accordingly to reflect the extended plan period.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not address the acute need for affordable housing arising in the Borough. The HEDNA shows a net affordable housing need of 143 dwellings per annum between 2011–2036, which is equivalent to the Borough’s total OAN, but there is no consideration whether <i>“an increase in the total housing figures included in the Local Plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes”</i> as required by the PPG (2a-029-20140306).</p> <p>The Local Plan’s proposed spatial strategy is supported in principle. In that context the proposal to allocate the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>land at Cottage Farm, Oadby as a Direction for Growth is, therefore, very much welcomed.</p> <p>The Local Plan housing requirement and land supply should, however, also include a “contingency buffer”.</p> <p>The identified unmet need in Leicester is arising now and needs to be addressed now in this Local Plan, and the others currently being prepared around the HMA. A short delay in the submission of the Local Plan will allow the distribution of the development needs to be understood and then agreed.</p> <p>The positive statement in the Local Plan to undertake a review of the Local Plan at least every 5 years and in the stated circumstances (para 1.5.6) is welcomed. However, the commitment to a review itself is not an adequate response to the matter set out above that should be addressed now. Moreover, the “commitment” to a Review should be embedded within an actual policy.</p>	
18.12.17	Coop	<p><u>Policy 2 (Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough)</u></p> <p>The Co-op <b>support</b> the Plan strategy to deliver at least 2,390 new additional homes in the Plan period to 2031 and in particular, the allocation of 1,159 net additional homes on the Direction for Growth sites. It is considered that Policy 2 is positively prepared, justified and consistent with National Policy and for these reasons, meets the tests of soundness.</p>	<p>Comment of support welcomed.</p> <p>The Council would like to reiterate that the Plan’s strategy is to deliver at least 2960 new additional new homes up to 2031.</p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED HOUSING NEED (OAN)</p> <p>Background The process of undertaking an OAN is clearly set out in the Framework, principally in §14. §47, §152 and §159 and should be undertaken in a systemic and</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

		<p>transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.</p> <p>The starting point for this assessment requires local planning authorities to have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This involves the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) working with neighbouring authorities where housing markets cross administrative areas as detailed in §159 of the Framework. The Framework goes on to set out factors that should be included in a SHMA including identifying:</p> <p>“the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets household and population projections taking account of migration and demographic change;</li> <li>• Addresses the need for all types of housing including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and</li> <li>• Caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.”</li> </ul> <p>Key points that are worth noting from the above are that the objective assessment should identify the full need for housing before the Council consider undertaking any process of assessing the ability to deliver this figure. In addition, §159 specifically relates to catering for both housing need and housing demand within the authority area. It is also worth pointing out that any assessment of housing need and demand within the SHMA must also consider the following</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>factors; falling household formation rates, net inward migration, the need to address the under provision of housing from the previous local plan period, the results of the Census 2011, housing vacancy rates including the need to factor in a housing vacancy rate for churn in the housing market, economic factors to ensure that the economic forecasts for an area are supported by sufficient housing to deliver economic growth, offsetting a falling working age population by providing enough housing to ensure retiring workers can be replaced by incoming residents, addressing affordability and delivering the full need for affordable housing in the area.</p> <p>Of particular importance is the need to consider market signals. The consideration of market signals is one of the core planning principles considered in §17 of the Framework, which states:</p> <p>“Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities.”</p> <p>Of critical importance is what the Framework goes on to say in §158 in the section discussing Plan Making. It states here that:</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.”</p> <p>Tackling market signals are therefore at the very core of what the Framework is trying to achieve in</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>promoting sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing land.</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) gives further explanation to what the Framework means with regards to market signals, and sets out in a range of paragraphs the way in which local planning authorities should go about factoring in relevant market signals in arriving at their OAN. §19 and §20 of the PPG gives guidance on what market signals should be taken into account and how plan makers should respond to these market signals. The below extract identifies some particularly pertinent points:</p> <p>“The housing need number suggested by household projections (the starting point) should be adjusted to reflect the appropriate market signals, as well as other market indicators of the balance between demand for and supply of dwellings. Prices of rents rising faster than national/local average may well indicate particular market undersupply relative to demand.”</p> <p>The paragraph goes on to indicate that these factors would include, but should not be limited to land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rates of development and overcrowding. However, given what the Framework says at §17, quoted above, it seems clear that particular consideration should be given to affordability.</p> <p>In order to consider how market signals should be taken forward §20 identifies some key concepts:  “Appropriate comparisons of indicators should be made. This includes comparison with longer term trends (both in absolute levels and rates of change) in the: housing market area; similar demographic and economic areas; and nationally. A worsening trend in any of these</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>indicators will require upward adjustment to planned housing numbers compared to ones based solely on household projections.”</p> <p>It is therefore clear that where market signals are apparent (in any of the indicators assessed) there is an absolute and clear direction that an upward adjustment to housing numbers is required. It is also clear that both the level of change and the rates of change are considerations and that local planning authorities need to carefully benchmark themselves against other areas. This should not simply be a case of considering neighbouring authorities but should look at, as well as these, local authorities on a national basis, if the demographic and economic indicators are relevant. Gladman are firmly of the view that considering comparisons purely against neighbouring authorities is not sufficiently robust and does not address the underlying issues which both the Framework and the PPG are trying to tackle with regard to housing.</p> <p>What is of further importance when considering these issues is the period of time analysed when considering both relative and absolute change. It has become apparent in our consideration of a number of plans that many local planning authorities choose to look at periods of time which are not fully representative of the depth of the housing crisis which we are currently within.</p> <p>Gladman is of the view that local planning authorities must take a long-term view when considering affordability and consider the relative and absolute change over a long term 15-20 year period, which coincides with the normal time span of a Local Plan. Authorities should assess as a constituent part of their OAN, how they can improve affordability over the life time of a plan to a point where affordability is more in line with average earnings and affordable mortgage</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>lending rates. They should assess a level of housing over the 15-20 year plan period which would enable this step change and consider its deliverability in the plan. Only through planning for significant housing growth can local authorities realistically tackle market signals in the way advocated by the PPG and tackle the affordability and housing crisis.</p> <p>The need to identify the full OAN before considering any issues with the ability of a Local Planning Authority to accommodate that level of development has been confirmed in the High Court. Most notably in Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council v (1) Gallagher Homes Limited (2) Lioncourt Homes Limited where it was considered that arriving at a housing requirement was a two-stage process and that first the unconstrained OAN must be arrived at. In the judgment, it was stated:</p> <p>“The NPPF indeed effected a radical change. It consisted in the two-step approach which paragraph 47 enjoined. The previous policy’s methodology was essentially the striking of a balance. By contrast paragraph 47 required the OAN [objectively assessed need] to be made first, and to be given effect in the Local Plan save only to the extent that that would be inconsistent with other NPPF policies. [...] The two-step approach is by no means barren or technical. It means that housing need is clearly and cleanly ascertained. And as the judge said at paragraph 94, “[h]ere, numbers matter; because the larger the need, the more pressure will or might be applied to [impinge] on other inconsistent policies”.</p> <p>Therefore, following the exercise to identify the full OAN for housing in an area:</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate.” (NPPF §152)</p> <p>This statement clearly sets out that local planning authorities should seek to deliver the full OAN and that this should be tested through the evidence base. Only where the evidence shows that this is not achievable, should they then test other options to see if any significant adverse impacts could be reduced or eliminated by pursuing these options. If this is not possible then they should test if the significant adverse impacts could be mitigated and where this is not possible, where compensatory measures may be appropriate.</p> <p>The final stage of the process is outlined in §14 and involves a planning judgement as to whether, following all of the stages of the process outlined above:</p> <p>“Local Plans should meet OAN, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or</li> <li>• specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”</li> </ul> <p>It is also worth noting that the final part of this sentence refers to footnote 9 of the Framework which</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>sets out the types of policies that the Government consider to be restrictive. These include:  "sites protected under the Birds and Habitat Directive (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion".</p> <p>Although this list is not exhaustive it is clear that local landscape designations, intrinsic value of the countryside, character of areas, green gaps etc. are not specifically mentioned as constraints by the Framework.</p>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough</p> <p>Gladman support the Spatial Strategy as set out within Policy 2, especially the identification of the Direction for Growth to the South East of Wigston. The area of growth will directly support the main town centre of Wigston and will contribute towards improvements to the local highway network.</p> <p>In distributing the growth outlined in the Plan, the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location, are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. A wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that the level of development proposed in the Local Plan is sufficient to meet the needs of the Borough up to 2031. However, as suggested in the representation, the Council has allowed a level of flexibility (a buffer) within the Plan to negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as potentially accommodate a small proportion of Leicester City's unmet need.</p> <p>The Council is confident that the levels of development proposed will come forward within the Plan period as expected and illustrated within the Local Plan housing trajectory. As with any trajectory, the further into the future it forecasts, the (potentially) less reliable it becomes. In the short to medium term the Council are confident that the trajectory is accurate and robust and the 'buffer' is unlikely to be required.</p>

		<p>The Plan introduces an element of flexibility into the housing supply to ensure that the housing requirement is achieved or surpassed. This is to be welcomed. However, the deliverability of the sites identified as contributing to this flexibility need to be carefully considered. The Council identify that an additional 300 units could come from Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth. These units, whilst providing some flexibility, are unlikely to be delivered in the short term as they form part of Phase 3 of the strategic allocation. If therefore, the Council identify a problem with housing delivery that needs addressing in the short term, in order to maintain a 5 year housing land supply, the flexibility set out in the Plan (para 4.2.11) is unlikely to help to resolve this issue. It is therefore considered, that further flexibility is required in the OWLP through the identification of small scale sites, that are in line with the Spatial Strategy, but which can be delivered in the short term to plug any gap in the 5 year housing land supply.</p>	
18.12.17	Harborough District Council	<p><u>4.2.5 Housing Growth</u></p> <p>HDC welcomes the confirmation that the Borough is able to meet its own OAN and will not be reliant on any other local authority within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA.</p>	Comment of support welcomed.
18.12.17	Harborough District Council	<p><u>4.2.11 Additional housing land</u></p> <p>HDC supports the identification of land to deliver approximately 400 additional houses to cover any delivery issues on allocated sites and to make a small contribution to meeting Leicester's unmet need (the scale of which has not yet been declared).</p>	Comment of support welcomed.
18.12.17	Harborough District Council	<p><u>4.2.21 Town Centre Growth</u></p> <p>HDC supports the principle set out in the spatial</p>	Comment of support welcomed.

		strategy that the town centres will be the focus for retail growth.	
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>OAHN and Housing Requirement</b></p> <p>As set out in the NPPF the Council should be proactively supporting sustainable development to deliver the homes needed by identifying and then meeting housing needs (para 17) in particular the Council should be significantly boosting the supply of housing (para 47). The Council should ensure that the assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated taking full account of market and economic signals (para 158). The Council should use its evidence base to ensure that the Plan meets in full OAHN as far as consistent with the framework including identifying key sites critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period (para 47).</p> <p>The NPPG advises that housing need should be assessed in relation to the relevant functional area known as the HMA (ID 2a-008). An OAHN should be unconstrained (ID 2a-004) and strongly recommends the use of its standard methodology (ID 2a-005). This methodology is a three stage process comprising :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demographic based on past population change and household formation rates (HFR) (ID 2a-015 – 017) ;</li> <li>• Economic to accommodate and not jeopardise future job growth (ID 2a-018) ;</li> <li>• Market signals to consider undersupply relative to demand (ID 2a-019 &amp; 020) ;</li> <li>• Affordable housing need is separately assessed (ID 2a-022 – 028) but delivery of affordable housing can be a consideration for increasing planned housing provision (ID 2a-029).</li> </ul> <p>The Council's latest OAHN calculation is set out in Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HEDNA 2017. This Report</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p>

		<p>identifies an OAHN for Oadby &amp; Wigston of 2,960 dwellings (148 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2011 – 2031. This OAHN comprises of :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A demographic starting point of 123 dwellings per annum using 2014 Sub National Population / Household Projections (SNPP/SNHP) plus 10 year migration trend adjustment multiplied by a vacancy rate ;</li> <li>• 148 dwellings per annum after a market signal adjustment of +25 dwellings per annum. It is noted that Oadby &amp; Wigston has an affordability ratio of 7.7 which within the HMA is second highest after Harborough. As set out in the NPPG the more significant the affordability constraints then the larger the improvement in affordability needed (ID 2a-020). The adjustment of +25 dwellings per annum represents a 20% market signal adjustment.</li> </ul> <p>At the HMA level there is no economic growth led adjustment to OAHN because the demographic projections plus market signal adjustment exceed economic led forecasts. Previously at the North West Leicestershire Local Plan Examination the HBF and other parties criticised the HEDNA’s approach of no adjustment to support economic growth. There is a genuine concern that the HEDNA does not positively support economic growth in the HMA.</p> <p>The Councils latest evidence shows a net affordable housing need of 143 dwellings per annum which is the same figure as the Borough’s total OAHN. However the proposed housing requirement disregards this significant affordable housing need and there is no further increase in the total housing requirement to help deliver affordable homes as set out in the NPPG (ID 2a-029). It is acknowledged that the Council may not be able to meet full affordable housing needs because to seek to deliver all identified affordable</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>housing need as a proportion of market housing may result in an unrealistic and undeliverable position however it does not necessarily mean that some increased provision could not be achieved. The Council has not adequately considered the scope for additional housing over and above OAHN to make a contribution towards meeting affordable housing need.</p> <p>The housing requirement of at least 2,960 dwellings (148 dwellings per annum) for the plan period 2011 – 2031 set out in <b>Policy 2</b> also excludes any contribution to meeting declared quantified unmet housing needs from elsewhere in the Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA. As identified in the HWP the Government considers that Councils may not be undertakings an honest assessment of housing needs. As a consequence the Government has consulted on a standardised methodology for the calculation of OAHN. The Council should give consideration to the implications of the Government’s proposed standard methodology for both the Borough and the HMA. By the time of the Local Plan Examination (if submitted after March 2018) it may be necessary for the Council to prepare an assessment of housing needs based on this standard methodology. If a re-assessment of housing needs using the standard methodology is undertaken the HBF may wish to submit further comments on OAHN and the Council’s housing requirement in written Hearing Statements and during oral discussions at the Examination Hearing Sessions.</p>	
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>Housing Land Supply (HLS)</b></p> <p>The overall HLS of 2,960 dwellings is set out in Table 1 of the Plan summarised as :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,346 dwellings (578 dwellings built April 2011 – March 2017 and 768 dwellings existing commitments as at March 2017) ;</li> <li>• 1,614 dwellings (129 dwellings allocated in Wigston</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p>

		<p>town centre, 76 dwellings allocated in Oadby district centre, Direction for Growth Areas allocations for 1,159 dwellings and allocation of smaller sites (11 – 99 dwellings) for 250 dwellings in Leicester PUA).</p> <p>The HBF do not comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites therefore our representations are submitted without prejudice to any comments made by other parties on the deliverability of specific sites included in the overall HLS, 5 YHLS and housing trajectory (Figure 1). The Council’s HLS assumes that all of the proposed allocations in the Plan will be found sound. However the soundness of individual allocations will be discussed throughout the course of the examination if any are found to be unsound these will need to be deleted from the HLS accordingly.</p> <p>It is also essential that the Council’s assumptions on lead-in times, non-implementation, lapse and delivery rates for sites are realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing and sense checked by the Council using historical empirical data and local knowledge. The figures set out in Table 1 provide no contingency within the HLS. The Council cites an additional 400 dwellings sourced as 40 dwellings from within the settlement boundary of Kilby Bridge, 300 dwellings from Phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth and 70 dwellings from windfalls (see para 4.2.11) which the Council states negates any potential delivery issues on allocated sites and helps fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City’s declared unmet need. This additional 400 dwellings represents a contingency of circa 13.5% the HBF always recommends as large a contingency as possible. The Council’s proposed level of contingency is also below the 10 – 20% non-implementation gap together with 15 – 20% lapse rate illustrated by the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>DCLG presentation slide from the HBF Planning Conference September 2015 (see below). The slide also suggests “<i>the need to plan for permissions on more units than the housing start / completions ambition</i>”.</p> <p>The Council should also consider the allocation of developable reserve sites together with an appropriate release mechanism as recommended by the LPEG Report. The LPEG Report proposed that “<i>the NPPF makes clear that local plans should be required not only to demonstrate a five year land supply but also focus on ensuring a more effective supply of developable land for the medium to long term (over the whole plan period), plus make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable Reserve Sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF</i>” (para 11.4 of the LPEG Report).</p>	
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>Year Housing Land Supply (YHLS)</b></p> <p>At the time of this consultation the Council has not provided an up to date 5 YHLS calculation. The 5 YHLS is a snap shot in time which can change very quickly. The following analysis addresses matters of principle rather than detailed site specific analysis. The HBF’s preferences for the calculation of 5 YHLS are the Sedgefield approach to shortfalls as set out in the NPPG (ID 3-035) with a 20% buffer applied to both the annualised housing requirement and any shortfall.</p> <p>If the Council could not demonstrate a 5 YHLS on adoption of the Local Plan which is maintainable throughout the plan period then the Plan could not be found sound. If further site allocations are needed in order to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Response to these representations is set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p>

		<p>possible range of products. Inevitably the key to increasing housing supply is increasing the number of sales outlets which means the allocation of more sites.</p> <p>The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand. This approach is also advocated in the Housing White Paper because a good mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector.</p> <p>When more information on 5 YHLS becomes available the HBF may wish to submit further comments in written Hearing Statements and during oral discussions at the Examination Hearing Sessions.</p>	
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Page 27 – Housing Growth</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.2.4 to 4.2.6</p> <p>Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the HMA, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>The Council identifies at paragraph 4.2.4 of the plan that its OAHN for the period 2011 – 2031 is 2,960 dwellings (148 dwellings per annum). This figure derives from the Leicester and Leicestershire HEDNA, which provides a 'policy off' assessment of the need for housing following the guidance set out in the NPPG.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that the assumptions and conclusions of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) are robust and justified. All of the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have accepted the outcomes of the HEDNA and approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes. In addition,</p>

		<p>Paragraph: 029 Reference ID: 2a-029-20140306 of the NPPG makes the case that total affordable housing need should be considered in the context of its likely delivery as a proportion of mixed market and affordable housing developments, given the probable percentage of affordable housing to be delivered by market housing led developments. It goes on to state that an increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes. NPPF considers this issue separately to any adjustments made in respect of market signals.</p> <p>The HEDNA highlights Oadby and Wigston as the only authority in the HMA where the net need for affordable housing per annum exceeds the demographic led housing need and notes that the evidence would justify consideration of upward adjustments to increase affordable housing delivery in all of the HMA local authorities (albeit a note of caution is added in doing this). Notwithstanding the significant affordable housing need, HEDNA does not seek to adjust the OAHN to address affordable housing need, making only a market signal adjustment of 20% (an additional 25 dwellings above the identified demographic led requirement).</p> <p>As made clear in HEDNA, OAHN figures for the HMA are not plan targets but the starting point for discussion. In light of this it is considered that it is within Oadby and Wigston's remit to consider an upwards adjustment to the OAHN in the Borough to address affordable housing need, especially in light of historic under-delivery. Similarly, the OAHN does not take into account the potential need to meet unmet housing needs from other authority areas in the HMA, particularly Leicester City. To be positively prepared (and thus sound) the Local Plan needs to adequately address these issues</p>	<p>all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan.</p> <p>In addition, the HEDNA has been found sound and robust evidence base at the recent North West Leicestershire Local Plan Examination in Public. Therefore, the assumptions and conclusions within the HEDNA conform to national policy and guidance set out in the NPPF and NPPG. In conformity with national policy and guidance, the HEDNA used national population projections as its starting point from which upward adjustments were made. It is incorrect to suggest that the HEDNA did not take account of upwards adjustments relating to affordable housing need.</p> <p>To note, the Council is in agreement that the housing OAN identified within the HEDNA is not a Plan target. The figures identified within the HEDNA are the starting point from which Plan targets flow. To get to the Plan period target specified within the Council's Local Plan, various pieces of evidence base documentation was taken account of, including land availability, and most importantly in context of the Borough, transport and highway infrastructure testing.</p> <p>It should be noted that at paragraph 4.2.11 of the Local Plan, the Council illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes up to 2031. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need.</p>
--	--	---	--

		and consequently allocate additional sites to meet any uplift to the OAN.	
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough</p> <p>Draft Policy 2 sets out the spatial strategy for the Borough in respect of the quantum and location of development. In respect of housing, the Council proposes an overall housing requirement that exactly matches the OAHN of 2,960 dwellings identified in HEDNA. This is not considered a sound basis on which to ensure delivery of the housing needed within the Borough. Without any element of flexibility to deal with non-implementation or delays to development, it is our view that the plan cannot be judged to be effective .</p> <p>Similarly, the plan fails to have sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change as required by paragraph 14 of the Framework and is therefore not consistent with national policy. This is particularly pertinent as 60% of the projected housing delivery is to occur on the three Direction for Growth areas in the Borough where delays in lead times are more likely to happen. In this regard, it is widely accepted that housing delivery can be slow on large strategic sites, as substantial infrastructure works are required ahead of dwellings being constructed and delivered. The dominance of a limited number of sites will therefore risk the future delivery of housing in Wigston and so place at risk the vision and objectives of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst paragraphs 4.2.11 and 4.3.36 refer to a buffer being provided of circa 400 dwellings (40 at Kilby Bridge, 70 windfall allowance over the plan period and 300 at phase 3 of the Wigston Direction for Growth area) these do not represent a planned approach to dealing with the circumstances in which a contingency</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Upon the publication of the HEDNA in January 2017, the Council has had to work extremely proactively and positively to meet its illustrated housing OAN. The housing OAN illustrated within the HEDNA (and subsequent Plan target) is a huge 'step change' for the Council. From planning for 90 dwellings per year, the Council has had to plan for 148 dwellings per year to fulfil its own OAN.</p> <p>The huge change / shift in housing requirement has meant that the Council has had to identify and allocate over 60 per cent more land than it would have been required to identify should the requirement have remained at 90 dwellings per year. The principal constraint for the Council, has always been its highway and transport infrastructure and network. The highway network within the Borough is currently severely congested along both its routes and its junctions; the levels of growth identified and allocated only exacerbate this further.</p> <p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study assessed the highway and transport network within the Borough up to 2031 taking account of the land identified and allocated within the Local Plan. The assessment concluded that the levels of development proposed could be accommodated, however highway mitigation works would be required. Any development over and above that proposed within the Plan is likely to have significant further impacts on the local highway network.</p>

		<p>is required. The 300 additional dwellings at phase 3 the Wigston Direction for Growth area are noted to be planned for post-2031 and would, in any case, need to be considered through a future review of the plan. Phase 3 development is not evaluated in the sustainability appraisal and thus it cannot be considered at this point that it necessarily be would be the most appropriate strategy and is not therefore justified.</p> <p>It is our view that there is a strong case for making provision for reserve sites in the Local Plan, given the likelihood that should the Plan proceed to adoption it will require an early review to deal with the matter of unmet needs from elsewhere within the HMA. This approach would give some certainty to the direction of travel in any early review, as well as help speed up the process.</p> <p>Seven Oaks Farm to the north of Newton Lane, Wigston, (in which Davidsons Developments has an interest) combined with the land to the west would provide a suitable location for accommodating additional development and could perform as a reserve site, subject to an appropriate release mechanism.</p> <p>Such an allocation would give the plan some flexibility and assist in meeting the requirement for the plan to be sound. Davidsons and Jelsons are keen to work collaboratively and are liaising regarding the sites; hence why the supporting Landscape Framework and Transport Appraisal considered below cover both areas of land.</p> <p>Land to the north of Newton Lane, including the Seven Oaks Farm site has been considered as part of the sustainability appraisal and whilst not allocated, it</p>	<p>As suggested by the representation, in addition to the Council meeting its own OAN for housing, the Local Plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) illustrates a 'buffer' of new additional homes up to 2031. This buffer would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites, as well as help fulfil a proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need.</p> <p>In addition, the Council is confident that the levels of development proposed will come forward within the Plan period as expected and illustrated within the Local Plan housing trajectory. As with any trajectory, the further into the future it forecasts, the (potentially) less reliable it becomes. In the short to medium term the Council are confident that the trajectory is accurate and robust and the 'buffer' is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>Up to 2031, as illustrated, the Borough area can just provide (from a transport and highway network capacity point of view) the required housing need. Post 2031, the Strategic Growth Plan has the potential to 'unlock' further land within the Borough through its proposed provision of large scale highway and transport infrastructure that would relieve the pressures on the transport and highway network within the Leicester Principal Urban Area, particularly Leicester City and the Borough of Oadby and Wigston.</p> <p>As suggested earlier, due to the constrained and congested nature of the Borough's highway network any development over and above that allocated within the Local Plan (up to 2031) would be subject to highway testing that took account of cumulative impact and not just site specific impact.</p> <p>In reference to the land North of Newton Lane, as submitted by Landmark Planning, it is important to</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>scored comparably to sites that have been allocated, e.g. the Cottage Farm extension on the A6 at Oadby. The sustainability credentials of the Seven Oaks Farm location were broadly outlined in the representations made to the Preferred Options consultation in December 2016. These current representations are supported by further evidence of the suitability of the site for development; namely a Landscape Framework Plan (prepared by Golby + Luck) and a Transport Appraisal (undertaken by ADC Infrastructure). Both Sites.</p> <p>The Landscape Framework Plan demonstrates how land to the north of Newton Lane, including the land at Seven Oaks Farm, could form a logical extension to Wigston that would also complement and link into the consented/allocated Direction for Growth to the south and east of the settlement. The site would be capable of delivering significant new areas of publicly accessible Green Infrastructure that would build on existing public rights of way and natural features and providing green linkages between Oadby golf course right through to Kilby Bridge. At the same time the function of the Green Wedge would not be compromised and built development would be designed to be no closer to Oadby than it is at present.</p> <p>The Transport Appraisal considers a number of options for site access, including adding a fourth arm to the roundabout serving Phase 1 of the Direction for Growth. In all scenarios at least 2 points of access can be achieved. The report considers there to be scope for diverting a bus service through the site and that good pedestrian and cycling connections could be secured. Whilst junctions would require modeling in order to fully assess the impact of the development of the site on the highway network, the appraisal considers that</p>	<p>highlight that the site does not have a main site access point that is directly onto a main arterial route, for example a route classified as an A Road or B Road. It should also be noted that the site did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, therefore has not been taken account of from a cumulative transport / highway testing perspective. All three Direction for Growth Areas allocated within the Local Plan have been subject to cumulative transport / highway testing and were taken account of in the South East Leicestershire Transport</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>mitigation could be implemented where any impact would be severe.</p> <p>In summary, the plan is not currently sound as it is not positively prepared or effective. In order to make the plan sound, the Council should include a 'buffer' for delays or non-implementation in delivering the housing trajectory. It is our view that such a buffer could take the form of 'reserve' sites and that land north of Newton Lane, Wigston would be a suitable and sustainable site.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>Site Selection</p> <p>Policy 2 identifies individual site allocations and Direction for Growth Areas where residential development is to be delivered. The larger allocations are then identified in Chapter 7 and through Policies 18, 20 and 21.</p> <p>As explained in more detail in the other representations relating to Chapter 7 it is considered the Sustainability Assessment has not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate. In particular the SA has failed to consider the Land at Oadby Grange, which forms a reasonable alternative. The omission of this and other reasonable alternatives has been found to be unlawful by Mr. Justice Mitting in the High Court Judgment of the City and District Council of St Albans vs Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government et al [2009] EWHC 1280 (Admin). Had this site been considered as a reasonable alternative, it is considered that the Local Plan would have proposed this as an allocation given its sustainability credentials.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>In relation to the suitability of the land at Oadby Grange it is of note that the Council had not been made aware the recent interest in bringing the land forward, prior to the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation stage. It was only made aware through Pegasus Planning's submission on the 18th December 2017 (the closing day for the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation). Therefore this land has not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Been assessed by the Council through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment since 2013, or</li> <li>• Been submitted to the Council for consideration during any of the Call for Sites processes that have been undertaken by the Council for the purposes of Local Plan preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, this land has been subject to a Section 106 Agreement between Mr Thomas Watson Walker, the Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council. The original S106 Agreement dates back to 2001. Throughout the time of the agreement, the Council has been in discussions with the land owner to provide a</p>

			<p>publically owned country park, hence the land area ceasing to be considered by the Council for built development post 2013 (alongside a lack of developer or site promoter interest).</p> <p>The land has previously been included in the Council's SHLAA process due to it being considered through the Council's Allocations Issues and Options Public Consultation 2007. It has not been promoted by an external land agent or land owner.</p> <p>In addition, the Oadby Grange site, is situated in designated Countryside and does not have direct access onto one of the Borough's main highway and transport routes (A Road or B Road). The site is located to the very edge of an existing residential estate, approximately 0.7 miles from the nearest main route, the A6. It should also be noted that the site did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, therefore has not been taken account of from a cumulative transport / highway testing perspective.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the Council, throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, has considered sites that have been promoted to the Council through the numerous Local Plan Call for Sites processes undertaken and the SHLAA Call for Sites process undertaken. The Council has considered sites that have known developer interest and have been informed regarding a sites availability, achievability and suitability.</p> <p>To reiterate, the Council has not been made aware of the site being promoted by Pegasus Planning during the Local Plan process, until the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation final day for representations, therefore the Council considers that it is inappropriate</p>
--	--	--	--

			to say that the Council has not considered the site, in particular through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as the Council was unaware of it.
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>Land at Oadby Grange</p> <p>The Land at Oadby Grange has not been properly assessed and this represents an opportunity to deliver housing on a site well related to the Principal Urban Area and which is contained by mature landscape features and the topography of the area. The site is in an accessible location and is not located within a Green Wedge or affected by any designations. It also lies within Flood Zone 1 (the zone with least probability of flooding).</p> <p>The objector has prepared a Site Delivery Statement which highlights why the site is suitable for an allocation of between 270 and 320 dwellings. To avoid duplication, the merits of the site are not repeated in full here, but the document should be read in combination with these objections.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The reasons why the Land at Oadby Grange has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative in the SA Report have been set out above.</p> <p>Furthermore given the high level nature of the SA and a requirement for a consistency between the appraisal of sites in line with the SA Assumptions it is not considered appropriate that details presented in the Site Delivery Statement should influence the outcome of the SA. This level of detail is not available for consideration for each site and therefore the information included should not influence the findings of any appraisal undertaken.</p>
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>SHLAA</p> <p>The SHLAA proformas are not available on the LPA website but it is known that Land at Oadby Grange was tested in the 2013 SHLAA with a potential capacity of 365 dwellings. No insurmountable constraints were identified, however from a planning policy perspective the SHLAA proforma [page 36] did record the following constraint:-</p> <p><b>“Section 106 agreement stemming from development on Florence Wragg Way to provide the land as open space”</b></p> <p>This is a mis-representation of the s.106 agreement (a copy of which is provided alongside these</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>In relation to the suitability of the land at Oadby Grange it is of note that the Council had not been made aware the recent interest in bringing the land forward, prior to the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation stage. It was only made aware through Pegasus Planning’s submission on the 18th December 2017 (the closing day for the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation). Therefore this land has not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Been assessed by the Council through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment since 2013, or</li> <li>• Been submitted to the Council for consideration</li> </ul>

		<p>representations). Whilst it is correct that the s.106 does provide for a country park around the periphery of the site it does not require the open fields that form the main part of the site to be provided as open space. The s.106 clearly identifies those parts of the site as "retained land."</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan also mis-represented the position and identified the land as proposed recreation space. However, the land remains in private ownership and there is no intention on the part of the landowner to make the land available for that purpose.</p> <p>The related Policy R7 was therefore nothing more than aspirational. It should be noted that the LPA did consider purchasing the site but chose not to proceed with this.</p> <p>In this context, it is also relevant to highlight that the country park has yet to be handed over to the LPA because negotiations have not yet been finalised. If the site was to come forward for development there would be opportunities address this matter and also secure possible enhancements to the extent of the Country Park and/or its future management.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Pre Submission Draft Plan does not continue to identify the land as a proposed recreation area on the draft Policies Map. It simply shows the site as "countryside" beyond the built up area.</p> <p>Had the policy status of the site been properly understood earlier, the site should have been considered more favourably.</p>	<p>during any of the Call for Sites processes that have been undertaken by the Council for the purposes of Local Plan preparation.</p> <p>Furthermore, this land has been subject to a Section 106 Agreement between Mr Thomas Watson Walker, the Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council. The original S106 Agreement dates back to 2001. Throughout the time of the agreement, the Council has been in discussions with the land owner to provide a publically owned country park, hence the land area ceasing to be considered by the Council for built development post 2013 (alongside a lack of developer or site promoter interest).</p> <p>The land has previously been included in the Council's SHLAA process due to it being considered through the Council's Allocations Issues and Options Public Consultation 2007. It has not been promoted by an external land agent or land owner.</p> <p>In addition, the Oadby Grange site, is situated in designated Countryside and does not have direct access onto one of the Borough's main highway and transport routes (A Road or B Road). The site is located to the very edge of an existing residential estate, approximately 0.7 miles from the nearest main route, the A6. It should also be noted that the site did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, therefore has not been taken account of from a cumulative transport / highway testing perspective.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the Council, throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, has considered sites that have been promoted to the Council through the numerous Local Plan Call for Sites processes undertaken and the SHLAA Call for Sites process</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b>  The Pre Submission Plan and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal has not considered the option of allocating Land at Oadby Grange for housing and has therefore not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Pegasus Group has prepared a Site Deliverability Statement on behalf of the objector which identifies the merits of the site and how it could be developed. This which should be read alongside these objections.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b></p> <p>Land at Oadby Grange should be identified as an additional residential allocation to address the increased housing requirement that is likely to arise from a more robust assessment of the OAN (see objections to Policy S2.</p> <p>If those objections are not accepted, the site should still be allocated for housing as an alternative to land at Stoughton Grange or Cottage Farm (also see objections to Policies 18 and 21)</p>	<p>undertaken. The Council has considered sites that have known developer interest and have been informed regarding a sites availability, achievability and suitability.</p> <p>To reiterate, the Council has not been made aware of the site being promoted by Pegasus Planning during the Local Plan process, until the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation final day for representations, therefore the Council considers that it is inappropriate to say that the Council has not considered the site, in particular through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as the Council was unaware of it.</p>
18.12.17	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Leicestershire County Council, in its role as local highway authority (LHA), has been working closely with Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (OWBC) as part of the Local Plan making process. As such it is content that the draft submission document is appropriately evidenced and also appropriately deals with transportation considerations at this stage in the planning process. Subject to OWBC's continued commitment to the policies and delivery approaches set out within the document, the LHA supports the submission of the plan and looks forward to working</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>

		with Oadby and Wigston Borough Council in its delivery.	
18.12.17	Leicestershire County Council	The LHA also recognises the challenges associated with accommodating significant further growth over and above that which is outlined within the draft local plan and confirms that further evidence would be required as to the impact of additional proposed development on the highway network and appropriate mitigation.	Comment noted.
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p><b>Merits of Development</b></p> <p>We have set out in Sections 3, 4 and 5 our representations on the soundness of the Pre-Submission version of the Plan in respect of a number of issues. In this Section, we summarise the planning merits of the land which Jelson is promoting in conjunction with Davidsons, and then review the Sustainability Appraisal which has been prepared as part of the evidence base for the Plan.</p> <p>We have explained in Section 2 that the site is located in Flood Zone 1 and that there are no statutorily listed buildings, or other designated heritage assets, within the site or in close proximity to it. Furthermore, we have explained that the site immediately adjoins the existing urban area of Wigston. There are existing bus stops on Meadow Way and Guthlaxton Way, served by routes that provide public transport links into Wigston town centre (the principal centre of the Borough) and also Leicester City Centre. In other words, there is an existing public transport system in place which can facilitate trips to shops, services and employment opportunities by means other than the private car.</p> <p>Therefore, and as a matter of principle, we conclude that the site occupies a sustainable location adjacent to the existing urban area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Local Plan is one of its many important pieces of evidence base. When assessing the sites for allocation within the Local Plan, the Council considers many aspects, not just the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Although the Borough area, being constrained and compact in size, having severe transport and highway infrastructure issues, specifically congestion along its routes and at its junctions, in order to allocate sufficient land to accommodate the required levels of growth up to 2031, the Council considered it necessary to identify three Direction for Growth Areas on greenfield land. The three Direction for Growth Areas allocated within the Plan were considered to have the least negative impact on the Borough's highway and transport infrastructure network, and were considered the most appropriate locations in relation to existing urban development form, the Leicester Principal Urban Area and access onto main arterial transport routes (A Roads and B Roads).</p> <p>The Wigston Direction for Growth Area (Phase 1) was first identified through the Council's Core Strategy in 2010, and comprised the Council's single greenfield release site of 450 new homes. Subsequent to the Core</p>

		<p>As we have noted elsewhere, Golby and Luck have prepared a Landscape Framework Plan, which demonstrates how development parcels on the site might be arranged in order to prevent any coalescence between Oadby and Wigston and so avoid any conflict with the purposes of the Green Wedge. That plan also shows that development could be brought forward alongside new landscaping, and the enhancement of existing features, in order to provide an appropriate form of development on the eastern edge of Wigston that would extend the urban area in a logical fashion, whilst continuing to provide an appropriate green 'edge' between built development and the countryside to the east.</p> <p>The Council has commissioned a Sustainability Appraisal, which has been prepared by Land Use Consultants to support the Pre-Submission version of the Plan. The Appraisal carries out assessments of both those sites which are proposed for allocation in the Plan, and those which have been submitted earlier in the planmaking process but which the Council has decided not to propose for allocation (and which includes the land which Jelson is promoting in conjunction with Davidsons).</p> <p>Chapter 5, supported by Appendix 5, of the Appraisal sets out the scoring against prescribed sustainability objectives for all residential development options which have been submitted through the plan-making process, including those sites which have been allocated. The land promoted by Jelson and Davidsons (Site OWBC 43) scores very positively in relation to housing (objective 1), health (objective 2), community facilities (objective 3), education (objective 16), employment opportunities (objective 17) and public transport (objective 22). In our view, this reflects that there are a</p>	<p>Strategy adoption, the land promoters for Phase 1 publically consulted on a Masterplan scheme that sought further development of the area (up to 1000 new homes including the 450 of Phase 2). It was this Masterplan that formed the basis of the Phase 2 Wigston Direction for Growth Area that is allocated within the Council's Local Plan. The Wigston Direction for Growth Area has been subject to cumulative transport testing and importantly has two main site access points directly onto, Newton Lane to the north and the main arterial route (A Road) of Welford Road (A5199) (significant to Leicester and Leicestershire also) to the south west. In addition, 5 hectares of employment land has been allocated at the Wigston Direction for Growth area, which contributes towards its appropriateness and sustainability. As well as residential and employment provision, the scale of development proposed at the Wigston Direction for Growth Area provides essential community facility provision, including a new local centre, a new primary school, and a new community facility building.</p> <p>The Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Area allocated within the Local Plan, similar to the Wigston Direction for Growth Area, was a site of extant development (Phase 1). The Local Plan allocates further land comprising Phase 2 development. The Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Areas direct access onto one of the Borough's (and Leicester and Leicestershire's) main arterial routes, the A6 (A Road) was considered a fundamental element, alongside its extant Phase 1 development.</p> <p>The Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth Area does not comprise of extant development like the other two Direction for Growth Areas, however does have two main site access points directly onto the main arterial</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>number of factors which point to a conclusion that the site occupies a sustainable location for residential development.</p> <p>The Appraisal also concludes that the site is likely to have a significant negative effect on the historic environment, biodiversity and landscape. The more detailed assessment of the site in Appendix 5 states that the negative effect is likely to arise from two areas of archaeological potential within the site. However, the Appraisal notes that “the negative effect is uncertain given that it may be possible to mitigate negative impacts on areas which are likely to contain buried archaeology”. We agree with this view, and so it follows that it is feasible that the impacts could be reduced from the ‘significant negative’ set out in the Appraisal.</p> <p>Again the significant negative score for biodiversity arises, it appears, from a candidate Local Wildlife Site being located within the site. However, the Appraisal also notes that a scheme could be designed to mitigate any impacts on habitats. We agree, and conclude that there is potential for the impacts on this objective to be less than the significant negative identified by the Council’s consultants.</p> <p>Finally, the significant negative score in relation to landscape as a consequence of the site comprising greenfield land. Again, the Council’s consultants note that specific impacts will be known once a scheme for the site has been prepared. Whilst we agree, we do refer back to the Golby and Luck Landscape Framework Plan, which shows potential for comprehensive new landscaping, and the enhancement of existing features, in order to soften the edge of the development and respect its sensitive relationship with the countryside to the east. Therefore, while development on the site will</p>	<p>routes (B Road) of Stoughton Road (B582) to the east and Gartree Road (B582) to the north.</p> <p>In addition, it should be noted that the three Direction for Growth Areas have formed part of the Local Plan throughout its process, as well as being illustrated as Broad Locations (consistent with paragraph 47 of the NPPF) within the Council’s SHLAA for a number of years. Prior to the production of the Pre-Submission version of the Council’s Local Plan, the Preferred Options version of the Local Plan highlighted Land between Stoughton Road and Gartree Road, Oadby (now the allocated Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth Area) and Land at Cottage Farm, Oadby (now the allocated Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Area) as options for Greenfield Release sites, should the Borough’s housing need require a need to do so.</p> <p>In reference to the land North of Newton Lane, as submitted by GVA, it is important to highlight that the site does not have a main site access point that is directly onto a main arterial route, for example a route classified as an A Road or B Road. It should also be noted that the site did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, (nor has any cumulative study been submitted), therefore has not been taken account of from a cumulative transport / highway testing perspective. All three Direction for Growth Areas allocated within the Local Plan have been subject to cumulative transport / highway testing and were taken account of in the South East Leicestershire Transport Study.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>have an impact on the landscape, we conclude that this could be mitigated, such that the score ascribed to the site by the Council's consultants could be reduced as a consequence.</p> <p>It is worth also noting how Site OWBC 43 scores against those sites which have been proposed for allocation in the Plan. When compared to Cottage Farm Direction for Growth (OWBC 44), we note that Jelson's site is likely to have a significant positive effect in relation to community facilities (objective 3) whereas Cottage Farm is expected to have only a minor positive effect. In relation to landscaping, OWBC 43 is said to have a significant negative impact (although as we have said above, with reference to the Golby and Luck plan this could be reduced), whereas Cottage Farm is said to have a mix of significant negative and minor positive impacts. The detailed analysis in Appendix 5 of the Appraisal states that the 'minor positive' impact of the Cottage Farm site will arise from the provision of open space on the site. Given that Golby and Luck have shown open space and landscaping on the Landscape Framework Plan for OWBC 43, we conclude that both sites should at least score equally in relation to this objective, rather than Cottage Farm scoring better than Jelson's site.</p> <p>That being so, we note that the two sites score equally in all other regards. In our view, this means that OWBC 43 scores, at least, equally, if not better than OWBC 44 overall.</p> <p>In relation to the Wigston Direction for Growth Phase 2 site (OWBC 17a), we note that this scores worse in relation to health than OWBC 43. OWBC 17a is projected to have a mix of minor positive and negative impacts on health, whereas OWBC 43 is projected to</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>have significant positive and only minor negative impacts. Furthermore, whilst both sites are projected to have significant positive impacts on community facilities, there is a question mark attributed to Site OWBC 17a, which indicated uncertainty about the potential for those impacts to be delivered.</p> <p>Otherwise, the two sites score equally. Consequently, we conclude, based on the Sustainability Appraisal, that OWBC 43 scores better than OWBC 17a.</p> <p>Finally, we compare the score of OWBC 43 to the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth site (OWBC 24 and OWBC 28). OWBC 43 scores better than OWBC 24 in the following areas:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community facilities;</li> <li>• education; and</li> <li>• access.</li> </ul> <p>OWBC 43 scores better than OWBC 28 in the following areas:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• health;</li> <li>• community facilities;</li> <li>• education;</li> <li>• employment opportunities;</li> <li>• access; and</li> <li>• public transport.</li> </ul> <p>In a number of cases, the differences are significant. For example, OWBC 43 is projected to have significant positive impacts on community facilities, whereas OWBC 24 is projected to have only a combination of minor positive and minor negative impacts, and OWBC 28 is projected to have a combination of minor positive and significant negative impacts. Similarly, OWBC 43 is forecast to have significant positive impacts on</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>education, but OWBC 24 and OWBC are forecast to have only minor negative impacts. Furthermore, OWBC is projected to have minor positive impacts on employment opportunities and negligible impacts on access. OWBC 28 is projected to have significant negative impacts on both.</p> <p>This conclusion is expressed despite the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal. Furthermore, and as we have explained elsewhere in this Report, the site could also be accessed via Denbydale, which we expect could serve at least part of the site. The Council's conclusion on this point is therefore incorrect.</p> <p>Most significant, though, is the Council's assertion that the location of the site in the countryside means development would not be sustainable as a matter of principle. This is an unreasonable conclusion to reach given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the other proposed Direction for Growth sites are located in the countryside; and</li> <li>b) the Sustainability Appraisal has demonstrated that Jelson's land is more sustainable than the three proposed Direction for Growth allocations.</li> </ul> <p>The reasons given by the Council in Appendix 6 of the Sustainability Appraisal for allocating certain sites are equally as unclear. In relation to Stoughton Grange, the Council's reason is given as,</p> <p><i>"Site is located in the Green Wedge and is to be released through the Local Plan. The Green Wedge boundary has been amended through the Local Plan process... Both OWBC 24 and OWBC 28 form the same site in the Pre-Submission Local Plan. The total number of residential units proposed is 300."</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>In our view, none of that provides justification for the allocation of the site. It is simply a description of the site. This also reaffirms our conclusion in Section 5 that the Council has provided no justification for its proposed Green Wedge releases.</p> <p>A similar issue arises in relation to the Cottage Farm Direction for Growth site (OWBC 44). The Council's reasoning for allocation is given as,  <i>"Site is located adjacent to the existing Green Wedge. The Green Wedge is to be extended and part of the proposal site will be located within the extended Green Wedge boundary. The Green Wedge boundary has been amended through the Local Plan process..."</i></p> <p>Again, nothing in that statement seeks to explain or justify the decision to allocate the site instead of a more sustainable option presented by Jelson's land at OWBC 43.</p> <p>Accordingly, for all of these reasons, we conclude that the Plan is unsound because it fails to have regard to the Sustainability Appraisal which forms part of its evidence base and which concludes that Site OWBC 43 is more sustainable than the proposed Direction for Growth allocations. Furthermore, the Plan is unsound because the Council has failed to justify its proposed allocations with regard to the conclusions reached by its evidence base.</p> <p>In order to remedy this error, we conclude that the Council should propose the allocation of Site OWBC 43 for residential development, in recognition of its sustainable location, as demonstrated in the Council's evidence base.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b><i>We conclude that Policies 2, 18, 20 and 21 are not justified, because they do not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, as demonstrated by the conclusions reached in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>We have already concluded elsewhere that the Council needs to revisit its spatial strategy and evidence base in relation to Green Wedges. On the basis of the above, we also conclude that the Council should review its spatial strategy, and in particular its proposed allocations, in the light of the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, and ensure that it is setting out a strategy that reflects the conclusions of its evidence base. To this end, we suggest that Site OWBC 43 is proposed for allocation in recognition of its sustainable location for new residential development.</i></b></p>	
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>Conclusion</b> For the Oadby &amp; Wigston Local Plan to be found sound under the four tests of soundness as defined by the NPPF (para 182), the Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Currently the Local Plan is unsound because of :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an under-estimation of housing needs ;</li> <li>• an ineffective review mechanism to deal with identified unmet housing needs in Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA ;</li> <li>• insufficient flexibility in overall HLS ;</li> <li>• potentially no 5 YHLS on adoption of the Plan ;</li> <li>• unjustified policy requirements for NDSS ;</li> <li>• insufficient viability testing of proposed affordable</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Local Plan has been positively prepared, it is justified, it is effective and it is consistent with national policy. Please see officer responses to all other HBF comments for the Council's reasoning for this.</p>

		<p>housing policy.</p> <p>Therefore the Local Plan is inconsistent with national policy. It is not positively prepared or properly justified meaning it will be ineffective. It is hoped that these representations are of assistance to the Council in preparing the next stages of the Oadby &amp; Wigston Local Plan. In the meantime if any further information or assistance is required please contact the undersigned.</p>	
15.12.17	Gordon White and Hood	<p><u>Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough Comments – DWH (Ellis Farm, Kilby Bridge)</u></p> <p>Section 4.2.11 – refers to the possibility of up to 40 new homes within the Kilby Bridge area, the whole of Kilby Bridge is around 20,000 sqm the useable, easily developed areas behind the housing to the west and the car showroom equate to around a useable area of 13,700 sqm which would give a very high development footprint which would create mass housing with small plots, totally against all other planning policies for the area. With the addition of an expansion of the Kilby bridge settlement boundary of around 13,000 sqm this would allow more sympathetic development of the area as a whole allowing the area to achieve the required number of houses. It must be remembered that the area of the existing settlement boundary includes some areas of flood zone 3, the extension of the boundary onto the ellis farm site is outside this flood area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The western parcel of land situated adjacent to the Grand Union Canal (within the settlement envelope) has been proposed for redevelopment by the Canal and Rivers Trust (in partnership with H2O Urban) for 16 new canal side residential dwellings, along with small scale retail and boating facilities.</p> <p>Through Local Plan consultations (including the most recent consultation), Wheatcroft Properties Limited have promoted a site (within the settlement envelope) for up to 3 new residential dwellings to the western side of Kilby Bridge also.</p> <p>The above equates to 19 new residential dwellings to the western side of Kilby Bridge.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the full 40 additional new homes at Kilby Bridge be realised over the plan period, a further 21 residential units would be delivered on the 1.37h land area to the east (of Welford Road) described by Gordon White and Hood as usable. Crude calculations illustrate (21 / 1.37) that to fulfil the 21 units on 1.37h of land would require a density of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The current</p>

			<p>minimum dwellings per hectare target set out within Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope, is 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The current minimum dwellings per hectare target set out within Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope, is 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Council considers that the proposed settlement envelope defined within the Local Plan has sufficient capacity to accommodate (up to) 40 dwellings over the Plan period.</p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para 4.2.5 (Page 27)</p> <p>We welcome the recognition at paragraph 4.2.5 that the City has declared an unmet need in the period to 2031 (and beyond) and that its unmet need will have to be accommodated elsewhere in the HMA. Whilst the scale of unmet need will not be fully quantified until the draft Leicester Local Plan has developed further, it is expected to be significant. We would therefore expect emerging local plans within the HMA to set out how they will help respond to Leicester's unmet need over the time period of the plan.</p> <p>Para 4.2.11 (Page 28)</p> <p>We therefore welcome that the plan (at paragraph 4.2.11) refers to an overprovision of housing supply of around 400 dwellings which 'could help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's declared unmet need'.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para. 4.2.12 (Page 28)</p> <p>'Should evidence suggest a need for further development at the Wigston Direction for Growth area (Phase 3), it would be subject to appropriate testing, in particular, highway and transport infrastructure</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicester City Council for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The addition of Leicester City Council's highway</p>

		<p>capacity, and liaison with the Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council Highways department.'</p> <p>This sentence should also include Leicester City Council Highway Authority, where relevant.</p>	<p>department in paragraph 4.2.12 is considered appropriate due to the close spatial link with the two local authority areas.</p> <p>The Council is proposing the following minor amendment –</p> <p><i>'Should evidence suggest a need for further development at the Wigston Direction for Growth area (Phase 3), it would be subject to appropriate testing, in particular, highway and transport infrastructure capacity, and liaison with the Borough Council, <b>Leicester City Council's Highways Department</b> and Leicestershire County Council Highways department.'</i></p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development Within the Borough - p36</p> <p>The City Council welcomes the statement that the Borough will work in partnership with local authorities to coordinate the provision of funding of infrastructure and facilities to meet the needs of planned development. This is especially important with regard to cross boundary issues.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Chapter Six – Housing Delivery</p> <p>The Council's Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) (2017) sets out that there is an Objectively Assessed Need of 148 new homes per annum from 2011 up to 2031 (a total of 2,960) in the Borough. The PSLP states that the Council is aware that the City of Leicester has declared an unmet need and will require help from other Leicester &amp; Leicestershire HMA partners up to 2031 however the Council proposes to meet only its own need during the plan period.</p> <p>We understand that following publication of the HEDNA</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough states at paragraph 4.2.11 that the Council has identified a number of additional new homes (in addition to the 2960 Plan target) that could be delivered should there be need to do so. The paragraph states that the additional homes would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites within the Borough and could help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's unmet need.</p>

		<p>for the HMA, both Leicester City Council and Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough Council declared that they would not be able to accommodate their full OAN for housing within their own boundaries. Letters were sent out by the Council in March 2017, to all other authorities within the HMA, setting out the position and the Council's formal declaration of unmet housing need.</p> <p>Since that time the Council now consider that it will be able to accommodate its needs in the period 2011-2031 but not in respect of the period 2031-2036. This position was set out in a further letter in November 2017.</p> <p>The PSLP states that the HMA authorities, Leicestershire County Council and the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP) are producing a (non statutory) Strategic Growth Plan that will act as the strategic planning framework for the HMS up to 2050. However the process of preparing the Strategic Growth Plan is not anticipated to be complete until the end of 2018.</p> <p>We note that the Council took a paper titled "Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing" to Full Cabinet on 5 December 2017 which was prepared to demonstrate that all of the planning authorities are working together to meet the requirements of the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>This statement states at paragraph 2.9 that Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough Council are yet to formally and finally evidence the extent of their unmet need.</p> <p>Post 2031, the PSLP states that the strategy set out in the Strategic Growth Plan, for this period, will come into effect. One of the key elements to this strategy is</p>	<p>It is incorrect to suggest that the Council is only seeking to meet only it's on need. The Council under the Duty to Cooperate is working with all other local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA on a consistent and ongoing basis.</p> <p>The paragraph referred to in the comments (para 2.9 of the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed need for Housing) does state that the Borough Council is yet to formally and finally evidence the extent of their unmet need, however it is only relevant for the period 2031 onwards. Post Plan period the Council has yet to evidence its housing or employment need. The evidence and strategy for delivering development post 2031 will be dealt with through the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth plan.</p> <p>It must be noted, that the vehicle expressway proposed within the Strategic Growth Plan is different to the EDDR / potential transport route safeguarded through the Local Plan. The vehicle expressway is to be evidenced through the production of the Strategic Growth Plan is to be constructed post Plan period.</p> <p>The Council has been in discussions with the University regarding their land holdings and will continue to work proactively with the University regarding masterplanning and future uses of their assets.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>the delivery of the expressway. As stated in our representations on Chapter One, given the importance of the expressway for meeting housing delivery and also providing some certainty on proposed allocations and safeguarded land, the lack of clarity on the realistic deliverability of the expressway is concerning and should be addressed.</p> <p>Although, both the Council and the Joint Statement of Co-operation note that further work on capacity is still being undertaken, however, it is considered that even with new sites coming forward there will not be enough housing land in the HMA, to meet the full housing need.</p> <p>The University wishes to discuss with the Council the opportunity to potentially promote some of their land for housing. For example, UoL owns a seven hectare site on Stoughton Road, Oadby which is considered to be appropriate for approximately 150 to 200 new dwellings.</p> <p>The University is especially interested in discussing how existing residential properties, currently utilised by students, can be freed up for housing within the HMA, and the development of PBSA,, would be a method in achieving this.</p>	
18.12.17	Coop	<p><u>Policy 3 – Regeneration Schemes and Large Scale Change – Co-op</u></p> <p>The Co-op <b>support</b> the use of, either, Masterplans, Development Briefs and / or other appropriate plans or strategies in the case of sites delivering large scale change. In particular, strategic highways matters should be addressed in conjunction with Leicestershire County Council Highways Department.</p> <p>Officers will be aware that the Co-op has been working</p>	Comment of support welcomed.

		constructively with both the Borough and County Councils in respect of our interests at the Stoughton Estate in recent years. The intention is to continue that relationship to deliver well-planned growth in the north of the Borough.	
15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Policy 3: Regeneration Schemes and Large scale change</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> The Policy (p38) lists the things which masterplans and development briefs should do, and includes, “conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings”. However, the list doesn’t include, “Conserve and enhance Green Infrastructure assets and Local Green Spaces”. It should.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from STAG for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>For clarity the Council is proposing to add the bullet point wording set out below to Local Plan Policy 3 Regeneration Schemes and Large Scale Change.</p> <p><b><i>'Conserve and enhance Green Infrastructure assets and Local Green Spaces'</i></b></p>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 3: REGENERATION SCHEMES AND LARGE SCALE CHANGE SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE BOROUGH</b></p> <p>The requirement for a Masterplan, Development Brief and/or “other appropriate plans or strategies” is not objected to in principle as they can be valuable tools in facilitating the delivery of sustainable development.</p> <p>However, the NPPF requires (para 154) Local Plans policies to: “set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.” The NPPG provides further guidance (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 12-010-20140306): “In drafting policies the local planning authority should avoid undue repetition, for example by using generic policies to set out principles that may be common to different types of development. There should be no need to reiterate</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>As the comment mentions NPPF paragraph 154 states <i>'Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan'</i>. The Council considers that Local Plan Policy 3 Regeneration Schemes and Large Scale Change, sets out clearly 'what will' or 'will not' be permitted. The production of masterplans, development briefs, and other appropriate plans will also support the 'where'.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 3 Regeneration Schemes and Large Scale Change clearly states that <i>'when regeneration schemes or large scale change is proposed, the Council will require the production of, either, Masterplans,</i></p>

		<p><i>policies that are already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.”</i></p> <p>Policy 3 does not meet those requirements. Moreover whilst the policy broadly sets out the matters to be considered within the required documents, it does not provide clear guidance to either the applicant or the decision maker in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is responsible for deciding what type document should be prepared?</li> <li>• Who is responsible for preparing the document?</li> <li>• What level of detail is required?</li> <li>• Should there be consultation?</li> <li>• What status will the document assume?</li> <li>• When should the document be prepared? Can a masterplan be submitted alongside a planning application or does it need to be approved in advance?</li> </ul> <p>The policy should, therefore, be recast to provide the required guidance.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 3, which is considered unsound on the basis that it is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not provide clear policy guidance required to assist the applicant and decision maker.</p> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> The policy should be recast to provide the required guidance.</p>	<p><i>Development Briefs and / or other appropriate plans or strategies. In conjunction with Leicestershire County Council Highways Department, the Council will also require the production of Transport Assessments’.</i> The Council considers that as the Council is requiring the production of the named above, the policy conforms to and is consistent with national policy set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>In addition, the Policy sets out what should be contained within a masterplan, development brief, and other appropriate plans. The policy also states that the earliest liaison with the Council (amongst others) should be sought. The Council also considers that the policy is clear when the production of masterplans, development proposals and other appropriate plans is required... <i>‘when regeneration schemes or large scale change is proposed’.</i></p>
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	Chapter Five – Cohesive Communities  The University supports the objective of Policy 4	Comment of support noted.

		(Creating a Skilled Workforce) which sets out that the Council will support development proposals that relate directly to the development of local skills, and training opportunities, particularly for young people and residents who are unemployed.	
15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Chapter 5: Cohesive Communities</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> Section 5.2 on Improving Health and well being isn't as strongly cross referenced as it should be to Green Infrastructure and Local Green Spaces. A few simple additions would make this more strategically integrated – e.g. in paragraph 5.2.9: "...guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services <i>including Green Infrastructure and Local Green Spaces.</i>" Reference to access to natural green space, open spaces, and Green Infrastructure should also be added in to Policy 5.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Throughout the Local Plan document, there are appropriate references and cross references to health and wellbeing and green and open spaces, for example Spatial Objective 9 and paragraphs 5.2.3, 5.6.1, 10.1.5 and 10.6.1.</p> <p>It should be noted that two of the five Council Corporate Priorities are focused on green and safe places and wellbeing for all.</p>
18.12.17	SSA Planning	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your pre-submission draft of the above. We responded at the Preferred Options stage to draft Policy 5.2 'Improving Health and Wellbeing', which appeared to link the location of hot food takeaways with deprivation and poor health, but did not evidence whether or how they were linked. The policy would therefore have left applicants unclear as to how the impact of development would be assessed.</p> <p>Consequently, we support the amended draft Policy 5, which, together with draft Policy 36, properly retains protections on retail health. By protecting retail health, walkable access to services, facilities and jobs are supported, which in turn are likely to lead to better health outcomes in the populations served by the centres or areas affected. We consider this effect far greater than any significant link between clustering or proximity and ill-health.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>

		In summary, we consider that the policies as now drafted are sound, as they plan positively for the facilities needed, rely on the retail evidence base for justification, will be effective in maintaining retail balance and consistent with national policy. We therefore support them	
15.12.17	Sport England	<p>Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. The guidance sets out ten key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Active Design principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Sport England would commend the use of the guidance in the master planning process for new residential developments. The document can be downloaded via the following link:</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/</a></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council is committed in creating healthy and active communities. The Council will ensure that the use of Sport England's Active Design guide is encouraged in all masterplanning or large scale development proposals.</p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 4 – Creating a Skilled Workforce</p> <p>In relation to Policy 4 Gladman would point out that the requirement to provide educational facilities is a key part of the Framework. Paragraph 72 states that local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement. This should involve working closely with developers over schemes to assess the best possible solution to educational provision taking account of the capacity of all schools in the area that serve the development, the distance pupils travel to access</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council will work closely with an applicant and Leicestershire County Council Education Department to seek appropriate contributions towards education facilities should there be an identified need to do so. The Council would only seek a contribution should the education authority consider there a justified reason to do so. It should be noted that Leicestershire County Council calculate relevant contributions via their adopted Planning Obligations Policy.</p>

		<p>schools and the most efficient and sustainable use of existing educational resources before requiring the provision of new facilities. Viability should also be a key consideration to ensure schemes are not prevented from being brought forward because of the need for significant infrastructure contributions. Gladman remind the Council that the lack of educational provision should not be used a reason for refusal as local planning authorities should work positively with the development industry to identify suitable and deliverable solutions to these issues.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 6 – High Quality Design and Materials</p> <p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>The Objector acknowledges that the NPPF at paragraph 56 states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. The principle of good design is not therefore something which is disputed.</p> <p>However, the terminology used in Policy 6 is somewhat extreme. It requires the “highest” quality of inclusive design and the use of the “highest” quality of materials. This sets the bar at a level which is unnecessarily high.</p> <p>To require all development to use the highest quality materials is excessive. What may be appropriate for a rear extension in a residential area might be very different to what is required for a prominent listed building in the town centre. What is appropriate and necessary for one type of development might be very different for another type of development.</p> <p>Whilst the intentions of the policy are laudable, the</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that the reference to the highest standards of inclusive design and use of the highest quality materials for all new development is appropriate. The Council is aware that the NPPF suggests that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development; it seeks to strive further in design terms.</p> <p>The Council however would have no objection to the policy wording being amended, for example ‘highest’ being replaced with ‘high’.</p>

		<p>wording highlighted above should be amended to be more in line with the reasonable expectations for achieving good design and high quality development.</p> <p>This is also necessary to ensure that planning policies are not imposing unjustified standards and burdens on new development which has implications for viability and delivery of much needed development (see the related guidance in NPPF paragraphs 173 and 174).</p> <p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b> The requirements in Policy 6 to achieve the “highest” quality of inclusive design and to use the “highest” quality of materials is excessive and unnecessary.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> The wording in Policy 6 should be toned down to still maintain the principle of good design but to not impose unnecessary and excessive requirements.</p>	
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 44 - Policy 6 High Quality Design and Materials</u></p> <p>The positive approach to design and materials is supported. This accords with guidance contained in paragraph 59 of the NPPF and avoids being overly prescriptive in design matters.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 6 – High Quality Design and Materials</p> <p>Gladman object to Policy 6 as to require the highest standards of design and highest quality of materials is overly onerous and difficult to evidence. The Policy should be written more flexibly requiring development to meet high quality standards of design using high quality materials.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that the reference to the highest standards of inclusive design and use of the highest quality materials for all new development is appropriate. The Council is aware that the NPPF suggests that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development; it seeks to strive further in design terms.</p> <p>The Council however would have no objection to the</p>

			policy wording being amended, for example 'highest' being replaced with 'high'.
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 6 – High Quality Design and Materials</p> <p>Davidsons Developments Ltd support the Pre-Submission Local Plan's positive approach to design and construction. This accords with guidance contained in paragraph 59 of the NPPF and avoids being overly prescriptive in design matters. It is pointed out, however, that not every application will require a Design and Access Statement and this requires correcting.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Policy 6 High Quality Design and Materials:</p> <p>Whilst the high quality design and materials are welcomed, it is also important to consider ongoing / long-term maintenance. As non-standard materials can be more costly to maintain, suitable resource should be secured to fund ongoing long-term maintenance.</p> <p>It should be noted that the County Council's maintenance policy cannot be amended to supply additional maintenance for new and enhanced areas / items.</p> <p>There is concern about the amount of tree planting in the highway and potential maintenance/safety implications. There are significant underground services in the public highway within Oadby/ Wigston that will restrict where certain features can be located (trees / signs / cycle stands etc.). This needs careful consideration and investigation. This also applies to underground drainage systems e.g. highway, private or other culverted ordinary watercourse.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>All development proposals that affect the highway will be appropriately consulted on with Leicestershire County Council as the local highways authority. All development proposals that seek a change to or creation of new public realm would need to take account of the Council's Public Realm Strategy, and where relevant Area Action plan Guidance.</p> <p>The Council will consider the on-going maintenance cost when considering the design of public spaces or the highway.</p> <p>Any development proposal that seeks the provision of new trees on or close to the highway will be consulted on with Leicestershire County Council as the local highway authority. Development proposals seeking provision of trees would also need to undertake the appropriate investigatory work to ensure that no underground services would (and / or could) be affected.</p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p><u>Policy 6 - High Quality Design and Materials (Page 45)</u></p> <p>After the bullet point '- encouraging sustainable means</p>	Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicester City Council for the reasoning

		of travel;' consider adding the following text:- <i>including walking, cycling, other forms of non-motorised transport and public transport.</i>	set out below.  To illustrate key examples of sustainable means of travel and add clarity, the Council is proposing the following amendment to bullet 8 of Policy 6 –  <i>'encouraging sustainable means of travel, including walking, cycling and public transport'.</i>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<u>Policy 6 – High Quality Design and Materials (Page 45)</u>  Change the 9th bullet point to read '- connects effectively and efficiently to existing routes <b>and developments</b> , by avoiding dead ends and convoluted routes, to allow it to integrate in to the wider settlement and to link to existing services and facilities.	Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicester City Council for the reasoning set out below.  To add clarity to the bullet 13 of Policy 6 the Council is proposing the following amendment –  <i>'connects effectively and efficiently to existing routes <b>and developments</b>, by avoiding dead ends and convoluted routes, to allow it to integrate in to the wider settlement and to link to existing services and facilities'.</i>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<b>POLICY 6: HIGH QUALITY DESIGN AND MATERIALS</b>  As an advocate of the importance of good design, Bloor Homes support the intent of Policy 6. However, the NPPF is quite clear in its requirements in this regard (para 58): " <i>Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.</i> " It later requires (para 154) Local Plans policies to: " <i>set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted</i>	Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.  The NPPF is clear in paragraph 59 that ' <i>...design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'.</i>  The Council considers that Local Plan Policy 6 High Quality Design and Materials guides the design of development and is not overly prescriptive by allowing a level of flexibility. The Council considers that this

		<p><i>and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.”</i> The NPPG provides further guidance (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 12-010-20140306): <i>“In drafting policies the local planning authority should avoid undue repetition, for example by using generic policies to set out principles that may be common to different types of development. There should be no need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.”</i></p> <p>Policy 6 as currently expressed fails to meet those requirements. Its adds little to the design guidance provided in Section 7 of the NPPF, it is imprecise and there is a lack of clarity in the terms used (e.g. “highest quality”). Consequently the policies would be open to wide interpretation and difficult to effectively apply in the development management process.</p> <p>The policy should, therefore, be recast to set out objective design standards that can be addressed through the design process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, the NPPF and NPPG both emphasise that the viability of sustainable development schemes should not undermined by unduly onerous requirements when taking account of the cumulative requirements of the Local Plan (i.e. other infrastructure and specific policy requirements). Indeed, the NPPF (paragraphs 158, 173-174) is clear that these matters must be considered at the plan making stage. Therefore, any design based policy requirements which would result in build and / or site development costs above locally adjusted BCIS rates should be subject to plan wide viability testing. It is clear from the published evidence base that the viability assessment</p>	<p>flexibility allows for individuality, innovation and diversity in design, and does not restrict or curtail design or material use unfairly, and does not impose styles or tastes. Due to this level of flexibility allowed, the Council does not agree that Local Plan Policy 6 would result in increased costs and should be subject to plan wide viability. The level of flexibility allowed for in the Policy is also consistent with national policy set out at paragraph 60 of the NPPF, which states <i>‘planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>has not taken these matters into account.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 3, which is considered unsound on the basis that it is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not provide clear policy guidance required to assist the applicant and decision maker.</p> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> The policy should be recast to provide the necessary design guidance and the implications of the requirements must also be robustly assessed.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 7 – Community Facilities <b>Representation:</b></p> <p>Policy 7 requires development proposals to provide on-site and/or off-site new or enhanced community facilities to meet any needs arising from new development.</p> <p>The principle is not disputed but the policy should clarify that such requirements will only be imposed where there is a deficit in the capacity of existing facilities which must be mitigated to make the development acceptable. Any such requirement must accord with the CIL regulations and NPPF paragraph 204 which states that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>- directly related to the development; and</li> <li>- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Pegasus Planning for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>To ensure clarity within the Council’s Local Plan, however to avoid unnecessary repeating of national policy and guidance, the Council is proposing the following wording addition to Local Plan paragraph 5.4.5 –</p> <p><i>‘...community facilities within the Borough. <b>Any developer contributions sought will be in accordance with the Borough Council’s Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document</b>’.</i></p> <p>The Council’s Developer Contribution SPD seeks developer contributions in conformity with government guidance, policy, legislation and regulations, therefore the Council does not consider it appropriate to repeat such within the Local Plan Policy. As the Council will only be seeking developer contributions in conformity</p>

		<p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b> Policy 7 does not make it clear that new or enhanced provision of community facilities will only be required where there is a lack of capacity in existing facilities and that such works will only be required (and at a scale) where it is necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b> Amend the wording in Policy 7 or the supporting text to clarify that any requirement for on site or off site community facilities accords with the CIL regulations and NPPF paragraph 204.</p>	<p>with the Developer Contributions SPD, therefore in conformity with CIL legislations / regulations, it will not be burdening development proposals with undue costs; it will be seeking contributions that are required by the planning process for mitigation purposes.</p>
15.12.17	Sport England	<p><u>Policy 7 Community facilities</u></p> <p>It is noted that that this policy does not included sports facilities but it should be noted that community facilities can contribute to active recreation and the health and wellbeing of communities.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Sport England for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council agrees that community facilities can play an important role in the communities health and wellbeing and can be places of recreation. The Council proposes to amend the final sentence of paragraph 5.4.2 to –</p> <p><i>'They are a key part of sustainable communities and can contribute positively towards community <b>health, recreation</b> and wellbeing'.</i></p>
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 50 - Policy 8 Green Infrastructure</u></p> <p>Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that, "Local planning authorities should:</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>As Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges suggests, the role and purpose of green wedges is not just to</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure; and Paragraph 5.5.12 of the Pre-submission version of the Local Plan notes that the proposed Direction for Growth area should establish new Green Infrastructure corridors to link growth to the existing Green Infrastructure. This is supported by my clients who recognise the important function that development can perform in delivering Green Infrastructure. Part of the land at Sutton Close could provide an extension to the adjoining Coombe Park, providing a benefit to existing and new residents in the area as desired by policy 9 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities). This can not be achieved, however, with the retention of the designation of the land as Green Wedge. The land at Sutton Close lies in a sustainable location and does not clearly meet the objectives of green wedge designation, particularly given the proposal to allocate the adjoining land to the south east at Cottage Farm. The purpose of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge is to separate the two settlements and this could still be achieved by retaining the land immediately between the two settlements (the land to the north west, south west and south east of the Sutton Close site).</li> </ul> <p>Reflecting the findings of the SHLAA, the only red indicator (other than its greenfield land status) relates to landscape where the assessment notes that the development may have a negative effect in that it might contribute to the coalescence of settlements. No further evidence is produced in respect of this concern and it is noted that it is a concern common to the majority of the 28 sites assessed. The site at Sutton Close is on the southern edge of Oadby with no settlement to the south. To the west lies Wigston</p>	<p>separate the two settlements of Oadby and Wigston. The objectives of green wedges in the Borough are to; prevent the merging of settlements; guide development form; provide a 'green lung' between the urban area and the countryside; and, act as a recreational resource.</p> <p>Due to the predominately urban nature of the Borough, access into green open areas of green wedge and the countryside beyond is vital.</p> <p>In relation to the suitability of the land to the south of Sutton Close, through the SHLAA and Local Plan Call for Sites process, in addition to the land being designated as green wedge, the Council had concerns regarding the access to the site. The site had no obvious formal access route. Such concerns were clarified in an email conversation with Landmark Planning dated the 21<sup>st</sup> June 2017 that stated the site could not be accessed currently and that the best access option would be to demolish an existing residential property. Although it was suggested in the email that a discussion was taking place with a home owner, the Council received no further update to these discussions.</p> <p>The Council concluded that allocating a site with no formal means of access was not positive planning, nor offered any degree of certainty that development in this location could actively be delivered.</p>
--	--	--	---

		Magna, however, the development of this site would close the gap between these two settlements only to a very limited degree. Any application for planning permission would be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prepared under the accepted guidelines (GLVIA), which I believe would conclude that the development would have no significant adverse impact on the landscape character of the area.	
15.12.17	Sport England	Para 5.5.6 are the opportunities referred to in this para supported by the wording of <u>policy 8</u> ?	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that the opportunities referred to in paragraph 5.5.6, namely exercise, sport and informal recreation, although not specifically stated, are supported by the wording of Policy 8 Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>The safeguarding and enhancement of existing strategic green infrastructure assets and the creation of new multifunctional areas of green space provide spaces in which the local communities can utilise for exercise, sport and informal recreation.</p> <p>The Council considers that the outcome of the policy, a net gain in green infrastructure assets will provide more green spaces that allow for the opportunities referred to by paragraph 5.5.6.</p>
15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Policy 8: Green infrastructure</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> Puzzled why Green Infrastructure hasn't also been moved into Protected Places, Chapter 10. Given that Policy 1 is now far more explicit in relation to "Presumed Development", it makes it even more important to be clear about mitigation plans to ensure that irreplaceable environmental and heritage assets are "Protected Places".</p> <p><b>B)</b> Local Green Spaces need to be cited as an</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that the location of a policy within the Local Plan document does not have an effect on its 'weight' or 'effectiveness'. It is merely how the document has been structured. The Council however would have no objection to moving Local Plan Policy 8 to a different chapter of the document if it was deemed appropriate.</p> <p>The Council is proposing minor modifications to the</p>

		<p>integrated part of the Green Infrastructure, to avoid the risk of the designation being treated as in a silo. At a minimum Local Green Spaces should be included in the list of assets in paragraph 5.5.5. In addition, a new paragraph 5.5.14 should be added briefly describing the designation and cross referencing to Chapter 10 and policy 45.</p> <p><b>C)</b> The first sentence of Policy 8 should include reference to Local Green Spaces: "...the preservation and enhancement of open spaces and assets that comprise the Borough's Green Infrastructure and its network, <i>including Local Green Spaces.</i>"</p> <p><b>D)</b> Policy weakened through loss of the bullet point that was in the previous draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"not permitting development that compromises the integrity of the overall Green Infrastructure networks."</i></li> </ul>	<p>Local Plan from the comments received from STAG for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>For consistency it is proposed the Local Green Spaces is contained within the list in Local Plan paragraph 5.5.5 as show below.</p> <p><i>'...local green spaces, cemeteries, sports fields...'</i></p> <p>With the proposal to include local green spaces as part of the list set out in Local Plan paragraph 5.5.5, the Council does not consider it necessary to include local green spaces in the policy, as the policy in its opening paragraph states <i>'...open spaces and assets that comprise the Borough's Green Infrastructure and its network'</i>.</p> <p>The Council considers that the removal of the bullet point referred to, does not weaken the policy. The overall objective of the policy is to not permit development that compromises the integrity of the overall green infrastructure network, and the policy sets out requirements by which the objective will be achieved.</p>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 8: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>The policy's aspirations in relation to the protection and enhancement of Green Infrastructure (GI) is welcomed. It is, however, unclear how this policy relates to the requirements for open space, sports and recreation provision set out in Policy 9. The Local Plan requirements should not place an unduly onerous burden on new developments as these matters can fundamentally affect the capacity and, therefore, viability of schemes. Further clarity is, therefore, required. Moreover, as highlighted in the response to Policy 9 the provision of multi-functional open spaces</p>	<p>The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Define Planning for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>It should be noted that Local Plan Policy 8 does not state that it would seek developer contributions. The Policy wording states that <i>'all new development must contribute towards achieving this net gain. Green Infrastructure assets will be created, preserved managed and where necessary enhanced by...using developer contributions to facilitate off-site improvements to existing Green Infrastructure assets / corridors, particularly their quality and accessibility'</i>.</p>

		<p>that responds to a variety of needs should be encouraged to maximise the benefits of GI and open space provision in association with development.</p> <p>The policy specifically refers to the use of developer contributions to facilitate off-site improvements to existing overall Green Infrastructure assets/corridors. However, there is no statement as to how the need for a contribution will be established and if it is required, how contribution will be calculated and secured, and the funds then utilised to deliver the required improvements where they are needed. That is a serious omission that needs to be addressed to ensure that the requirement meets the tests established in the 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind).</p> <p>Moreover, the NPPF and NPPG both emphasise that the viability of sustainable development schemes should not be undermined by unduly onerous requirements when taking account of the cumulative requirements of the Local Plan (i.e. other infrastructure and specific policy requirements). Notably, policies that have a cost implication for development proposals cannot be deferred to an SPD: see <i>William Davis Ltd &amp; Ors v Charnwood Borough Council [2017] EWHC 3006 (Admin) (23 November 2017)</i>. Indeed, the NPPF (paragraphs 158, 173-174) is clear that these matters must be considered at the plan making stage. It is, however, apparent from the published evidence base, that the viability assessment has not taken these matters into account.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> Bloor Homes object to Policy 8, which is considered</p>	<p>To ensure clarity, the Council proposes to remove the following wording from the 8<sup>th</sup> bullet of Policy 8 as follows –</p> <p><del>'using developer contributions to facilitate</del> <b>facilitating</b> off-site improvements to existing Green Infrastructure assets / corridors, particularly their quality and accessibility'.</p> <p>The Council considers that although it has been suggested that the link between Local Plan Policy 8 and Policy 9 is unclear, the link between open spaces, sport and recreation and Green Infrastructure is clear. Although it is considered that there is an inherent link between the them, the Council at Local Plan paragraph 5.5.5 states that '<i>local Green Infrastructure within the Borough includes formal and informal open spaces, cemeteries, sports fields, the golf course...</i>'</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>unsound on the basis that it is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government’s priorities and policies in terms of enabling sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Proposed Changes:</b> To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan the policy should clarify both the relationship with the public open space requirements set out in Policy 9 and the requirement for contributions to off-site improvements. The implications of those requirements must also be robustly assessed.</p>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 8 – Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Gladman object to Policy 8 on Green Infrastructure as it requires all new development to seek a net gain in Green Infrastructure provision. Some very small developments may not be able to achieve this requirement given their scale. The Policy should therefore be amended to state that all new development should seek a net gain in Green Infrastructure where appropriate.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 114 states that local planning authorities should set out a strategic approach in their Local Plan, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council considers that Local Plan Policy 8 Green Infrastructure supports the policy objective of the NPPF.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 8 – Green Infrastructure</p> <p>The positive stance in this policy to creating new Green Infrastructure is supported and reflective of paragraph 114 of the NPPF, which adopts a positive adopted to creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>As demonstrated in the supporting information that accompanies these representations, the creation and enhancement of green infrastructure are significant benefits that could be delivered by development to the</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>

18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>north of Newton Lane.</p> <p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 9 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities</p> <p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>Policy 9 requires new development to contribute either physically or financially to the provision of or improvement of open space, sport and recreation facilities.</p> <p>The principle of the policy is supported but any such provision from new development should only be sought if there is evidence that there is insufficient provision or capacity at local facilities (eg local playing fields or swimming pools) which means that it is necessary to mitigate against the impacts of new development.</p> <p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b></p> <p>n/a</p> <p><b>Changes:</b></p> <p>Amend the wording in Policy 9 or the supporting text to clarify that any requirement for improvements will only be sought if there is insufficient provision/capacity within the area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that the wording of Local Plan Policy 9 as well as the supporting text to the policy is clear in relation to the amount of open space required from a development proposal. The Council also considers that the Policy (with no reference to remedying existing shortfalls) does not seek to remedy existing shortfalls in provision, nor does it seek to seek contributions to existing facilities where there is sufficient capacity available.</p> <p>As Local Plan paragraph 5.6.11 illustrates, part of the Council’s annual monitoring comprises an open space audit that assesses the provision of open space and identifies areas of deficiency and surpluses in provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities. To illustrate surplus and deficiency on a ward by ward level, the audit takes account of the population of the ward and the Council’s locally based open space requirements (it should be noted that such space requirements have been discussed and agreed with Sport England). The audit then suggests wards that are deficient in a certain open space typology and / or wards that there is a surplus in provision. This information is then taken account of when negotiating off-site developer contributions towards new open space provision.</p> <p>In addition, the Council considers that as the quantity requirements are set out within the supporting text to Policy 9; the Council’s Open Space Audit is specified in the supporting text to Policy 9; the Developer Contributions SPD and Playing Pitch Strategy is specified within the Policy wording and supporting text</p>
----------	---------------------------------	--	---

			of Policy 9; and the Community Infrastructure Levy sets out that compliant infrastructure projects should satisfy the three statutory tests, as set out in CIL Regulation 122(2), all appropriate and relevant documentation is cited and available.
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p><u>Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities – paras 5.6.9 + 5.6.13 (table) – (Page 53)</u></p> <p>There is a shortage of high quality cricket provision within the City. The Plan should meet the needs of the intended population for open space and sports provision and provide a high quality cricket provision to help meet the City’s needs. Currently, there is no finalised Playing Pitch Strategy for Oadby and Wigston within the Pre-Submission evidence base. The website indicates that this document will be published in 2018. This is a concern, considering this issues the city is facing with regard to sports provision. The City council requests that any sporting provision within Oadby and Wigston, that helps meet the city's needs, is maintained. The City reserves the right to discuss this further with the National Governing Bodies and Sport England as plans develop.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council has now completed the production of its Playing Pitch Strategy. The Strategy illustrates that the Borough can meet its own needs in all sports and has surplus in both football and cricket provision which could contribute towards meeting a proportion of Leicester City’s need.</p> <p>According to the report, the Borough area is already meeting some of Leicester City’s cricket need, with both of the teams that play in the Borough being registered in the Leicester City area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Council’s Local Plan has allocated three direction for growth areas, all of which will be required to provide onsite open space, consisting of allotments, sports pitches, play areas and structural landscaping in accordance with other relevant Local Plan policy. Such onsite provision of sports pitches would add to the Borough’s current supply and could further meet the needs of Leicester City in the future should there be a need to do so.</p> <p>All relevant National Governing Bodies, in particular Sport England, have been involved in the production of the Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy and have been consulted on the content of the strategy. All comments received during consultation were fully incorporated into the strategy.</p> <p>As part of the Council’s annual monitoring, the Strategy</p>

			will be kept up to date and robust on an ongoing basis.
15.12.17	Sport England	<p><u>Section on Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities</u></p> <p>Support the playing pitch strategy (PPS) ref in paras 5.6.9 and 5.6.13. This is however based on the continued works to complete the PPS</p> <p>See the section protect provide and enhance in our guidance</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/aims-and-objectives/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/aims-and-objectives/</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a></p>	<p>Comment of support welcomed.</p> <p>The Council has now completed the production of its Playing Pitch Strategy. The Strategy illustrates that the Borough can meet its own needs in all sports.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Sport England on the production of the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>All relevant National Governing Bodies, in particular Sport England, have been involved in the production of the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy and have been consulted on the content of the strategy. All comments received during consultation were fully incorporated into the strategy.</p>
15.12.17	Sport England	Sport England is content with the references to built sports facilities and therefore supports <u>policy 9</u>	Comment of support welcomed.
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 9: OPEN SPACE, SPORT &amp; RECREATION FACILITIES</b></p> <p>Whilst the provision of an appropriate quantum and type of open space in association with development is supported, the scale and nature of public open space required as part of a new development is a fundamental consideration in the planning of development sites. Consequently, the NPPF (paragraph 73) requires Local Plan policies to determine what provision is needed based on a robust and up to date assessment of the local need for open space, that identifies deficits and surpluses in existing provision and takes account of opportunities for new provision. Policy 9, however, fails to provide any clarity in terms of what is required of new developments and how it will be delivered.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that the wording of Local Plan Policy 9 as well as the supporting text to the policy is clear in relation to the amount of open space required from a development proposal. The Council also considers that, the Policy (with no reference to remedying existing shortfalls) does not seek to remedy existing shortfalls in provision, nor does it seek to seek contributions to existing facilities where there is sufficient capacity available.</p> <p>As Local Plan paragraph 5.6.11 illustrates, part of the Council's annual monitoring comprises an open space audit that assesses the provision of open space and identifies areas of deficiency and surpluses in provision of open space, sports and recreational facilities. To</p>

	<p>That is a serious omission that needs to be addressed to ensure that the requirements meet the tests established in the 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind). Notably, therefore, new developments should not be required to remedy shortfalls in provision or indeed contribute to the provision of facilities where there is sufficient capacity available. That principle should be appropriately reflected in Policy 9, but where an identified deficit does exist or would arise as a result of the development (either in quantitative or accessibility terms), then all new developments should contribute to provision to ensure that the needs of development's population are met.</p> <p>The policy must, therefore, be recast to clearly set out the expectations in this regard and, in respect of off-site provision, the mechanism(s) for securing the required contributions. The policy should, however, incorporate sufficient flexibility in its requirements to maximise the opportunity for on-site provision to reflect the site specific circumstances and context. It is not, therefore, necessarily helpful to seek to apply blanket requirements for a variety of very specific types of open space that have particular location and design requirements to each and every site. Instead guidance is required that encourages proposals to provide multi-functional spaces that respond to a variety of needs and address the objectives of Policy 8 to maximise the benefits of open space provision associated with development.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, the specific site requirements, notably for sports provision, often dictate the layout of proposed developments and are a critical determinant</p>	<p>illustrate surplus and deficiency on a ward by ward level, the audit takes account of the population of the ward and the Council's locally based open space requirements (it should be noted that such space requirements have been discussed and agreed with Sport England). The audit then suggests wards that are deficient in a certain open space typology and / or wards that there is a surplus in provision. This information is then taken account of when negotiating off-site developer contributions towards new open space provision.</p> <p>In addition, the Council considers that as the quantity requirements are set out within the supporting text to Policy 9; the Council's Open Space Audit is specified in the supporting text to Policy 9; the Developer Contributions SPD and Playing Pitch Strategy is specified within the Policy wording and supporting text of Policy 9; and the Community Infrastructure Levy sets out that compliant infrastructure projects should satisfy the three statutory tests, as set out in CIL Regulation 122(2), all appropriate and relevant documentation is cited and available.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>of the capacity and, therefore, viability of schemes. The NPPF and NPPG both emphasise that the viability of sustainable development schemes should not be undermined by unduly onerous requirements when taking account of the cumulative requirements of the Local Plan (i.e. other infrastructure and specific policy requirements). Notably, policies that have a cost implication on development proposals cannot be deferred to an SPD: see <i>William Davis Ltd &amp; Ors v Charnwood Borough Council [2017] EWHC 3006 (Admin) (23 November 2017)</i>. Indeed, the NPPF (paragraphs 158, 173-174) is clear that these matters must be considered at the plan making stage. It is, however, apparent from the published evidence base that the viability assessment has not taken these matters into account.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b>  Bloor Homes object to Policy 9, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is not <b>justified</b> in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government’s priorities and policies in terms of the provision of public open space and facilitating the delivery of sustainable development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed Changes:</b>  To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan, the policy should be recast to reflect the findings of an up to date assessment of local need for open space. The policy should incorporate sufficient flexibility in the required provision to allow account to be taken of the existing (or proposed) provision in the area and the</p>	
--	---	--

		specific characteristics of the development site and to encourage the delivery of multi-functional public open space in the context of the aspirations of Policy 8 in relation to Green Infrastructure.	
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Policy 9 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities) states that the Council will seek to protect existing sites from development where there is a demand to retain them, they contribute towards the Green Infrastructure in the Borough, and the equivalent cannot be provided elsewhere. The policy states that existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be developed or lost unless <i>"the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location"</i>.</p> <p>The University agrees with the approach in Policy 9 that qualitative improvements to open space, sport and recreation facilities could potentially be achieved in the borough through the relocation, in certain instances, of existing facilities.</p> <p>We suggest that paragraph 5.6.13 of the PSLP which sets out that <i>"all areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities will be protected and retained, not just those identified within the Council's open space study and annual audits"</i> is amended to better reflect the policy of allowing re-provision as permitted for under Policy 9.</p> <p>We note that the Oadby and Wigston Playing Pitch Strategy is still being drafted and has yet to be finalised.</p> <p>If it would be helpful to the Council, the University would be happy to assist through provision of any evidence that might help inform this strategy.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Montagu Evans for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>To clarify the purpose of paragraph 5.6.13, the Council propose the following amendment to the paragraph –</p> <p><i>'all areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities <del>will be</del> <b>are relevant to Policy 9 and protected and retained</b>, not just those identified within the Council's open space study and annual audits'</i></p>

18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 10: PUBLIC REALM</b></p> <p>The policy's aspirations in relation to the public realm within proposed development is supported.</p> <p>However, the policy also refers to the use of developer contributions to facilitate off-site improvements to existing public realm, although there is no indication within the policy as to how the need for the contributions will be established, and if it is required how the contribution will be calculated and secured and the funds then utilised to deliver the required improvements where they are needed. That is a serious omission that needs to be addressed to ensure that the requirements meet the tests established in the 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind).</p> <p>Moreover, the NPPF and NPPG both emphasise that the viability of sustainable development schemes should not be undermined by unduly onerous requirements when taking account of the cumulative requirements of the Local Plan (i.e. other infrastructure and specific housing requirements). Notably, policies that have a cost implication on development proposals cannot be deferred to an SPD: see <i>William Davis Ltd &amp; Ors v Charnwood Borough Council [2017] EWHC 3006 (Admin) (23 November 2017)</i>. Indeed, the NPPF (paragraphs 158, 173-174) is clear that these matters must be considered at the plan making stage. It is, however, clear from the published evidence base that viability assessment has not taken these matters into account.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b></p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Local Plan paragraph 5.7.10 states that '<i>any developer contributions sought will be in accordance with the Borough Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document</i>'.</p> <p>The Council's Developer Contribution SPD seeks developer contributions in conformity with government guidance, policy, legislation and regulations, therefore the Council does not consider it appropriate to repeat such within the Local Plan Policy. As the Council will only be seeking developer contributions in conformity with the Developer Contributions SPD, therefore in conformity with CIL legislations / regulations, it will not be burdening development proposals with undue costs; it will be seeking contributions that are required by the planning process for mitigation purposes. As such it was not considered necessary to include this Policy within the Whole Plan Viability evidence base.</p>
----------	-------------------------------	---	--

		<p>Bloor Homes object to Policy 10, which is considered unsound on the basis that it is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government's priorities and policies in terms of enabling sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Proposed Changes:</b> To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan the policy should justify and clarify the requirements for contributions to off-site public realm improvements. The implications of those requirements must also be robustly assessed.</p>	
18.12.17	The Planning Bureau Limited (Mccarthy & Stone)	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the consultation papers for the aforementioned document. As the market leader in the provision of sheltered housing for sale to the elderly, McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd considers that with its extensive experience in providing development of this nature it is well placed to provide informed comments on the emerging Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough Council Local Plan – Pre-submission consultation, insofar as it affects or relates to housing for the elderly.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework stipulates that the planning system should be '<i>supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities</i>' and highlights the need to '<i>deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive mixed communities. Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community... such as... older people</i>' (emphasis added).</p> <p>The recently published National Planning Practice Guidance reaffirms this in the guidance for assessing housing need in the plan making process entitled "<b>How</b></p>	Comment of support noted.

		<p><b><i>should the needs for all types of housing be addressed?</i></b> (Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 2a-021-20140306) and a separate subsection is provided for "<b><i>Housing for older people</i></b>". This reads stipulates that <i>"the need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households (Department for Communities and Local Government Household Projections 2013). Plan makers will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to move. This could free up houses that are under-occupied. The age profile of the population can be drawn from Census data. Projections of population and households by age group should also be used. The future need for older persons housing broken down by tenure and type (e.g. Sheltered, enhanced sheltered, extra care, registered care) should be assessed and can be obtained from a number of online tool kits provided by the sector. The assessment should set out the level of need for residential institutions (use class C2). But identifying the need for particular types of general housing, such as bungalows, is equally important."</i>(My emphasis).</p> <p>We wrote to the Council in November 2016 as part of the issues and options and we were then keen to stress the need to consider addressing the current and future housing needs of older people within Oadby &amp; Wigston and for your Local Plan to acknowledge the role that owner-occupied sheltered housing schemes play in meeting older person housing needs, and in providing housing choice for the wider community by freeing up valuable, under- occupied family homes in the local area.</p> <p>We <b>commend</b> the Council for acknowledging the need</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>to provide specialist older person accommodation in the Borough to meet the diverse housing needs of its older residents in the pre-submission version of the plan and consider this approach to be both sound and appropriate.</p> <p>I trust that the above comments will be taken into account and considered as part of the examination and evolution of the Local Plan. We would be particularly keen to become involved with any consultation or workshops on emerging policy or strategy work in the field of the housing needs of the ageing population.</p>	
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	In relation to housing choices within the Council the University agrees with Policy 11 which supports the development of student halls of that meets an identified need and is proposed in appropriate sustainable locations.	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 11 – Housing Choices</p> <p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>Requirement to “reflect” the existing character of an area.</p> <p>The requirement in Policy 11 for all residential developments to “reflect” the character of the area in which they are located in unduly prescriptive and contrary to NPPF paragraph 60 which states:-</p> <p><b>“60. Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is,</b></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council is proposing minor modifications to Local Plan Policy 11 Housing Choices from the comments received from Pegasus Planning for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that the following wording, which is directly relevant to the wording at paragraph 60 of the NPPF, fully consistent with national policy and guidance. The following wording amendment is proposed by the Council at paragraph 5 of Local Plan Policy 11 Housing Choices –</p> <p><i>'All residential proposals will need to <b>promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and reflect the character of the area in which they are located.</b>'</i></p>

		<p><b>however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.”</b></p> <p>Whilst it may be perfectly reasonable to require that development is sympathetic to, or respects the character of an area, this is very different to a requirement to “reflect” the existing character. There may be cases where it is not appropriate to reflect the character of an area and where change is desirable.</p> <p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b></p> <p>The requirement for all residential developments to “reflect” the character of the area in which they are located is unduly prescriptive and contrary to NPPF paragraph 60.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b></p> <p>Replace the word “reflect” with the word “respect”</p>	
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 58 – Policy 11 Housing Choices</u></p> <p>My clients support the desire to ensuring all new residential developments comprise of a mix of dwelling types, tenures and sizes meeting the needs of communities and new prospective residents. It is intended that these aims would be delivered in any development of the land at Sutton Close.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 11: HOUSING CHOICES</b></p> <p>The overarching aspiration of Policy 11 is not objected to as it seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable housing developments.</p> <p>However, the NPPF requires (para 58) Local Plan to: <i>"develop robust and comprehensive policies that set</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is committed in providing a wide choice of homes that are of high quality and are ‘fit for purpose’ for modern day living and promote healthy lifestyles and good mental wellbeing, particularly in children and young people.</p>

		<p><i>out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.” It later requires (para 154) Local Plans policies to: “set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.” The NPPG provides further guidance (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 12-010-20140306): “In drafting policies the local planning authority should avoid undue repetition, for example by using generic policies to set out principles that may be common to different types of development. There should be no need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.”</i></p> <p>Policy 11 as currently expressed fails to meet those requirements. Its adds little to the requirements of the NPPF in terms of the required housing mix, and is imprecisely expressed which means that it will be open to wide interpretation. Greater clarity is, therefore, required as to how the policy will be effectively applied at the development management stage.</p> <p>There is no evidence that space provision in new dwellings the Borough is in any way substandard, but the policy still seeks to impose a vaguely expressed requirement for new dwellings to be of an appropriate size. Notably the Technical Housing Standards are appended to the Local Plan. However, the Written Ministerial Statement dated 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015 confirms that <i>“the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and</i></p>	<p>Local Plan Policy 11 Housing Choices does promote the use of the Governments Technical Housing Standards, however in very particular circumstances. The Council through Policy 11 is only seeking to apply the technical standards for conversions, sub-division and / or changes of use of existing buildings, for example redundant commercial or factory units.</p> <p>The Council seeks the use of the technical standards in these specific circumstances due to the relatively high number of extant commercial and factory units in predominately residential areas of the Borough and the low standard of development proposals for their sub-division that have been promoted in recent history. On a non statutory basis, through the planning application negotiation process, the Council has been successfully applying the standards on sub-division of existing commercial or factory properties. Thus far, the Council has not been made aware of any viability issues due to the applying of the technical standards in specific development proposals.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p><i>where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG</i>'. Therefore, if the Council wishes to adopt the NDSS up to date evidence of local need, together with assessments of the cumulative impact of the policy on viability, the implications of costs to being passed on to homebuyers, and the potential impact development delivery rates must be provided. That evidence has not been provided and the imposition of this requirement (however vaguely expressed) has not, therefore, been justified in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 56-020-20150327). There is therefore, no justification for the inclusion of this element of the policy, and it should therefore, be deleted.</p> <p>As a general point, whilst the reference in the policy to taking account of the impact on deliverability and/or viability of developments is welcomed, these matters will have a critical affect on the viability of new housing developments in the Borough, and the deliverability of sustainable development cannot be compromised by unduly onerous policy requirements. Notably, policies that have a cost implication on development proposals cannot be deferred to an SPD: see <i>William Davis Ltd &amp; Ors v Charnwood Borough Council [2017] EWHC 3006 (Admin) (23 November 2017)</i>. The Council must, therefore, demonstrate that the policy and infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan (cumulatively) in terms of financial contributions are achievable and do not render development unviable (NPPF paragraphs 158, 173-174). That must be considered at this stage. There is no evidence to that effect at this point in time as these policy requirements have not been robustly considered Local Plan's Viability Report.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 11, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is not <b>justified</b> in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national guidance</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government’s objective to ensure the housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed Changes:</b> To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan, the policy should be recast to provide to provide greater clarity in respect the policy requirements and the cumulative impact on the viability of sustainable development examined. The part relating to spaces standards should be deleted.</p>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 11 – Housing Choices</p> <p>Gladman support Policy H11 as it seeks to encourage the development of specialist accommodation for older people including both extra care and sheltered accommodation.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p>In <b>Policy 11 – Housing Choices</b> the Council states <i>“To ensure that new residential development promotes healthy living and dwellings are of the appropriate size for its proposed occupants; (unless there is a demonstrable reason for not doing so) all new dwellings should provide sufficient space for kitchen, dining, bedroom, and living facilities, and should include appropriate levels of internal storage”</i>. However this statement is ambiguous and it is unclear if the Council is intending to adopt the Nationally Described</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is committed in providing a wide choice of homes that are of high quality and are ‘fit for purpose’ for modern day living and promote healthy lifestyles and good mental wellbeing, particularly in children and young people.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 11 Housing Choices does promote the</p>

		<p>Space Standards (NDSS) which are included in Appendix 2 of the Plan. It is recommended that this bullet point in <b>Policy 11</b> and Appendix 2 are deleted. The Written Ministerial Statement dated 25th March 2015 confirms that <i>"the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG"</i>. If the Council wishes to adopt the NDSS this should only be done by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG. The NPPG sets out that <i>"Where a need for internal space standards is identified, local planning authorities should provide justification for requiring internal space policies. Local Planning Authorities should take account of the following areas need, viability and timing"</i>(ID: 56-020) :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need - It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Oadby &amp; Wigston which justifies the inclusion of the NDSS as a Local Plan policy. If it had been the Government's intention that generic statements justified adoption of the NDSS then the logical solution would have been to incorporate the standards as mandatory via the Building Regulations which the Government has not done. The NDSS should only be introduced on a "need to have" rather than a "nice to have" basis. The identification of a need for the NDSS must be more than simply stating that in some cases the standard has not been met it should identify the harm caused or may be caused in the future.</li> <li>• Viability - The impact on viability should be considered in particular an assessment of the cumulative impact of policy burdens. There is a direct relationship between unit size, cost per square metre, selling price per metre and affordability. The Council's</li> </ul>	<p>use of the Governments Technical Housing Standards, however in very particular circumstances. The paragraph that the HBF is referring to in its comment is not intending to adopt the technical standards. The Council through Policy 11 is only seeking to apply the technical standards for conversions, sub-division and / or changes of use of existing buildings, for example redundant commercial or factory units.</p> <p>The Council seeks the use of the technical standards in these specific circumstances due to the relatively high number of extant commercial and factory units in predominately residential areas of the Borough and the low standard of development proposals for their sub-division that have been promoted in recent history. On a non statutory basis, through the planning application negotiation process, the Council has been successfully applying the standards on sub-division of existing commercial or factory properties. Thus far, the Council has not been made aware of any viability issues due to the applying of the technical standards in specific development proposals.</p> <p>Paragraph 93 of the NPPF states that: <i>'Planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development'</i>. Policy 38 of the Local Plan seeks to promote development that helps to achieve reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure.</p> <p>The final section of Local Plan Policy 38 seeks all</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Viability Assessment is not based on NDSS compliant units for 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings. The Council cannot simply expect home buyers to absorb extra costs in a Local Plan area where there exists severe affordability pressures. There is also an impact of larger dwellings on land supply. The requirement for the NDSS would reduce site yields or the number of units on a site. Therefore the amount of land needed to achieve the same number of units must be increased. The efficient use of land is less because development densities have been decreased. At the same time the infrastructure and regulatory burden on fewer units per site intensifies the challenge of meeting residual land values which determines whether or not land is released for development by a willing landowner especially in lower value areas and on brownfield sites. It may also undermine delivery of affordable housing at the same time as pushing additional families into affordable housing need because they can no longer afford to buy a NDSS compliant home. The Council should undertake an assessment of these impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing - The Councils should take into consideration any adverse effects on delivery rates of sites included in the housing trajectory. The delivery rates on many sites will be predicated on market affordability at relevant price points of units and maximising absorption rates. An adverse impact on the affordability of starter home / first time buyer products may translate into reduced or slower delivery rates. As a consequence the Council should put forward proposals for transitional arrangements. The land deals underpinning the majority of identified sites will have been secured prior to any proposed introduction of NDSS. These sites should be allowed to move through the planning system before any proposed policy requirements are enforced. The NDSS should not be applied to any</li> </ul>	<p>development over 1 hectare in size to incorporate onsite renewable energy generation or onsite provision of buildings that reduce the need for non renewable energy use. The policy however allows flexibility in meeting this requirement on feasibility and viability grounds. The policy wording states that should onsite provision be deemed not feasible or viable then the requirement would cease to apply in that instance.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>outline or detailed approval prior to the specified date and any reserved matters applications should not be subject to the nationally described space standards. The achievement of Building Regulation standards for energy efficiency is a requirement of <b>Policy 38– Climate Change</b>. Therefore the meaning of the statement “<i>will be required to incorporate on site renewables energy generation or on-site provision of buildings that reduce need for non-renewable energy use</i>” in <b>Policy 38</b> is unclear. As there is no further explanation of the meaning or purpose of this statement in the supporting text it is suggested that this wording is unnecessary and should be deleted.</p>	
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 12 - Housing Density</p> <p>Davidsons is of the view that densities in the region of 30 dwellings per hectare strike a successful balance between using land efficiently and delivering high quality and well designed developments that create environments where people want to live. We therefore welcome the policy amendment to include a density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectares for locations outside of the urban area.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that paragraph 47 of the NPPF allows Local Planning Authorities to set their own density policies. However, it is considered that policy 12 remains unrealistic in respect of the densities to be achieved both within and outside the urban centres. Being overly optimistic in respect of housing density is likely to undermine delivery of the required housing numbers during the plan period. It could also lead to the Borough Council allocating insufficient land through the Local Plan process if high densities are relied upon.</p> <p>Furthermore, the policy does not explicitly differentiate between gross or net densities. The density at which a</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Within the Council’s Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation document, a two tiered approach to housing density was promoted. In summary, the approach sought 50 dph within town centre locations and 40 dph for all other locations. Having considered representations relating to dph, the Council amended the Local Plan to promote a three tiered approach. 50 dph was sought in town centre locations, 40dph in the rest of the Leicester PUA and 30 dph elsewhere. The densities illustrated within the Local Plan are gross values.</p> <p>In producing the Local Plan the Council took account of the Department for Communities and Local Governments ‘Fixing our broken housing market’ white paper (February 2017) and the HM Treasury Autumn Budget 2017, both of which encourage local authorities to build at higher densities in appropriate locations.</p> <p>The Council considers that the three tiered approach, relating to the location of development proposals is</p>

		<p>site can be developed will vary depending upon a number of factors including the policy context, the size of the site, configuration and the need for on-site infrastructure/ancillary uses such as schools, shopping areas, open space, flood attenuation, landscape buffer strips and roads.</p> <p>Typically, smaller sites will make use of existing roads and facilities and yield can be readily assessed using a net density multiplier.</p> <p>However, on larger sites, the density multiplier must reflect that as the demand for other\ uses becomes greater, the gross to net ration decreases.</p> <p>Applying a blanket minimum density across all sites larger than 0.3ha is therefore unrealistic and as noted above could undermine delivery of housing in the Borough. The policy is therefore considered ineffective in terms of its deliverability. As a minimum the policy should be re-worded so that densities are not an "at least" requirement but are set as a target.</p>	<p>appropriate for the Borough, taking account of its predominately urban compact form.</p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 12 – Housing Density</p> <p>Gladman object to the prescriptive nature of Policy 12 and the extremely high densities which are expected on new residential schemes without any flexibility exercised.</p> <p>Gladman consider that in order to introduce an element of flexibility to deliver a wide variety of units suitable for a range of house builders and occupiers, the term 'at least'; should be removed from the wording of each of the density requirement clauses to be replaced by a dwelling range.</p> <p>Therefore, instead of stating that on proposals outside</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Within the Council's Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation document, a two tiered approach to housing density was promoted. In summary, the approach sought 50 dph within town centre locations and 40 dph for all other locations. Having considered representations relating to dph, the Council amended the Local Plan to promote a three tiered approach. 50 dph was sought in town centre locations, 40dph in the rest of the Leicester PUA and 30 dph elsewhere.</p> <p>In producing the Local Plan the Council took account of the Department for Communities and Local</p>

		<p>of the Town Centre boundary of Wigston or district centre boundaries of Oadby and South Wigston, but within the Leicester PUA, a density of at least 40 dwellings per hectare (dph) will be required, the Policy should state that a density of 35 to 45 dph will be required.</p> <p>This would give sufficient comfort to the Council to ensure that densities reflect the constrained and urban nature of the borough, whilst allowing sufficient flexibility for design issues to be considered and addressed and a variety of dwellings to be provided to best meet the needs of the local population.</p>	<p>Governments 'Fixing our broken housing market' white paper (February 2017) and the HM Treasury Autumn Budget 2017, both of which encourage local authorities to build at higher densities in appropriate locations.</p> <p>The Council considers that the three tiered approach, relating to the location of development proposals is appropriate for the Borough, taking account of its predominately urban compact form.</p>
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 60 - Policy 12 - Housing Density</u></p> <p>Paragraph 47 of the NPPF allows Local Planning Authorities to set their own density policies, however, it is considered that policy 12 is unrealistic in respect of the need to achieve 40 dwellings to the hectare in areas outside of the town centre of Wigston and district centre boundaries of Oadby and South Wigston. As indicated in my representations on the previous version of the Plan, being overly optimistic in respect of housing density is likely to undermine delivery of the required housing numbers during the plan period. It would also lead to the Borough Council allocating insufficient land through this Local Plan process if high densities are relied upon, potentially rendering the Plan ineffective in terms of the soundness tests.</p> <p>My clients are firmly of the view that densities in the region of 30 dwellings per hectare strike a successful balance between using land efficiently and delivering high quality and well designed developments that create environments where people want to live. Irrespective of the density figure included within the policy, the policy should incorporate a degree of</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Within the Council's Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation document, a two tiered approach to housing density was promoted. In summary, the approach sought 50 dph within town centre locations and 40 dph for all other locations. Having considered representations relating to dph, the Council amended the Local Plan to promote a three tiered approach. 50 dph was sought in town centre locations, 40dph in the rest of the Leicester PUA and 30 dph elsewhere.</p> <p>In producing the Local Plan the Council took account of the Department for Communities and Local Governments 'Fixing our broken housing market' white paper (February 2017) and the HM Treasury Autumn Budget 2017, both of which encourage local authorities to build at higher densities in appropriate locations.</p> <p>The Council considers that the three tiered approach, relating to the location of development proposals is appropriate for the Borough, taking account of its predominately urban compact form.</p>

		flexibility that recognises that the housing densities should also have regard to the character of the surrounding area.	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>Paragraph 12.18 of the HEDNA identifies that there is a significantly greater discrepancy between the OAN and the number of homes required to address affordable needs in Oadby &amp; Wigston than there is elsewhere in the HMA.</p> <p>An uplift in housing provision of 390% in Oadby &amp; Wigston would be required to meet the full affordable housing need. Whilst an uplift on this scale would be unrealistic and would not be deliverable, the identified OAN of 148dpa provides for only 23% of the 632dpa required to meet the affordable need in full.</p> <p>NPPG (2a-029) requires that "An increase in the total housing figures included in the Local Plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes." This need is particularly acute in Oadby &amp; Wigston and so consideration should be given to a housing requirement significantly in excess of the OAN to provide the opportunity for a reasonable proportion of the affordable needs to be met.</p> <p>The LPA has previously indicated that there is a lack of capacity within the authority area to deliver housing but as explained in other representations prepared on behalf of Mrs B A Walker there is additional land at Oadby Grange which does have potential to deliver additional housing (including affordable housing) which</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that the assumptions and conclusions of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) are robust and justified. All of the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have accepted the outcomes of the HEDNA and approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing. The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes. In addition, all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan.</p> <p>In addition, the HEDNA has been found sound and robust evidence base at the recent North West Leicestershire Local Plan Examination in Public. Therefore, the assumptions and conclusions within the HEDNA conform to national policy and guidance set out in the NPPF and NPPG.</p> <p>The Council considers that Local Plan Policy 13 Affordable Housing illustrates the Council's commitment</p>

		can assist in meeting the housing shortfalls.	to the provision of affordable housing to meet the Borough's needs in a sustainable and viable way. The threshold and targets are evidenced by the Council's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment, as well as the Council's Whole Plan Viability Study evidence base work.
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 63 - Policy 13 Affordable Housing</u></p> <p>My clients support the desire to ensuring all new residential developments provide affordable housing as part of their delivery and support the suggested percentages set out in the draft policy.</p>	Comment support noted.
13.12.17	Tetlow King	<p>Without serious intervention housing affordability in Oadby and Wigston will continue to worsen, leaving behind those households unable to afford a home. This makes the delivery of more, and a more diverse range, of affordable housing one of the main priorities of the Local Plan. As a rented tenure, rent to buy can meet a very significant proportion of needs across the Borough without reliance on public funding and unlike starter homes and other tenures does not require an upfront deposit to access.</p> <p>For this reason, in response to <b>Policy 11</b> we suggest that it would be beneficial for the Council to include specific consideration of this tenure updating the wording to enable delivery of this tenure across the Borough. The below changes are recommended to improve the effectiveness of this policy, ensuring it remains effective over the lifetime of the Plan:</p> <p><i>"All residential development should contribute towards delivering a mix of dwelling types, tenures and sizes that meet the identified needs (and / or demand) of the communities within the Borough. It is expected that all new residential development proposals demonstrate how they contribute to achieving the identified needs</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2017, national government requires local planning authorities to review the Local Plan every 5 years from date of adoption.</p> <p>At paragraph 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council specifies the monitoring clause of the Local Plan. The clause states that the Council will review the Local Plan in part or in full no later than five years from adoption.</p> <p>Due to the above, the Council does not consider that the proposed wording addition should be made to the policy wording. The HEDNA is the current evidence base for housing needs within the local authority area, as well as the wider Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) and has been jointly signed up to by all HMA local authorities. Deviating from this joint evidence base would not be appropriate and could have impacts in other local authority areas.</p>

		<i>as set out within the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and any other more up-to-date evidence of housing need.”</i>	
13.12.17	Tetlow King	<p>Rentplus seeks to deliver high quality, affordable housing to local people that aspire to own their own home, through a partnership approach with locally active housing associations, to combine local experience and knowledge with each housing association’s ambitions to house local people.</p> <p>Whilst there is mention of starter homes within paragraph 6.3.6, the Housing White Paper consultation suggested a number of other affordable housing tenures that may be included within an updated NPPF. The Government has set out in successive consultations its plan to expand the definition of affordable housing as currently set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF; recent statements in the House of Commons, including by the Communities Secretary Sajid Javid, strongly suggest that rent to buy will be included in the next update to the NPPF as a separate tenure. Indeed, the Minister for Housing and Planning, Alok Sharma, recently confirmed in a letter that rent to buy can help increase access to home ownership, and that the tenure will be accounted for in working up the revised definition of affordable housing. We now expect consultation on an update to the NPPF in early 2018 followed by publication of a revised NPPF in April / May 2018. Rent to buy was included in the Housing White Paper Box 4 proposed definition; for this reason, <b>Policy 13</b> should include consideration of rent to buy within the tenure split.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 13 Affordable Housing, sets out the Council’s approach to affordable housing. The definition of affordable housing that the Council will utilise when applying the policy will be that set out by national government in its relevant planning policy and guidance. The Local Plan policy does not specify specific affordable housing tenures, other than Starter Homes, and even then states that provision will be done so in conformity with national government guidance and policy at the time of consideration of a planning proposal.</p> <p>The Council would encourage the use of the Rentplus model on appropriate planning application proposals, however does not feel it appropriate to specify the Rentplus (product) model as a specific tenure. The Council considers that there is flexibility in the current policy regarding tenure splits, which could encapsulate the Rentplus model or any other appropriate similar model where appropriate.</p>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 13: AFFORDABLE HOUSING</b></p> <p>Bloor Homes fully support the provision of affordable housing as an integral part of housing development in order to meet the affordable housing needs of the Borough. However, it is important that the affordable</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Viability evidence base undertaken for the Local Plan illustrates that the policy requirements set out within the document are viable and do not threaten</p>

		<p>housing provision reflects site and location specific variables and the changing needs of the District over the plan period, both in terms of quantum and tenure. Provision must, therefore, be based upon the most up to date evidence available, including the monitoring of market activity over the plan period to identify the ability of developers to deliver affordable housing across the differing locations within the Borough. In light of that, the proposed affordable housing tenure mix of 75% affordable / social rent and 25% intermediate is unduly prescriptive. The Government's proposals for Starter Homes as set out in the Housing White Paper alongside other affordable home ownership and rented tenures as a means of boosting the provision of affordable housing across the District should also be considered. This broadening of the approach to housing mix will allow for greater flexibility and will in turn assist in ensuring delivery.</p> <p><b><i>Soundness:</i></b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy H2, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is not <b>justified</b> in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national guidance</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government's objective to ensure affordable housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of sustainable development.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Proposed Changes:</i></b> To remedy the flaws in the soundness of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The policy should include Affordable Housing requirements that do not undermine the</li> </ul>	<p>viability.</p> <p>Due to the Borough's affordable housing need, the Council is committed in delivering affordable housing, however is totally aware of the affect affordable housing can have on the viability of development proposals. As mentioned, the Local Plan has been subject to viability evidence base, which illustrates that the policy requirements, as set out, are viable and deliverable. In certain cases, particularly in Oadby, the viability evidence base suggested higher percentages of affordable housing provision, and a lowering of the affordable housing threshold.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>viability of schemes and delay / prevent sustainable development; and</p> <p>The policy should include sufficient flexibility to allow development to respond to site-specific constraints, evidence of need and the provision of other forms of affordable housing.</p>	
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<p><b>Affordable Housing &amp; Viability</b></p> <p>If the Local Plan is to be compliant with the NPPF development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened (paras 173 &amp; 174). The residual land value model is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on viability. Therefore it is important that the Council understands and tests the influence of all inputs on the residual land value as this determines whether or not land is released for development. The Harman Report highlighted that "<i>what ultimately matters for housing delivery is whether the value received by land owners is sufficient to persuade him or her to sell their land for development</i>".</p> <p><b>Policy 13 – Affordable Housing</b> proposes on sites of 11+ dwellings differential affordable housing provision of 30% in Oadby, 20% in Wigston and 10% in South Wigston subject to viability.</p> <p>The Council's latest viability testing evidence is set out in Oadby &amp; Wigston Whole Plan Viability Assessment Report dated 2017 by Andrew Golland Associates. The findings show that policy trade-offs are required between affordable housing provision and infrastructure. The Council should be mindful that the cumulative burden of policy requirements are not set so high that the majority of sites are only deliverable if these sites are routinely rather than occasionally</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Viability evidence base undertaken for the Local Plan illustrates that the policy requirements set out within the document are viable and do not threaten viability.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 13 Affordable Housing is based on the policy requirements for affordable housing set out in the Council's Core Strategy. These policy requirements have been successful in delivering affordable housing throughout the Core Strategy Plan period to date. Due to the Borough's affordable housing need, the Council is committed in delivering affordable housing, however is totally aware of the affect affordable housing can have on the viability of development proposals. As mentioned, the Local Plan has been subject to viability evidence base, which illustrates that the policy requirements, as set out, are viable and deliverable. In certain cases, particularly in Oadby, the viability evidence base suggested higher percentages of affordable housing provision, and a lowering of the affordable housing threshold.</p> <p>The Council wish to reiterate, that all of the policy requirements within the Local Plan have been subject to viability evidence base work, this includes the Policy 21 Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Area. The policy requirements set out in the Plan have been found viable and deliverable. It should be noted that the</p>

		<p>negotiated on the grounds of viability. The proposed affordable housing tenure mix is 80% affordable rent and 20% intermediate. There should be flexibility in the policy wording so that the Council may deliver a mixed package of affordable housing including affordable home ownership and rented tenures. The Council has identified a need for 33 Starter Homes per annum.</p> <p>It is noted that in <b>Policy 21</b> the provision of at least 30% affordable housing is required. The setting of a minimum requirement in <b>Policy 21</b> is inconsistent with the approach set out in <b>Policy 13</b>. This inconsistency is not justified by the Council's viability evidence and the wording "at least" should be deleted.</p>	<p>affordable housing policy requirement set out within Local Plan 21 is consistent with the policy requirement set out in Policy 13 for the Oadby area.</p> <p>In addition, the Council considers that the wording of both Local Plan Policy 13 (<i>...minimum targets</i>) and Policy 21 (<i>...at least</i>) is consistent and does not need amending.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 13 - Affordable Housing</p> <p>We are pleased to note that the Council has updated their evidence base in terms of the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment. The policy should include provision for starter homes, which are acknowledged to make a contribution towards meeting affordable housing needs. The Council has identified an annual need for 33 starter homes in the Borough and this should be incorporated within the policy to ensure that that plan is positively prepared and effective and can therefore meet the tests of soundness.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As suggested at paragraph 6.3.6 of the Local Plan, the provision of Starter Homes on 'qualifying' sites will be done so in conformity with the national government guidance and policy at the time of consideration of the planning proposal. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 suggests that affordable housing includes starter homes within its definition. The Act also sets out the definition of a starter home. For the purposes of this local policy, the definition for starter homes will be consistent with that set out within the Housing and Planning Act 2016.</p> <p>The Council has not identified annual need for 33 starter homes within the policy.</p>
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wigston Direction for Growth area)	<p>Policy 14 encourages the provision of self-build and custom build on all large scale residential developments. The policy indicates that the Council will also consider proposals for self-build/custom build on smaller sites in the urban area. Policy 20 on the Direction for Growth at Wigston specifically requires the provision of self-build/custom build on the site.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>To ensure that the Council is acting positively and proactively it does not consider it appropriate to remove the reference to '<i>on all large scale residential development</i>' in Local Plan Policy 14 Self Build and Custom Build. It should be noted that Local Plan Policy</p>

	<p>There is insufficient evidence of the scale of interest in self-build and custom build in the borough. In addition, it is likely that those interested in self-build projects will not wish to build a unit on a large scale housing site. Provision for self-build units on larger sites will also create practical difficulties for housebuilders in managing the development of sites.</p> <p>The HBF has commented on other local plans indicating that, whilst it is supportive of self-build for its additionality to housing supply, it is not supportive of a housing mix approach where a requirement to provide self-build plots is imposed on sites of a certain size. This approach merely changes the house building delivery mechanism from one form of house building company to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply. If self-build plots reserved on larger sites are not developed, the Council has effectively caused unnecessary delay in housing delivery. The HBF also highlight the practical difficulties, including health and safety implications, working hours, length of build programme, of implementing a housing mix policy approach.</p> <p>As the HBF has highlighted in other responses to local plans, a number of Local Plan Inspectors have commented on the issues associated with self-build on larger sites. The East Devon Local Plan Inspector expressed reservations about the implementation difficulties associated with this sort of policy, commenting as follows:</p> <p><i>'However, I don't see how the planning system can make developers sell land to potential rivals (and at a reasonable price).</i></p> <p><i>East Devon Inspector's Report, January 2016 para 46</i></p>	<p>14 Self Build and Custom Build does not <u>require</u> the provision of custom and / or self build, it seeks to <u>encourage</u> provision of plots.</p> <p>In addition, to ensure consistency with Local Plan Policy 14, the Council would not be opposed to a rewording of the relevant policy bullet points (in Local Plan Policy 18, 20 and 21) in relation to provision of Self Build and Custom Build, that sought an 'encouragement' for provision, rather than a 'requirement' for provision.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The Cornwall Inspector commented on this issue as follows:  <i>'The Council's published change on this policy was too prescriptive in requiring larger developments to provide at least 5% of development as serviced plots for self-build/custom build. There is not yet the evidence to justify this level of prescription and there must be considerable uncertainty as to whether plots on large new housing estates would be attractive to self-build/custom builders.'</i>  <i>Cornwall Inspector's Report Para 168</i></p> <p>A further point is that any proposed policy requiring self-build/custom build on larger sites should be viability tested in accordance with the NPPG which confirms that different types of residential development such as those wanting to build their own homes are funded and delivered in different ways and this should be reflected in viability assessments (ID 10-009-20140306).</p> <p>Policies 14 and 20 should be amended to remove references to the provision of self-build/custom build on the proposed Directions for Growth sites.</p>	
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 14 SELF BUILD</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that self-build and custom house building is an element of the Government's housing strategy. However, no clear evidence of need or demand in the Borough has been presented in the Local Plan's evidence base. Reference is made to the Council's register, but those registered are not required to be means tested and, therefore, in reality the demand is likely to be significantly lower. Moreover, the requirement has not been justified or tested in terms of the potential impact on the deliverability of development schemes as required by the NPPF</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>To ensure that the Council is acting positively and proactively it does not consider it appropriate to remove Local Plan Policy 14 Self Build and Custom Build. It should be noted that Local Plan Policy 14 Self Build and Custom Build does not <u>require</u> the provision of custom and / or self build, it seeks to <u>encourage</u> provision of plots. Therefore if the provision of Self Build and Custom Build plots (through the planning application process) had significant negative impacts on the viability of development proposals, the Council would not require its provision.</p>

		<p>(paragraphs 158, 173-174). This requirement could have a critical affect on the viability of new housing development in the Borough, and the deliverability sustainable development cannot be compromised by unnecessary and unduly onerous requirements.</p> <p>In that light the Council's approach to self / custom build should be to increase the total amount of new housing developed by supporting development on small windfall sites as well as allocating additional small sites rather than by establishing a policy requirement for inclusion of such housing on larger allocated sites.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 14, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is not <b>justified</b> in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies; and</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national guidance</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government's objective to ensure the housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> Delete the policy.</p>	<p>In addition, to ensure consistency with Local Plan Policy 14, the Council would not be opposed to a rewording of the relevant policy bullet points (in Local Plan Policy 18, 20 and 21) in relation to provision of Self Build and Custom Build, that sought an 'encouragement' for provision, rather than a 'requirement' for provision.</p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 14 - Self Build and Custom Build</p> <p>Policy 14 requires housing developments over 11 dwellings to provide land for self-build and custom build dwellings to help meet identified local demand. Whilst the concept of Self Build and Custom Build Housing is supported, Gladman have concerns regarding Policy 14 as it is written as the inclusion of plots on large scale</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>To ensure that the Council is acting positively and proactively it does not consider it appropriate to remove Local Plan Policy 14 Self Build and Custom Build. It should be noted that Local Plan Policy 14 Self Build and Custom Build does not <u>require</u> the provision</p>

		sites does not add to the supply of houses overall (it merely changes the housing mix from one product to another). It is also difficult to assess how it will be implemented given issues around working hours, site access, health and safety etc. that are associated with large scale development sites. The percentage of provision on sites should also be determined on detailed evidence of need which the Council has not yet produced and the provision of these plots should also be subject to viability testing	of custom and / or self build, it seeks to <u>encourage</u> provision of plots. Therefore if the provision of Self Build and Custom Build plots (through the planning application process) had significant negative impacts on the viability of development proposals, the Council would not require its provision.  The Policy allows the flexibility for the Council to work with an applicant on a case by case basis to seek / encourage the provision of self build and custom build housing plots. For this reason the Council considers that it is appropriate not to include the provision of self build and custom build as part of the Local Plan Whole Plan Viability evidence base documentation.
18.12.17	Home Builders Federation (HBF)	<b>Housing Mix</b> In <b>Policy 14</b> the Council proposes to encourage self / custom build. The HBF is supportive of the Council's approach to the encouragement of self / custom build which is a potential contributor to overall housing supply. However it is noted that in <b>Policy 21</b> this encouragement has become a policy requirement so there is an inconsistency in the Council's approach. It is not evident that the Council has assessed such housing needs in its SHMA work as set out in the NPPG (ID 2a-021) or viability tested such a policy requirement.	Comment noted.  To ensure consistency with Local Plan Policy 14, which 'encourages' provision, the Council would not be opposed to a rewording of the relevant policy bullet points (in Local Plan Policy 18, 20 and 21) in relation to provision of Self Build and Custom Build, that sought an 'encouragement' for provision, rather than a 'requirement' for provision.
13.12.17	Historic England	<u>Policy 16</u>  Bullet point 9 is strongly welcomed.	Comment of support noted.
15.12.17	Sport England	A reference to active design could be added to all the policies in <u>Chapter Seven</u> – Allocations and Regeneration Opportunity areas.	Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.  The Council is committed in creating healthy and active communities. The Council will ensure that the use of Sport England's Active Design guide is encouraged in all masterplanning or large scale development proposals, for example the site allocations illustrated in Chapter Seven of the Local Plan.

15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Chapter 7 – Regeneration Areas</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> These sections on the sites identified for potential development need to be strengthened by including explicit reference to protecting extant mature trees and hedgerows, and conditions requiring planting, and contribution to future maintenance, of trees.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>All development that is proposed within the Borough area will need to conform to all relevant policies set out within the Local Plan. Although some areas within the Borough have specific policies relating to them, for example the direction for growth areas, it does not mean that other relevant policies set out in the Plan become irrelevant, they have the same relevance as with any development proposal.</p>
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Chapter Seven – Allocations and Regeneration Opportunity</p> <p>The PSLP identifies three areas for growth in the Borough and has allocated land accordingly. The northerly part of the Borough, along Gartree Road and Stoughton Road in Oadby is recognised as a growth area, and is referred to as Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth. This Growth Area is located on the opposite side of Stoughton Road to the University’s sports fields. Policy 18 refers to the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth area and Oadby Cemetery Allocation. This allocation sets out that the Green Wedge designation will remain to the east of the site that is currently in use as the University’s playing fields as well as arable land.</p> <p>As set out or comments on Chapter Six (Housing) the University would like to discuss with the Council the potentially promotion of some of their land for housing, including a seven hectare site on Stoughton Road, Oadby which is considered to be appropriate for approximately 150 to 200 new dwellings.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Chapter 7 – Failure to consider all reasonable alternatives</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The OAN forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan which is outside of the scope of SA.</p>

		<p><b>Representation:</b> Objections are made to Chapter 7 on the basis that the Sustainability Appraisal has not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives as required by the NPPG.</p> <p>The objector’s primary position as outlined in the representations relating to Policy 2 is that the OAN is not robust and that the housing requirement should be increased for this and other reasons. This will mean that additional sites will need to be allocated for housing and the objector considers that this should include Land at Oadby Grange.</p> <p>Even if those objections are not accepted, it is considered that the site is more suitable than some of the allocated sites as explained in the other representations that relate specifically to those sites.</p>	<p>The Land at Oadby Grange has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative through the SA given that the site was not submitted for any built development through the various Call for Sites exercises throughout the Local Plan process. The site was included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment in 2013, but was subsequently removed as discussions have been ongoing with the land owner regarding various recreational options for the site which would mean the site would not be deliverable for housing. These discussions are ongoing and the site has not been promoted or considered for any alternative use.</p> <p>The SA process has involved the identification and appraisal of reasonable alternatives for both site and policy options. In relation to the reasonable alternative sites the appraisal of those considered is presented in Appendix 5. Appendix 6 presents a summary of the Council’s reasoning for allocating or discounting sites as communicated to LUC during preparation of the SA.</p> <p>In relation to the emergence of those reasonable alternative site options considered, the previous iteration of the SA Report (Preferred Options) considered sites identified within the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, sites illustrated within the town centre masterplans and Local Development Orders, and sites submitted through the Call for Sites process that have had recent developer interest. Once the SA Report for the Preferred Options Local Plan was published alongside that version of the Local Plan further sites were promoted. Once the Council had identified the reasonable alternative site options for the Local Plan they were subject to SA by LUC. The findings were presented to the Council officers preparing the Local Plan in an internal summary</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>note in August 2016, so that the SA findings could inform decision making about which site options to take forward in the Local Plan. LUC also assessed the additional site options that came through the Preferred Options consultation and similarly passed the appraisal results onto the Council officers preparing the Plan, prior to finalisation of the Pre-Submission version of the Plan.</p> <p>In relation to the reasonable alternatives considered for the policy options in the Local Plan initially high level options for the policies to be included in the Local Plan were identified by the Council and from this reasonable alternative policy options were subject to SA by LUC during summer 2016. Findings were presented to the Council officers preparing the Plan in an internal summary note in August 2016, so that the SA findings could inform decision making about which policy options to take forward in the Preferred Options document. The SA matrices for the reasonable alternative policy options were presented in the Preferred Options SA Report (November 2016) and these are included in Appendix 7 of the Pre-Submission SA Report. Appendix 8 of the full SA Report presents an audit trail explaining the reasons for the Council's decision making about which policy options to take forward in the Local Plan.</p> <p>As such it is demonstrated how reasonable alternative options for both sites to be allocated and policies included in the Local Plan have been considered through the SA Report process. As such the SA Report meets the requirements of the PPG and SEA Directive.</p> <p>The reasons why the Land at Oadby Grange has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative in the SA Report have been set out above.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Furthermore given the high level nature of the SA and a requirement for a consistency between the appraisal of sites in line with the SA Assumptions it is not considered appropriate that details presented in the Site Delivery Statement should influence the outcome of the SA. This level of detail is not available for consideration for each site and therefore the information included should not influence the findings of any appraisal undertaken.</p> <p>The reasons why the Land at Oadby Grange has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative in the SA Report have been set out above.</p> <p>While site OWBC23 (which the objector has used as a proxy to compare the Land at Oadby Grange to sites which have been included for allocation) performs favourably in comparison to the noted allocated sites for some of the SA objectives the allocation of specific sites is outside of the scope of the SA Report.</p> <p>Appendix 6 presents a summary of the Council's reasoning for allocating or discounting sites as communicated to LUC during preparation of the SA. The SA Report does not present a ranking of sites for allocation but merely forms part of the evidence base for the selection of sites. Issues beyond the findings of the SA Report have been taken into consideration as part of this decision making process and have thereby influenced which sites have been allocated.</p>
15.12.17	Gordon White and Hood	<p>LOCAL PLAN PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DOCUMENT COMMENTS:-</p> <p>Section 7.1.1 refers to the redevelopment of the area as outlined above , 40 houses, tourism etc but without bringing in additional land for the housing and opening up current privately held land for the use of the public this can not be achieved.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The western parcel of land situated adjacent to the Grand Union Canal (within the settlement envelope) has been proposed for redevelopment by the Canal and Rivers Trust (in partnership with H2O Urban) for 16 new canal side residential dwellings, along with small scale retail and boating facilities.</p>

		<p>Section 7.1.2 refers to future master planning of the area, this has already been shown as a possible masterplan on our scheme, without the addition of extra housing land the requirements of the local plan can not be achieved.</p> <p>Section 7.1.4 – refers to the creation of a marina within the area, again reducing the number of housing sites to the area, a marina would not be financially viable without some development opportunities.</p> <p>Section 7.1.5 – policy 17 refers to a minimum development density of 30 dwellings per hectare with is against the nature of the site as a whole and would lead to an overdevelopment density of the existing areas available for development. The policy goes onto state that the key objectives are to maintain the open, attractive and rural setting of the area, at 30 per hectare as a minimum this would not occur unless additional land is made available.</p> <p>Section 7.4.13 – our proposal will actively encourage the promotion of healthy lifestyle etc by opening up a privately held land area for the public with additional walkways and footpaths.</p> <p>The local plan refers to a wish list for the Kilby Bridge Settlement area which includes tourism, housing, marina, starter units and enhancement of the area considered as a gateway to Wigston. This has been addressed in our documentation.</p>	<p>Through Local Plan consultations (including the most recent consultation), Wheatcroft Properties Limited has also promoted a site within the settlement envelope for up to 3 new residential dwellings. Combined, these two sites equate to 19 new residential dwellings to the western side of Kilby Bridge.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, in order for the full 40 additional new homes at Kilby Bridge be realised over the plan period, a further 21 residential units would be delivered on the 1.37h land area to the east (of Welford Road) described by Gordon White and Hood as usable. Crude calculations illustrate (21 / 1.37) that to fulfil the 21 units on 1.37h of land would require a density of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare. The current minimum dwellings per hectare target set out within Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope, is 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>The current minimum dwellings per hectare target set out within Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope, is 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council considers that the proposed settlement envelope defined within the Local Plan has sufficient capacity to accommodate up to 40 dwellings over the Plan period.</p> <p>It should be noted that Kilby Bridge is the Borough areas only rural settlement, and in essence is a rural hamlet. The Council, through the Local Plan is seeking to retain its unique and individual rural character through small scale development and regeneration opportunities.</p>
15.12.17	Gordon White and Hood	We have been in consultation with the planning policy department and were led by their comments to include	Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.

		<p>and promote the whole of the Ellis Farm site for a large housing scheme, we originally showed the smaller 6-7 property scheme outlined in this report. The planning policy team wanted to see the possibility of fully developing the site with sympathy given to the canal and the SSSI. See the scheme put forward for original consultation with the policy team for consideration as part of the emerging local plan. This scheme has in effect been ignored.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the overall and underlying aim for this proposed extension to the development area has been to provide dwellings, community facilities, and a site layout that respond appropriately and sympathetically to the landscape and context with controlled visual impact and with sustainable design at its core.</p> <p>The site proposed is well located for inclusion within the Oadby &amp; Wigston master concept plan utilising an isolated area of land between the railway line and the Grand Union Canal. The proposals are sympathetic to the ecological and rural nature of the site whilst addressing the known housing need.</p> <p>The environment agency have confirmed that the site lies outside of any known fluvial or tidal floodplains and is therefore at little risk of flooding.</p> <p>The external alterations to the existing buildings serve to enhance the quality of the local built environment.</p> <p>The proposed new-build dwelling concept serves to harness the vistas towards the surrounding open countryside and landscape features through careful orientation and arrangement on the site. This also, with the additional land allows for the development and</p>	<p>Due to the proximity of the large housing scheme to the Limedelves SSSI, its relationship with the Grand Union Canal conservation area, its situation in the Countryside, its highways impact, and its dominating scale in relation to the existing settlement area of Kilby Bridge, the Council did not consider large scale development appropriate.</p> <p>The extent of the settlement envelope defined within the Local Plan consists of the existing brownfield areas of Kilby Bridge settlement, part of which is designated conservation area. The Council considers that the existing brownfield elements of Kilby Bridge are capable of delivering each element of the policy and there is not a need to extend the defined settlement envelope beyond the existing brownfield areas into open countryside.</p> <p>Kilby Bridge is the Borough's only non-urban settlement and is rural in nature. The Council considers that Local Plan Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope is completely appropriate in relation to the settlement, location, situation, extant designations, scale, size and environmental value. The Council seeks to retain the settlements rural history and character, however is aware that the settlement needs some small scale sympathetic development in order to enable regeneration of the hamlet.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>opening up of the private land into public ownership.</p> <p>The new-build dwellings and assisted living will seek to exploit the latest energy efficient technologies, whilst utilising site orientation and topography to ensure high levels of self-sufficiency and sustainability within the development.</p> <p>The development seeks to minimise it's ecological impact via implementation of landscape buffer zones, protection of habitats where required and the visual promotion 'Kilby-Foxton Canal' and 'Lake' Site of Special Scientific Interest. The SSSI would be extended and enhanced by the small scale development.</p> <p>Each vista towards the site has been considered, ensuring that all views towards the site have been addressed; with subtle architectural interventions key to the development unveiling itself without imposing on the context.</p> <p>Pedestrian and vehicle links are integrated into the overall design and layouts, providing clear and simple access around the site with minimal impact on the surroundings. Enhancing and addressing an issue of parking on the main road.</p> <p>The development sits at ease on the site both visually and functionally; working with existing site factors whilst providing elements of contemporary design that makes a positive mark on the landscape.</p> <p>The proposed additional areas and opening up of the area as shown on the plans would meet all of the requirements outlined in the new local plan and aid in the aspirations outlined in the document, which we consider can not easily be achieved by the local plan in</p>	
--	--	---	--

		its existing form.	
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wheatcroft Properties)	<p>Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope</p> <p>Policy 17 proposes that the Council will consider small scale development proposals within the defined Settlement Envelope of Kilby Bridge. The policy advises that any residential development proposals should be small scale and identifies the potential for up to 40 dwellings to be delivered across the whole settlement. The proposed definition of a settlement envelope for Kilby Bridge and the support for small scale residential development is supported. Kilby Bridge is as sustainable location for some further limited growth, and as the Submission Draft Plan indicates, allowing some limited development would assist with the regeneration of the settlement, supporting the development of vacant and underused land.</p> <p>The definition of a settlement envelope for Kilby Bridge is consistent with guidance set out in the NPPF which encourages local planning authorities to plan for the needs of the more sustainable rural settlements (paras 54 and 55).</p> <p>Wheatcroft Properties Limited own land to the west of Welford Road. The site consists of a vacant residential property, Ingleneuk, in some 0.11 hectares of land with the potential for redevelopment for around 3 dwellings. Redevelopment of the site would assist with the regeneration of the settlement.</p>	Comment of support noted.
11.12.17	Natural England	Natural England has already provided detailed comments on previous iterations of the emerging local plan. We have nothing further to add here. Our interests relate purely to any potential impact of the local plan on the natural environment, with a particular emphasis on avoiding any adverse impacts on nationally and internationally designated nature	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope sets out the Council's approach to the Kilby Bridge area. The policy sets out a number of key objectives, including conserving and enhancing the Grand Union Canal conservation area as well as the Kilby-Foxton</p>

		<p>conservation sites such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) which are protected under the Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 (As Amended). With that in mind, care should be taken to avoid any development with a potentially harmful effect on the Kilby-Foxton Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which forms part of the Grand Union Canal, specifically the section between Kilby and Foxton including the Limedelves Quarry and the surrounding grassland. We broadly welcome Chapter 10 on protected places including the section on biodiversity and geodiversity. We are pleased to note that any development proposals that have a significant negative impact on important areas or result in significant habitat loss within the Borough will not be permitted for development.</p>	SSSI.
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>Policy 17 Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope</u></p> <p>Due to the very close proximity of the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area to the south, the inclusion of a key objective for heritage assets within the policy is strongly welcomed. A supporting paragraph outlining the particular importance of the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area would strengthen this policy. The site is within an area of ridge and furrow. Please ensure that the advice of the County Archaeological Advisor is sought.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>The Council will ensure that if any development is proposed within the Kilby Bridge Settlement Envelope, the County Archaeological Advisor will be consulted for comments.</p> <p>It should be noted, that Local Plan Policy 41 Conservation Areas has more information relating to the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area. The Policy also seeks the conservation and preservation of all of the designated Conservation Areas within the Borough.</p>
18.12.17	Coop	<p><u>Policy 18 – Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth and Oadby Cemetery Allocation – Co-op</u></p> <p>As the Council is aware, the Co-op has extensive interests in land at the Stoughton Estate in Oadby. Naturally, the Co-op <b>supports</b> and welcomes the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth area allocation, including the delivery of at least 300 dwellings with associated Class A1 – A4 uses at Stoughton Grange.</p> <p>Importantly, this allocation will safeguard the Eastern</p>	Comment of support welcomed.

		<p>District Distributor Road (EDDR) route and also make provision for appropriate land for cemetery and burial uses. It is considered that Policy 18 has been positively prepared and clearly justified by the technical information provided to the Council to date and further survey work which is ongoing.</p> <p>It is also clearly effective as the Co-op is currently preparing an outline planning application on the allocation site for submission in 2018. This will demonstrate that the site is deliverable and as such, suitable for allocation within the emerging Local Plan. Importantly, this will also demonstrate to the Local Plan Examination that the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth policy meets the relevant tests of soundness.</p>	
18.12.17	Harborough District Council	<p><u>7.2.14 Oadby Cemetery Allocation</u></p> <p>HDC supports the proposed extension of the previously allocated cemetery site.</p>	Comment of support welcomed.
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Support/Object:</b> Object</p> <p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 18 – Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth Area</p> <p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>As set out in other representations on behalf of Mrs B A Walker in relation to Policy 2, the objector's primary position is that the OAN is not robust and that the housing requirement should be increased for this and other reasons. This will mean that additional sites will need to be allocated for housing and the objector considers that this should include Land at Oadby Grange.</p> <p>Even if those objections are not accepted, it is considered that the site is still more suitable than some of the allocated sites including the Land at Stoughton</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The purpose of the Council's Green Wedge Review is to assess the boundaries of the existing green wedge designations, as defined on Council's Saved Local Plan Proposals Map and the Council's Adopted Policies Map. The review took into account the Broad Location for Growth Areas identified within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the options for greenfield release sites identified within the Council's Preferred Options Local Plan consultation document.</p> <p>Each of the existing green wedges was assessed against the functions set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Green Wedge Review Joint Methodology to see whether or not the current designated boundaries should be kept the same or amended.</p>

		<p>Grange Direction for Growth Area (Policy 18). As explained in the more general objection in relation to Chapter 7, the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives, as the LPA has failed to consider Land at Oadby Grange as an option for residential development.</p> <p>Land at Oadby Grange</p> <p>The merits of the Land at Oadby Grange are set out in separate representations and the attached Site Deliverability Statement and are not repeated again here to avoid duplication.</p> <p>Land at Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth</p> <p>Land at Stoughton Grange is allocated for amongst other things, 300 dwellings through Policy 18.</p> <p>The site is currently located within a defined Green Wedge. Paragraph 10.6.5 of the draft plan explains the importance of the Green Wedges and states:-</p> <p><b>“With the Borough being relatively compact and urban in nature, Green Wedges are extremely important; they play major roles in shaping the character of the environment and help stimulate leisure and tourism whilst improving residents and visitors quality of life.”</b></p> <p>However, the draft Local Plan at paragraph 7.2.3 indicates that the Green Wedge Review was undertaken due to the need to accommodate additional growth. It explains that the entire proposed growth area at Stoughton Grange is within land which has historically been identified as part of a Green Wedge.</p>	<p>As stated within the review document, for the purpose of the review document the Oadby, Thurnby, Stoughton Green Wedge was assessed at an overall ‘macro’ scale, however to ensure a good level of detail the Oadby, Thurnby, Stoughton Green Wedge was split down into two sub areas to aid the review process.</p> <p>One of the Green Wedge Review’s recommendations for the Oadby, Thurnby, Stoughton Green Wedge was to remove the land area identified as a Broad Location for Growth / Greenfield Release Site option, should the Council be required to allocate the land for development within the Council’s new Local Plan. Although, the land area illustrated within Figure 15 (of the Green Wedge Review document) currently forms part of the green wedge area situated within the Borough boundary, the removal of the land area would not have a significant detrimental impact on the attributes of the overall green wedge designation. Due to the current, overall large size of the Oadby, Thurnby, Stoughton Green Wedge and the current distance between the urban areas of Leicester City, Harborough District and the settlement of Oadby, removal of the land area would not allow for settlement coalescence.</p> <p>Due to the identified needs of the Borough, in particular housing OAN, the Council considered it necessary to release the land area to form the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth Area.</p> <p>In relation to the suitability of the land at Oadby Grange it is of note that the Council had not been made aware the recent interest in bringing the land forward, prior to the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation stage. It was only made aware through Pegasus Planning’s submission on the 18th December 2017 (the closing day for the Local Plan Pre-Submission</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Objection is raised on the grounds that it is not necessary or appropriate to release this land from the Green Wedge when better suited sites outside of the designated area are available. The proposed allocation would cause development to encroach into the Green Wedge and which will consolidate development in this area, reducing the separation of built up areas, further distancing residents of Leicester and other urban areas from the countryside and eroding the important "Green Lung" that the Green Wedge Review refers to at p.37. This runs counter to the objectives of the Green Wedge designation.</p> <p>Given the harm to the Green Wedge, the LPA should have considered all options outside of the designated area before allocating this site. The Land at Oadby Grange offers the opportunity to provide a similar number of dwellings on a site outside the Green Wedge and it should therefore be considered sequentially preferable in this regard.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal also highlights at paragraph 4.66 that development at Stoughton Grange would be provided in a location "with poorer levels of access to existing facilities." The site proforma in the appendices to the SA also notes that the site is not within walking distance of any primary schools, secondary schools or colleges (OWBC24). The Site Deliverability Statement that has been prepared for Oadby Grange does not identify any such constraints for that site meaning that it is also sequentially preferable in accessibility terms.</p> <p>Heritage is also a potential constraint for Land at Stoughton Grange with development having the potential to affect the settings of designated heritage assets (see Local Plan para 7.2.5). No such constraints</p>	<p>Consultation). Therefore this land has not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Been assessed by the Council through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment since 2013, or</li> <li>• Been submitted to the Council for consideration during any of the Call for Sites processes that have been undertaken by the Council for the purposes of Local Plan preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, this land has been subject to a Section 106 Agreement between Mr Thomas Watson Walker, the Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council. The original S106 Agreement dates back to 2001. Throughout the time of the agreement, the Council has been in discussions with the land owner to provide a publically owned country park, hence the land area ceasing to be considered by the Council for built development post 2013 (alongside a lack of developer or site promoter interest).</p> <p>The land has previously been included in the Council's SHLAA process due to it being considered through the Council's Allocations Issues and Options Public Consultation 2007. It has not been promoted by an external land agent or land owner.</p> <p>In addition, the Oadby Grange site, is situated in designated Countryside and does not have direct access onto one of the Borough's main highway and transport routes (A Road or B Road). The site is located to the very edge of an existing residential estate, approximately 0.7 miles from the nearest main route, the A6. It should also be noted that the site did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, therefore has not been taken account of from a</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>affect Oadby Grange and as such these potential impacts can be avoided.</p> <p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b></p> <p>The Pre Submission Plan and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal has not considered the option of allocating Land at Oadby Grange for housing and has therefore not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The Stoughton Grange allocation gives rise to adverse impacts which do not arise with the Land at Oadby Grange.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b></p> <p>Land at Oadby Grange should be identified as an additional residential allocation to address the increased housing requirement that is likely to arise from a more robust assessment of the OAN (see objections to Policy S2) and the need to provide for contingency and choice.</p> <p>If those objections are not accepted, the site should still be allocated for housing as an alternative to land at Stoughton Grange (Policy 18) because it represents a more sustainable option.</p>	<p>cumulative transport / highway testing perspective.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the Council, throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, has considered sites that have been promoted to the Council through the numerous Local Plan Call for Sites processes undertaken and the SHLAA Call for Sites process undertaken. The Council has considered sites that have known developer interest and have been informed regarding a sites availability, achievability and suitability.</p> <p>To reiterate, the Council has not been made aware of the site being promoted by Pegasus Planning during the Local Plan process, until the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation final day for representations, therefore the Council considers that it is inappropriate to say that the Council has not considered the site, in particular through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as the Council was unaware of it.</p> <p>The reasons why the Land at Oadby Grange has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative in the SA Report have been set out above. The previous sections have also demonstrated how the Council has made use of the SA findings to inform the selection of site options and policy options for inclusion in the Local Plan.</p>
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>Policy 18 Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth</u></p> <p>Development at this location would require very careful design due to the numerous heritage assets nearby, including those within the site and at Evington and Stoughton. Supporting paragraph 7.2.5 is welcomed; reference should also be made to the numerous</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the Historic England for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council proposes to include the need for a Heritage Impact Assessment within Policy 18 Stoughton Grange</p>

		<p>heritage assets at Evington to the north west and Stoughton to the north east. The policy should be revised to include reference to the other heritage assets and their settings close to the site. Whilst the requirement for a detailed masterplan is welcomed, the need for a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment should be included within the policy.</p> <p><u>Oadby Cemetery Allocation</u> Due to the proximity of the site to the moated grange at Stoughton scheduled monument, the County archaeologist should be consulted.</p>	<p>Direction for Growth upon the advice of Historic England. The Council proposes the following wording in the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph (directly below the bullets).</p> <p><i>'Any proposal for development of this growth area will be required to conform to all other relevant policies set out within this Plan <b>and should be accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment</b>'.</i></p> <p>The Council will ensure that the County Archaeologist is consulted should a development proposal for the cemetery allocation be submitted to the Council.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 20 – Wigston Direction for Growth Area</p> <p>The Council's proposed allocation of an expanded Direction for Growth Area adjoining Wigston is supported in principle. It is our view that this policy provides an opportunity to ensure that the plan is both positively prepared, effective and justified by identifying additional growth areas (or reserve sites) that may be needed to deliver the OAHN across the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA. Paragraph 7.4.17 alludes to the fact that further development could occur within this growth area beyond the Plan period, subject to testing through a review of the Plan.</p> <p>We consider that this exercise should be carried out as part of this Local Plan process. Furthermore, consideration of additional land should not be confined purely to the Council's suggested Phase 3 Wigston Direction for Growth Area but should properly assess all possible options in the area, including land north of Newton Lane, including the land at Seven Oaks Farm. Land north of Newton Lane would integrate well with Phase 1 and 2 elements of the Wigston Growth Area, as demonstrated by the Landscape Framework Plan</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council's Local Plan allocates sufficient land to meet its own Objectively Assessed Needs in full. The Local Plan also identifies a residential 'buffer' of approximately 400 new homes, which would negate any potential delivery issues on allocated sites in the future, but also could help fulfil a small proportion of Leicester City's unmet need.</p> <p>The Borough area of Oadby and Wigston is unique in England and comprises a small compact urban area, adjacent to the major City of Leicester. The Borough area is constrained by a number of factors, including land availability; however its key constraint is its severely congested transport and highway infrastructure network. As illustrated by the South East Leicester Transport Study, the scale of development identified within the Council's Local Plan up to 2031 can just be accommodated, however with required mitigation. Additional development over and above that identified within the Local Plan could seriously undermine the deliverability of the development</p>

		<p>and can deliver sustainable development in respect of transport choice. As noted in 7.4.3 of Pre-Submission Draft Plan, further development at the Wigston Direction for Growth Area would continue to support the Vision and spatial objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>As a minimum the policy should make explicit reference to expanding the Wigston Direction for Growth Area beyond Phase 2 and define the physical boundaries of the expanded area. It is our view that this should identify land to the north of Newton Lane. It should also ideally clarify the mechanism by which the release of the additional land is managed, either within Policy 20 or alternatively in Policy 2 Spatial Strategy through the specific identification of "reserve sites". These changes are considered necessary to render the Plan sound and specifically to ensure that the Local Plan meets objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.</p>	identified in the Plan.
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 20 – Wigston Direction for Growth Area</p> <p>Gladman support the allocation of further land for an additional 600 dwellings at the Wigston Direction for Growth area for "phase 2" development. Gladman consider the Direction for Growth Area to be the most sustainable location in the district for new development, as a result of its proximity to the town centre and public transport links into Leicester City.</p>	Comment of support noted.
18.12.17	Pegasus (Wigston Direction for Growth area)	<p><u>Policy 20 Wigston Direction for Growth</u></p> <p>Policy 20 of the Submission Draft Plan sets out the Council's proposals to allocate further land at the Wigston Direction for Growth area for Phase 2 development. The Phase 2 allocation provides for at least 600 homes and some 2.5 hectares of employment land.</p>	Comment of support noted.

		<p>The policy sets out the range of supporting infrastructure that would be required as part of the development. The overall requirements as set out in the policy are supported. David Wilson Homes has prepared an initial Indicative Masterplan showing how the approved Phase 1 of the Wigston Direction for Growth can be expanded to provide for a Phase 2 development of some additional 600 homes. The plan also identifies the broad location for a third phase of development with the scope to provide for an additional 500 dwellings on land within David Wilson Homes' control if required.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.4.10 of the Submission Draft Plan notes that the Council is aware that a cumulative approach to the development of the Direction for Growth could require amendments to the existing Section 106 agreement relating to Phase 1. The Council's commitment to work collaboratively with the land owner to amend the Section 106 agreement as deemed necessary is welcomed.</p> <p>Separate comments are made in relation to the requirements to provide for self-build/custom build units as part of the proposed development.</p>	
13.12.17	Gladman (Kodiak Land)	<p>Policy 20- Wigston Direction for Growth Area</p> <p>Kodiak supports the allocation of further land for an additional 600 dwellings at the Wigston Direction for Growth area for "phase 2" development. Kodiak considers the Direction for Growth Area to be the most sustainable location in the district for new development, as a result of its proximity to the town centre and public transport links into Leicester City. Kodiak also recognises the need to provide infrastructure to serve the extension to the town. This infrastructure will also supplement the existing services and facilities in the</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Policy 20 Wigston Direction for Growth Area allocates land for at least 600 new homes (for Phase 2), it does not suggest that 600 new homes is the maximum number of new homes for this area in this Phase.</p> <p>In addition, Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough, also suggests that there is a further potential 300 new homes which would comprise Phase 3. As the Plan suggests, the delivery of such</p>

		<p>surrounding area and encourage more sustainable travel patterns for those residing in proximity to the growth area.</p> <p>Kodiak does not object to the provision of additional infrastructure being secured on site or through off-site contributions, providing that such contributions are proportionate to the scale of the development on each site and otherwise meet the tests outlined in the CIL regulations. Kodiak also supports the requirement for 20% of the development on site to be affordable.</p> <p>At present, the policy does not explain why a maximum of 600 dwellings is identified on the site; Kodiak would suggest that the submission version of the plan should contain an analysis of the capacity of the growth area and ensure sufficient flexibility is built in. Kodiak supports the assertion at 7.4.17 of the supporting text that subject to appropriate testing, further development could occur on other land within the growth area should evidence suggest a need to do so in the future. However, we consider that in line with our suggestion to allocate additional dwellings in this plan, over and above the housing requirement to provide additional flexibility, the Council should allocate additional land beyond the growth area boundary, at the west of Welford Road, notably to the north of the land promoted by Kodiak through this representation. This land would effectively be surrounded by development once the allocations in this plan are built out, and it would cease to contain the attributes of 'open' countryside and be unable to perform its functions. The land has also previously been allocated for a potential Park and Ride site so the Council have previously recognised its limitations as open countryside instead preferring it as a site for potential development. Allocation of additional land to the west of Welford</p>	<p>Phase is planned for the post 2031 period, however should evidence suggest a need to do so, the Phase could be brought forward subject to appropriate testing and subsequent review of the Local Plan. The location of such further Phase is a logical and sustainable extension to an existing site allocation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the site Kodiak Land is promoting through its submission, is allocated within Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development within the Borough, and is taken account of in Table 1 of the Plan and the subsequent housing delivery trajectory.</p>
--	--	---	--

		Road would complete the logical extension of Wigston in accordance with the aims and objectives of the Direction for Growth area.	
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p><u>Para. 7.4.12 (page 76)</u></p> <p>The following sentence should be included in this paragraph:-</p> <p><i>"To collaborate with Leicester City Council Highway Authority, where relevant, if adverse impacts on the city's highway are identified and / or there are opportunities for new or improved sustainable transport links into Leicester."</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicester City Council for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that a minor amendment to the final sentence of paragraph 7.4.12 will cover the point made by Leicester City Council rather than the new sentence proposed by Leicester City Council.</p> <p>The Council proposes to amend the final sentence of paragraph 7.4.12 to –</p> <p><i>'Required infrastructure relating to this growth area will be that agreed by Leicestershire County Council Highways department, <b>Leicester City Council Highways department</b> and the Borough Council'.</i></p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p><u>Policy 21 - Cottage farm Direction for Growth area (page 81)</u></p> <p>The following wording should be included in the policy:-</p> <p><i>"To collaborate with Leicester City Council Highway Authority, where relevant, if it is found that the development impacts onto the city's highway network and / or there are opportunities for new or improved sustainable transport links into Leicester."</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicester City Council for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that a minor amendment to the final sentence of Policy 21 will cover the point made by Leicester City Council rather than the new sentence proposed by Leicester City Council.</p> <p>The Council proposes to amend the final sentence of Policy 21 to –</p> <p><i>'Any proposal would also be required to submit a detailed Transport Assessment as part of any planning application to ensure that Leicestershire County Council Highways department <b>and Leicester City Council</b></i></p>

			<i>Highways department can fully assess any traffic / transport implications stemming from the development.'</i>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 21 COTTAGE FARM DIRECTION FOR GROWTH</b></p> <p>In order to meet the identified housing needs in the Borough, the Local Plan seeks to facilitate a continual supply of both market and affordable housing from a "portfolio" of deliverable development sites based on a robust spatial development strategy. The allocation of the Cottage Farm Direction of Growth in Policy 21 as a fundamental part of that strategy is very much welcomed and supported.</p> <p>Bloor Homes Ltd are in the process of implementing a planning permission for the delivery of 150 dwellings on land south of Cottage Farm, Oadby (Phase I). They also control additional land to the west and south west of the committed development scheme (Phase II). The initial site assessments and masterplanning undertaken in relation to the Phase II site have indicated that a further 250 dwellings, associated public open space and infrastructure can be provided. That will therefore, make a significant contribution to meeting market and affordable housing needs in the plan period, and provide competition and choice in the housing market.</p> <p>The Cottage Farm site relates well to the existing southern edge of Oadby's urban form. The services and facilities within the surrounding area (notably Gartree High School and Beauchamp College, Oadby Town Centre that includes local shops, a post office, a library and a doctors surgery, and the supermarket and health centre on the A6) would be readily accessible to</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>To ensure that the Council is acting positively and proactively it does not consider it appropriate to remove Self Build and Custom Build from the policy, however to ensure consistency with Local Plan Policy 14, the Council would not be opposed to a rewording of the relevant policy bullet points (in Local Plan Policy 18, 20 and 21) in relation to provision of Self Build and Custom Build, that sought an 'encouragement' for provision, rather than a 'requirement' for provision.</p>

		<p>future residents.</p> <p>The site is not subject to any nationally significant or local environmental, landscape or cultural designations, and it is apparent that there are no over riding or particular constraints to development in respect of highways, drainage, landscape, ecology, archaeology and cultural heritage. Indeed, the emerging Masterplan proposals that have already been submitted to the Borough Council demonstrate the suitability and capacity of the site for development.</p> <p>The scheme proposals have been prepared with a clear knowledge and understanding of the specific characteristics of the site (the opportunities and constraints). The core aim is to create an attractive and sustainable environment that respects, and responds to, the site's setting, retaining natural key features wherever possible, and taking advantage of the existing landscape framework to create a high quality distinctive development with a sense of place that is well integrated into its surroundings. Moreover, an iterative assessment and design process has ensured that the appropriate mitigation required to address the potential environmental impacts that may arise, notably on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area, have been embedded into the emerging Masterplan proposals.</p> <p>The development will be access scheme via the committed Phase I development that will provide a new signal controlled T-junction onto the A6 Glen Road. The access junction incorporates signal controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing points and would have sufficient operating capacity to cater for the full 400 dwellings proposed in Phases I and II of the development.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>The development proposals for Phase II also provide the opportunity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance the pedestrian and cycle routes/links to provide safe and convenient routes to local facilities and amenities and bus services on Glen Road and within Coombe Rise;</li> <li>• Provide a variety of landscaped public open spaces including a substantial extension to Coombe Park providing much needed additional formal sports facilities and car parking in the area with a new access from within the Cottage Farm development; and</li> <li>• Incorporate a robust Green Infrastructure Strategy that seeks to structure the development proposals, enhance the area’s landscape character and biodiversity, connect the proposed public open spaces and provide new pedestrian links to the existing public right of way network to enhance the connectivity of the urban area to the surrounding countryside</li> </ul> <p>The Phase II site is available and suitable for development, and the emerging scheme is deliverable. It is a realisable opportunity that would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified development needs in Oadby and the Borough within the plan period, and positively contribute to the economic, social and environmental objectives of sustainable development advocated by the NPPF. Therefore, as stated above, its proposed allocation is supported.</p> <p>However, in respect of the terms of Policy 21, Bloors</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Homes do have concerns in relation to the requirements to include self build and custom build plots as part of the Phase II development. Whilst it is acknowledged that self-build and custom house building is an element of the Government’s housing strategy, no clear evidence of need or demand in the Borough has been presented in the Local Plan’s evidence base. Reference is made to the Council’s register, but those registered are not required to be means tested and, therefore, in reality the demand is likely to be significantly lower. Moreover, the requirement has not been justified or tested in terms of the potential impact on the deliverability of the development scheme as required by the NPPF (paragraphs 158, 173-174). This requirements should, therefore, be deleted from the policy.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes support the allocation of the Cottage Farm site for residential development, but object to the requirement within Policy 21 to provide self-build plots, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is not <b>justified</b> in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies in terms of provision for self build; and</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national guidance</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government’s objective to ensure the housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> The requirement to provide for self build plots should be deleted.</p>	
18.12.17	Pegasus Group	<b>Support/Object:</b> Object	Comment noted.

	(Oadby Grange)	<p><b>Consultation Point:</b> Policy 21 – Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Area</p> <p><b>Representation:</b></p> <p>As set out in other representations on behalf of Mrs B A Walker in relation to Policy 2, the objector’s primary position is that the OAN is not robust and that the housing requirement should be increased for this and other reasons. This will mean that additional sites will need to be allocated for housing and the objector considers that this should include Land at Oadby Grange.</p> <p>Even if those objections are not accepted, it is considered that the site is still more suitable than some of the allocated sites including the Land at Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Area (Policy 21). As explained in the more general objections in relation to Chapter 7, the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives, as the LPA has failed to consider Land at Oadby Grange as an option for residential development.</p> <p>Land at Oadby Grange</p> <p>The merits of the Land at Oadby Grange are set out in separate representations and the attached Site Deliverability Statement and are not repeated again here to avoid duplication.</p> <p>Land at Cottage Farm</p> <p>The Land at Cottage Farm is allocated for a further 250 dwellings (phase 2) through Policy 21, in addition to</p>	<p>In relation to the suitability of the land at Oadby Grange it is of note that the Council had not been made aware the recent interest in bringing the land forward, prior to the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation stage. It was only made aware through Pegasus Planning’s submission on the 18th December 2017 (the closing day for the Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation). Therefore this land has not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Been assessed by the Council through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment since 2013, or</li> <li>• Been submitted to the Council for consideration during any of the Call for Sites processes that have been undertaken by the Council for the purposes of Local Plan preparation.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, this land has been subject to a Section 106 Agreement between Mr Thomas Watson Walker, the Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council. The original S106 Agreement dates back to 2001. Throughout the time of the agreement, the Council has been in discussions with the land owner to provide a publically owned country park, hence the land area ceasing to be considered by the Council for built development post 2013 (alongside a lack of developer or site promoter interest).</p> <p>The land has previously been included in the Council’s SHLAA process due to it being considered through the Council’s Allocations Issues and Options Public Consultation 2007. It has not been promoted by an external land agent or land owner.</p> <p>In addition, the Oadby Grange site, is situated in</p>
--	----------------	--	--

		<p>the 150 dwellings that have already been granted (phase 1).          Whilst the draft allocation site located just beyond the defined Green Wedge in this area, the site still comprises open land which separates Oadby and Wigston. The Green Wedge Review (2017) highlights concerns about the southern end of the wedge noting that this is important as it “reduces the likelihood of “wrap” round development that would essentially join the two settlements.”[page 25].</p> <p>It is notable that the LPA even proposes to extend the Green Wedge designation immediately to the west of the proposed allocation, no doubt recognizing that development in this location will reduce the degree of separation that the plan seeks to maintain (in combination with the Wigston Area for Growth – Policy 20). Whilst it should be repeated that the site is not part of the designated area it will still to some degree diminish an important green lung between the urban areas and connection to the wider countryside as described in the Green Wedge Review at page 25 (2017).</p> <p>Regardless of the impact of the degree of separation for the two main towns, development in this location would represent a new incursion into open land, which would be poorly related to the pattern of built development in the area contrary to the emerging Policy 44 (Landscape and Character). It would read as an outlier which is surrounded by open land on three of its four sides. The Sustainability Appraisal proforma for this site (OWBC44 at Appendix page 356) considers the need to protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape and states that “development of residential properties at this location has the potential to negatively impact upon the landscape and a</p>	<p>designated Countryside and does not have direct access onto one of the Borough’s main highway and transport routes (A Road or B Road). The site is located to the very edge of an existing residential estate, approximately 0.7 miles from the nearest main route, the A6. It should also be noted that the site did not form part of the South East Leicestershire Transport Study, therefore has not been taken account of from a cumulative transport / highway testing perspective.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the Council, throughout the preparation of the Local Plan, has considered sites that have been promoted to the Council through the numerous Local Plan Call for Sites processes undertaken and the SHLAA Call for Sites process undertaken. The Council has considered sites that have known developer interest and have been informed regarding a sites availability, achievability and suitability.</p> <p>To reiterate, the Council has not been made aware of the site being promoted by Pegasus Planning during the Local Plan process, until the Pre-Submission Local Plan Consultation final day for representations, therefore the Council considers that it is inappropriate to say that the Council has not considered the site, in particular through the Sustainability Appraisal process, as the Council was unaware of it.</p> <p>Comments relating to the appropriateness of the Cottage Farm Direction for Growth are set out in the Local Plan Spatial Strategy Submission document that the Council has produced for Local Plan Submission.</p> <p>The findings of the SA Report in relation to the Land at Cottage Farm which the objector has highlighted are not in question. The SA appraisal of site OWBC44 has</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>significant negative effect is expected on this SA objective.”</p> <p>The Land at Oadby Grange would by comparison be a far more sympathetic and logical rounding off for the built-up area and the initial Landscape and Visual Analysis set out in the Site Deliverability Statement which is submitted alongside these representations indicates that the site is capable of accommodating development without causing significant harm to the landscape or visual amenities of the area.</p> <p><b>Summary of representation (if it is more than 100 words in length):</b>  The Pre Submission Plan and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal has not considered the option of allocating Land at Oadby Grange for housing and has therefore not demonstrated that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The objector has provided a Site Deliverability Statement which identifies the merits of the site and how it could be developed. This which should be read alongside these objections.</p> <p><b>Changes:</b></p> <p>Land at Oadby Grange should be identified as an additional residential allocation to address the increased housing requirement that is likely to arise from a more robust assessment of the OAN (see objections to Policy S2) and the need to provide for contingency and choice.</p> <p>If those objections are not accepted, the site should still be allocated for housing as an alternative to the</p>	<p>recognised that the associated uses which will be provided alongside the residential development at this location may include open space meaning a minor positive effect is also expected on SA objective 9 (landscape) in combination with the significant negative also identified effect due to incursion into the countryside and loss of greenfield land.</p> <p>The findings of the SA Report for Policy 21 should also be considered in relation to any development at the site given that this text would guide the development. The SA of this policy in Appendix 9 highlights that the Council proposes to extend the Green Wedge to bound the south west of the growth area to ensure that there is no future coalescence of the settlements of Wigston and Oadby. This proposal would help to mitigate effects of coalescence and associated adverse impacts on the landscape, for example, it requires that development within the Direction for Growth area would not have “detrimental impact on the surrounding Green Wedge and Countryside”.</p> <p>The reasons for not including the Land at Oadby Grange as a reasonable alternative for appraisal within the SA Report have been explained above. It has also been noted that the SA Report forms part of the decision making process for the consideration of options for policies and sites to take forward in the Local Plan.</p>
--	--	--	---

		Land at Cottage Farm Direction for Growth Area (Policy 21).	
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Chapter Eight – Economic Prosperity Sustainable Transport and Initiatives</p> <p>An area of the University’s land at Manor Road Sports Centre and Southmeads Field has for some time been safeguarded through the adopted Core Strategy for the delivery of a “Potential Transport Route” (former Eastern District Distributor Road). The Council propose to retain this safeguarding in the new Local Plan. The Council’s Local Transport Plan Phase 2 Study, which forms part of the Evidence Base, concludes that on the basis of preliminary studies it would not be appropriate to remove the safeguarding at this stage as further evaluation is required. Observations from Leicestershire County Council Highways Authority conclude that the preliminary work indicates that such a road would appear to have some merits.</p> <p>The continued safeguarding of the University’s land in the context of this preliminary work and current lack of certainty on delivery, constrains that part of the University’s land reserved for the Potential Transport Route’s alignment and also to some extent the development potential of some of its estate.</p> <p>The NPPF states that Local Plans should be aspirational, but there is also a requirement for them to be realistic. The University considers that further evidence should be provided or an early review undertaken in relation to the deliverability of the Potential Transport Route and a programme provided for advancing it in the short term in order for the project to be considered realistic. In the absence of this we consider that any ongoing safeguarding would be unsound.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, the Council, in collaboration with Leicestershire County Council, Harborough District Council and Leicester City Council, commissioned Edwards and Edwards Consultancy Ltd to produce the South East Leicestershire Transport Study. Part of the remit of the study was to assess the likely impact of the potential transport route should it be built out.</p> <p>The study concluded that, should the route be built out, there would be likely benefits to traffic undertaking orbital movements linking the Fosse Park industrial / commercial areas and the M1 junction with the PUA area to the East of Leicester City. The results also show that traffic from Oadby and Wigston would potentially make use of the scheme using Brabazon Road to access the A6 rather than using the B582 through New Street in Oadby.</p> <p>For this reason, the Borough Council, City Council and County Council consider it is justified that the route be safeguarded through this Local Plan.</p>
15.12.17	Sport England	Chapter Eight – Economic Prosperity	Comment noted.

		<p>Sport England would advise of our economic value of sport toolkit</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/research/benefits-of-sport/economic-value-of-sport/">https://www.sportengland.org/research/benefits-of-sport/economic-value-of-sport/</a></p>	<p>The Council will seek to utilise the Sport England Economic Value of Sport – Local Model when assessing relevant development proposals.</p>
18.12.17	Turley Planning	<p>Policy 22 – Delivering Retail</p> <p>Policy 22 sets out the additional overall retail capacities (net) that will be sought within a number of identified centres over the plan period, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wigston, 1,169 sq m;</li> <li>• Oadby, 1,351 sq m;</li> <li>• South Wigston, 373 sq m; and</li> <li>• Local Centres, 81 sq m.</li> </ul> <p>As with Policy 2, no clarification is provided within the policy itself as to whether the figures provided relate to comparison or convenience floorspace, or the breakdown between the two. Taking Oadby specifically, it is apparent from the supporting text that the additional retail capacity identified in Policy 22 is comparison only.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.2.16 of the Pre-Submission Plan states that the Retail Capacity Study (November 2016) identifies “zero quantitative capacity for convenience retail floorspace in Oadby in the short, medium or long term, up to 2031”. It continues by stating that, “due to this, there is no demonstrable requirement to proactively plan for new convenience floorspace in Oadby district centre up to the end of the plan period.”</p> <p>In contrast, it continues by stating that the capacity for additional comparison floorspace over the plan period is 1,351 sq m (net) – the total figure for new retail</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>As the representation suggests, Local Plan Policy 22 sets out the additional overall retail capacities in net floorspace up to 2031 for each of the Borough’s main centres. The Policy wording itself does not set out the breakdown between convenience and comparison retail floorspace, the splits are clearly set out within the three tables of the policy supporting text.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 22 Delivering Retail and its supporting text is evidenced by the Council’s Retail Capacity Study 2016 undertaken taken by Lichfields (then Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners). The retail capacity study assesses each of the Borough’s three main centres of Wigston, Oadby and South Wigston in detail, and specifies (with robust justification) their individual retail (both convenience and comparison) capacities up to 2031. The retail capacity study assessed both quantitative and qualitative need for retail floorspace within the Borough, and indeed the comment received acknowledges that the study concludes that <i>Oadby district centre is well provided for on a qualitative basis</i>. It is important to bear in mind that the NPPF does not include any specific reference to the ‘discount’ sector or for that matter any specific sector. Whilst Paragraph 23 of the NPPF refers to allocated sites for the ‘...<i>scale and type of retail</i>’ needed, type is referring to convenience and/or comparison retail floorspace. This stands to reason when it is considered in the context that most of</p>

		<p>floorspace set out in Policy 22.</p> <p>As stated in relation to Policy 2, our client strongly disagrees with the failure to identify any additional convenience retail floorspace in Oadby. Our client considers there to be a qualitative need for additional convenience floorspace over the plan period, specifically in the form of a new deep discounter foodstore(s). This position is supported by the Council's own evidence base relating to retail.</p> <p>The evidence base relating to the retail policies set out in the Pre-Submission Plan is contained in the Oadby and Wigston Retail Capacity Study (November 2016).</p> <p>Despite the title of the Study, it purports to address the need for new retail floorspace over the plan period in the Borough in both quantitative and qualitative terms. On closer inspection, the Study is almost exclusively concerned with quantitative capacity for new retail floorspace, with scant regard for qualitative factors. Paragraph 161 of the NPPF confirms that the evidence base should assess "the needs for land or floorspace for economic development, including both the quantitative and qualitative needs for all foreseeable types of economic activity over the plan period, including for retail and leisure development" (our emphasis).</p> <p>Paragraph 3.28 of the Retail Capacity Study notes that "the expansion of discount food operators continues and at rapid pace, building upon sustained growth in the last decade". It continues by noting that "it is surprising that Oadby and Wigston Borough contains just one deep discount foodstore, an Aldi on Bull Head Street in Wigston, which is on the small side of Aldi's current format; there are no Lidl stores within the Borough." The Study therefore concludes that "in the</p>	<p>the leading convenience retailers carry a multiplicity of lines, including premium and value/budget lines. There is nothing in the NPPF that requires a local planning authority to plan for the needs of individual commercial businesses/commercial businesses models. The 2016 Retail Capacity Study is clear that there is no quantitative need for additional convenience retail floorspace in Oadby over the plan period, and that the centre is well provided for on a qualitative basis. The 2016 Retail Capacity Study provides a robust retail evidence base that has enabled Council officers to produce town centre and retail planning policies which meet the requirements of Paragraph 23 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.28 of the Retail Capacity Study does state that <i>'the expansion of discount food operators continues and at rapid pace, building upon sustained growth in the last decade, albeit the recent experimental reintroduction of the Netto facia has ended with the pilot stores closing. It is surprising that Oadby and Wigston Borough contains just one deep discount foodstore, an Aldi on Bull Head Street in Wigston, which is on the small side of Aldi's current format; there are no Lidl stores within the Borough. There is however, a Farmfoods store and an Iceland store present both of which are on Bell Street in Wigston. In the short to medium term, any new foodstore proposals in Oadby and Wigston Borough are likely to be driven by discount operators such as Aldi and Lidl. As of June 2016, Aldi and Lidl saw sales increase by 11.5% and 13.8% respectively, taking their combined market share of the UK to a new high of 10.5%, based on the twelve weeks to 19 June 2016'</i></p> <p>The paragraph does however need to be viewed in the context of the report. The paragraph sits in the chapter of the report that is looking at retail trends, specifically,</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>short to medium term, any new foodstore proposals in Oadby and Wigston Borough are likely to be driven by discount operators such as Aldi and Lidl”.</p> <p>Turning specifically to Oadby, the Retail Capacity Study states that, in terms of convenience floorspace, Oadby district centre is well provided for on a qualitative basis. The paragraph, however, continues by acknowledging that “Oadby is lacking a deep discount foodstores, such as Aldi and Lidl, which would be an attractor for the large student population and it is likely that any new foodstore operator coming forward in Oadby would be a deep discount foodstore operator” (Paragraph 3.107).</p> <p>Despite this evidence, the Retail Capacity Study states that there is no need for additional convenience goods floorspace in Oadby (Paragraph 3.122). Indeed, the only additional convenience floorspace identified over the plan period is 637 sq m (net) sales floorspace capacity in Wigston town centre and 38 sq m (net) within the local centres. The Retail Capacity Study states that one reason for this is because the majority of foodstores in the Borough are trading at below expected levels, when comparing the 2016 household survey results with the benchmark turnover of these stores (Paragraph 3.123). Whilst in general terms the Study claims that there is a good range of convenience retail stores available to residents of the study area, at Paragraph 3.123 it is recognised that there is “a more limited range of deep discounters in the Borough than in other neighbouring areas”.</p> <p>Our client considers that the evidence base and current market conditions demonstrate that there is a clear and unmet qualitative need for additional convenience floorspace over the plan period, specifically a requirement for increased market provision by deep</p>	<p>‘Retail Operators Changing Formats’, it is not a paragraph stating outcomes or conclusions to retail capacity assessments. It should also be noted that paragraph 3.28 suggests that ‘...<i>any new foodstore proposals in Oadby and Wigston Borough are likely to be driven by discount operators</i>’, it does not state that there is a required need for them in the Borough. The statement is based on national trends and the expansion of discount food stores generally, and of course the absence of assessed quantitative and qualitative need in a development plan does not preclude applications for convenience retail floorspace coming forward. In a town centre location there would be no retail policy reason to resist such a proposal. Outside of a defined town centre, it is incumbent on an applicant to address the sequential approach and impact tests as part of an overall consideration of compliance with the development plan having regard to other material consideration. Lichfields is merely making the point that growth in the discount fascia sector nationally and an absence of such fascias in Oadby and Wigston points to a likelihood of further proposals for stores within this sector coming forward. The local planning authority would respond to any such proposals accordingly having regard to the development plan and material considerations.</p> <p>The settlement of Oadby has a wealth of larger convenience retail stores, including an ASDA, a Waitrose, a Sainsbury’s and a Marks and Spencers Food Store. The District centre of Oadby also has a number of smaller scale convenience food retail stores. In addition there are a number of local centres within Oadby that are ‘home’ to smaller scale convenience retail stores. It is not the cases that for a town centre to be healthy it needs to contain the full spectrum of convenience retail fascias. Applying that logic to the</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>discounters, particularly to serve Oadby.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.16 of the Pre-Submission Plan recognises that “there is tendency with the residents of Wigston, Oadby and South Wigston, not to travel out of ‘their’ settlement to access other shops, services and facilities that are available within the Borough”. This desire to shop within ‘their’ settlement is currently undermined by the limited representation of deep discounters in the Borough, and particularly in Oadby.</p> <p>Aside from the Council’s own evidence base, the Mintel Food and Non-Food Discounters UK (September 2017) also helps to demonstrate the continued growth in the market share of, and the demand for, deep discounter provision.</p> <p>This is in part as a result of wage growth failing to keep pace with inflation. This means that for the first time since 2014, real incomes are now falling. Despite this retail sales, in both value and volume terms, remained positive in the first half of 2017, although it is forecast that it is a trend that will bite harder in the second half of the year. Mintel conclude that, if consumers become stretched they are likely to look to cut back on expenditure, particularly in discretionary areas, which is likely to be to the benefit of the value oriented discount sector.</p> <p>The Mintel report also refers to the growth in popularity of the two largest discounters (ALDI and Lidl) within the UK over the last decade. The report notes that discounter use is high amongst UK consumers, with 89% shopping with at least one discount retailer in the three months to July 2017. They are popular across all age groups, but particularly among the younger generation of shoppers.</p>	<p>comparison retail sector illustrates that this is a comment without basis. Only regional centres contain a high proportion of national multiple comparison retail fascias, but that does not mean that lower order centres are necessarily in any way less healthy. The 2016 Retail Study is pointing out that any foodstore operator seeking a future presence in Oadby &amp; Wigston Borough is most likely to be in the deep discount foodstore sector, having regard to the existing provision within Oadby and current national trends.</p> <p>The Study does not identify any need (quantitative or qualitative) for additional convenience retail floorspace within Oadby District Centre up to the period to 2031 and on this basis, it is not necessary for the Council to allocate sites within Oadby for new convenience goods destinations.</p> <p>Regarding the demand for ‘deep discount’ convenience retail within the Oadby area, the Council has not been made aware of any requirement recently but would treat any proposal coming forward on individual merit having regard to the development plan and material considerations.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council, within the Local Plan, specifically through Policy 2 Spatial Strategy for Development in the Borough and Policy 22 Delivering Retail, has allocated/identified land sufficient to meet the retail needs of the Borough up to 2031. Further information and guidance relating to the Local Plan retail allocations is found within the Council’s Town Centres Area Action Plan document (Area Action Plan Guidance).</p> <p>The Council would like to reiterate that it has proactively sought retail development opportunities that</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Mintel also note that the growth of the food discounters has continued to defy expectations - they are now the UK's fifth (Aldi) and seventh (Lidl) largest grocers and combined account for over 10% of grocery retail sales. Looking forward, Mintel note that there are ambitious pipelines of stores for both retailers which should ensure growth continues in the short term. The report states that both operators consider that there is plenty of growing room left in the UK, evidenced by the following figures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lidl plans to invest a further £1.5 billion to add 60 new stores a year between 2017 and 2019; and</li> <li>• Aldi plans to add 300 by 2022.</li> </ul> <p>Mintel therefore conclude that "clearly neither has plans to slow down and at present there seems to be no reason to do so." Indeed, despite murmurings of slower growth in early 2016, growth actually accelerated, and the more uncertain economic environment is only likely to benefit their position.</p> <p>The information set out above demonstrates the growth in popularity and demand for deep discounters at a national level, together with the continued plans for growth in representation in the short to medium term. This is consistent with the comments regarding this sector in the Retail Capacity Study.</p> <p>At a local level, Oadby meets the 'profile' of those areas targeted by deep discounters. As noted by Mintel, whilst popular across all age groups, deep discounters are particularly popular with younger generations. This is reflected by the Council's Retail Capacity Study, which notes that a deep discounter in Oadby is likely to be an attractor for the large student population (given</p>	<p>are consistent with the sequential approach to main town centre uses, as set out within the NPPF at paragraphs 23 to 27.</p> <p>Retail, leisure and office development should be located within town and district centres, or at a smaller scale, local centres. The site being promoted by Turley is not situated within any of the recognised centres within the Borough, and is located within the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge which crosses boundaries with Leicester City. The site also forms part of the Strategic Green Infrastructure corridor that runs from Leicester City in the north to the countryside of the Borough (and beyond in Harborough District). Any retail development proposed outside of defined town centres will be considered having regard to the development plan and material considerations including the tests of the sequential approach and impact.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>the proximity of the Oadby Student Village).</p> <p>It is therefore concluded that there is a clear and unmet qualitative need for deep discounter provision to serve Oadby. This is supported by the Council's own evidence base and national data sources. The Pre-Submission Plan, however, makes no provision for any additional convenience floorspace in Oadby across the plan period. Despite this, Paragraph 8.2.1 states that "identifying sufficient land to meet the retail needs of the Borough is positively achieved through this Plan".</p> <p>Our client strongly disagrees with this statement and contends that Policy 22 fails to provide for sufficient retail floorspace, specifically to meet the need for deep discounter provision. Having established that there is an unmet need for additional convenience floorspace in Oadby to accommodate a deep discounter(s), it follows that the Pre-Submission Plan should identify land to meet this requirement.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Pre-Submission Plan promotes a 'town and district centre first' approach for main town centre uses, with some flexibility for edge of centre locations. Whilst the Pre-Submission Plan does not specifically identify sites for additional retail floorspace in Oadby, the Draft Adopted Policies Map identifies two 'Town Centre Allocation Sites'. It is understood that these relate to two sites identified in the Town Centres Area Action Plan (September 2013), namely Brooksby Square and Baxter's Place. Neither site is, however, considered suitable to accommodate a deep discounter.</p> <p>Both sites are predominantly located behind the main retail frontage of the district centre, therefore lacking the prominence and visibility required by a modern convenience retailer. It is also noted that neither</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Baxter's Place or Brooksby Square are intended to accommodate the level of floorspace required by a modern deep discounter. Baxter's Place is intended to be a mixed retail, commercial and community scheme focused around a new central square. Neither the site itself nor the proposed mix of uses is considered suitable to accommodate a deep discounter foodstore. Likewise, Brooksby Square is intended to accommodate residential development and commercial development, together with a new public square fronted by a café/bar or kiosk. Neither the site, nor the intended use, is considered suitable to accommodate a deep discounter.</p> <p>Turning to the wider district centre, there are no suitable or available sites/premises that could accommodate a modern deep discounter. The Town Centres Area Action Plan recognises that Oadby district centre "suffers from a lack of modern units that are capable of satisfying modern retailer requirements". The boundary for Oadby district centre is also tightly drawn, adjoined by non-town centres uses along many of its boundaries. It is therefore difficult for retailers to identify sites/premises suitable to accommodate a modern convenience retailer within the district centre.</p> <p>This is evidenced by recent investment in convenience floorspace (Asda, Sainsbury's and Waitrose) being located outside of the district centre itself, along Leicester Road (the A6).</p> <p>In light of the above, our client considers that there is a short term need for the Council to identify land to accommodate a deep discounter within Oadby, and that no such site is available within the district centre itself, or in an edge of centre location. Land promoted by our client through the 'Call for Sites' process is considered suitable and available for such a use.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>The site extends to approximately 3.1 ha and is on two of the main arterial routes running through Oadby – being located to the north-west of Palmerston Way and south-west of Leicester Road. The location of the foodstore is to be fixed, but could be to the south west of Leicester Road close to the existing petrol filling station. The remainder of the site is within the ownership of our client and is considered suitable for future development, either during this plan period or beyond. This is returned to in more detail below in relation to Policy 42.</p> <p>The site is sustainably located, being served by bus routes and benefiting from a strong surrounding residential catchment area. This includes the Oadby Student Village, which is located approximately 250m to the north east. The site is also located in relatively close proximity to Oadby district centre, which is approximately 780m to the south east.</p> <p>The site is entirely within the ownership of Leicester Racecourse Holdings Ltd and is available for development now. It is not currently publically accessible and benefits from an existing vehicular access from Leicester Road. The site is considered entirely suitable for retail use, given the clear need for additional convenience floorspace and the lack of in or edge of centre sites in Oadby.</p> <p>It is recognised that the site is currently identified as part of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge. It is, however, argued by our client that the site should be removed from this designation. The reasons for this are set out in more detail below in relation to Policy 42 – Green Wedges.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>In light of the above, Policy 22 is not considered to be 'sound' given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not positively prepared – given that the Policy 22 fails to make provision for the retail needs of the Borough, particularly with regards to the need for deep discounter provision in Oadby;</li> <li>• It is not justified – given that Policy 22 does not represent the most appropriate strategy, on the basis that it fails to provide for sufficient levels of additional convenience floorspace; and</li> <li>• It is not consistent with national policy – given the failure of the LPA to objectively identify sites for sufficient retail floorspace over the plan period.</li> </ul>	
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Para. 8.7.12 – (Page 97)  The Eastern District Distributor Road is a long standing Highway Improvement Scheme and we will continue to retain the scheme until such a time that decisions have been made about how to address the problems of access &amp; traffic movements around the Eastern side of Leicester as highlighted by the South East of Leicester Transport study (Edwards &amp; Edwards, 2017).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 26 Sustainable Transport and Initiatives (Page 97)</li> <li>• Draft Adopted Policies Map</li> </ul> <p>The City welcomes that Oadby and Wigton's section of the EDDR transport route is to be safeguarded on the Oadby and Wigton's Draft Adopted Policies Map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivering Economic Prosperity</li> </ul> <p>The City Council supports the proposals for employment in O &amp; W pre-submission draft plan.</p>	Comment of support welcomed.

15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Section 8.7. Transport and section 9.9. Car Parking</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> Good to see more, and stronger references to provision for cycling at various places through the plan – including in this section.</p> <p><b>B)</b> Good that the commitment to free town centre car parking has also now gone. About time – it was environmentally inappropriate, and financially unsustainable.</p>	Comment of support noted.
10.11.17	Mr Wilson (local resident)	<p>One final observation, that I will clarify before the deadline, is that the one and only road that connects Oadby and Wigston is, at best, a crawl in busy times that will only be made worse by further developments. Build a new connecting road to cater for new housing.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the congestion at some of the junctions within the Borough, as well as its routes. However, the Council is also aware of the need to provide new homes and employment opportunities for its communities. Through the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council has sought to provide the required number of homes and the right amount of employment opportunities for its communities.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, the Council jointly commissioned the South East Leicestershire Transport Study with Harborough District Council, Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council, that assessed the likely impact of proposed planned growth within the Borough (as well as Harborough District) area up to 2031. The study concluded that, although there would be increased traffic levels on the surrounding roads and junctions of each growth area identified, each of the growth areas has the potential to accommodate growth without having a significant detrimental impact on the wider highway network. However, certain levels of mitigation will be needed.</p>

16.12.17	Mr Wilson (local resident)	<p>Traffic congestion is not primarily a problem, but rather the solution to our basic mobility problem, which is that too many people want to move at the same times each day. Why? Because efficient operation of both the economy and school systems requires that people work, go to school, and even run errands during about the same hours so they can interact with each other. The same problem exists in every major conurbation area in the world.</p> <p>There is but one link road between Wigston and Oadby, and there is but one link road between Wigston and South Wigston. At peak times, as above, traffic density is very, very high. Static traffic, increased pollution and high frustration levels. I accept that people need somewhere to live but the plans shown are unsustainable, put peoples health at risk from pollution and add to ever increasing congestion.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements in roads is the only solution. People will not use public transport due to cost and convenience. The car is the only way to get to work and for the school run, all of which occur at the same time each day. The solution is simple, increase the roads between Oadby, Wigston and South Wigston. Then build houses.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study undertaken as evidence base for the Local Plan highlights the severity of the congestion within the Borough, specifically along its routes as well as at its junctions.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the limitations of the existing highway network and has sought to locate development within locations that have the least detrimental impact. The Council has also allocated three Direction for Growth areas throughout the Borough that seek development of a level that can contribute towards highway and transport mitigation (via financial contribution).</p> <p>The levels of growth proposed within the Local Plan are considered deliverable by the transport study, albeit a level of mitigation is required up to 2031.</p> <p>Post 2031, the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan is proposing large scale highway and transport infrastructure that should relieve the pressures on the transport and highway network within the Leicester Principal Urban Area, particularly Leicester City and the Borough of Oadby and Wigston.</p>
04.12.17	Office of Rail and Road (ORR)	<p>The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) has perused the documents and comments as follows:</p> <p>We having looked at the Oadby &amp; Wigston Local Plan Pre-submission consultation document, Sustainable Transport and Initiatives pages 96 -98. From a level crossing safety perspective, we have no comments to make at this stage. However, should developments cause increased public usage of any specific level</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult with ORR and Network Rail on any future plans or strategies.</p>

		crossing, we would expect the Council to engage with Network Rail, in particular their local level crossing manager, so that the risk assessment for the specific crossing may be reviewed and options to improve or maintain the level of risk control may be considered.	
18.12.17	Leicestershire County Council	Like previous local plans there is mention of encouraging installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charge points for new developments but no mention of encouraging/supporting EV charge points for existing developments or for on-street charging. This will be needed if Oadby & Wigston is going to encourage EV's into the town centre and encourage existing residents to move to EV to meet national carbon reduction targets and air quality legislation.	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Leicestershire County Council for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>To encourage the provision of electric vehicle charging points in existing car parking facilities, both on and off street, the Council is proposing the following wording amendment for paragraph 9.9.5 –</p> <p><i>'...should be introduced for an agreed number of spaces to encourage electrical vehicle use. <b>The Council will also encourage provision of electric charging points at existing parking facilities</b>'.</i></p>
13.12.17	Historic England	<u>Policy 32</u> is strongly welcomed.	Comment of support noted.
10.12.17	Mr D Lucas	<p>Parking and the constant disaster of Paddock St parking, traffic turning into Long Street causing even more chaos in Town Centre.</p> <p>As converting the Bull Head Street half to 2 way traffic was approved at my last meeting as a County Councillor, why oh why is that matter ignored.</p> <p>The proposal to split up Paddock Street car park may be pretty on a plan BUT one can drive around looking for a space &amp; usually get one.</p> <p>BUT if car parking is split up traffic will be popping up all over the place MORE CHAOS.</p> <p>"Major" traffic plans are needed already but housing proposal will cause dramatic build ups. Are developer</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Through the Local Plan, the Town Centres Area Action Plan (Area Action Plan Guidance) and specific Local Development Orders, the Council considers that it has the appropriate tools to provide development within the town centre of Wigston, enhances the built form, the public car parking arrangements as well as the highway and transport infrastructure.</p>

		contributions going to junction improvements.	
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p>Taxis – (Page 112)</p> <p>Paragraph 9.10.1 recognises that taxi control offices could be operational 24 hours a day and waiting vehicles and customers can have significant noise, pollution and traffic generation impacts which can be to the detriment of neighbouring uses, especially when located in a residential area.</p> <p>Suggest that the provision of an electric vehicle charging hub for electric taxis be included in the policy (as a method for improving air quality).</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Although the Council would always encourage the use of electric taxi vehicles and subsequent charging points, the Council is not aware of any evidence to suggest that the Local Plan should require the provision of electric charging points for electric taxis through development.</p> <p>Should evidence suggest the need for electric taxi vehicle charging points in the future, the Council will amend the Local Plan accordingly in a subsequent review.</p>
18.12.17	Montagu Evans (University of Leicester)	<p>Chapter Ten – Protected Places</p> <p>We note that Policy 42 (Green Wedges) allows outdoor leisure, recreation and sporting facilities to be developed within Green Wedges. As set out in our previous representations we consider that in some instances, indoor leisure facilities would also be appropriate, including within the Green Wedge by virtue of their complimentary relationship with the outdoor pitches.</p> <p>Our previous suggestion to incorporate ‘indoor leisure facilities’ into this policy was considered by the Council and the Officer’s response to this, as set out in the “Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Representations November to December 2016 - Officer Responses” document, confirmed that the wording of Policy 42 would be amended to include “<i>and related indoor leisure</i>”. We note that this amendment has not been made in the current PSLP Policy and request again that the Officer’s amendment is made.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Montagu Evans for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>To clarify the intention of Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges the Council proposes the following minor amendment to bullet 6 –</p> <p><i>‘Outdoor leisure <b>and</b> recreation, and <b>outdoor / indoor sporting facilities</b>’</i></p>
15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action	<b>Section 10.1 and Policy 37 Biodiversity and</b>	Comment noted.

	Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Geodiversity</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> Would be strengthened by addition of commitment to planting trees and ensuring succession for areas of the Borough with mature tree-scape, where succession planting is essential to ensure sustainability. Would fit in para 10.1.5 and in Policy 37.</p> <p><b>B)</b> It remains the case that none of the references to the Biodiversity Audit make explicit that it doesn't cover the whole Borough – only those parts which are proposed for potential development. It's essential that whenever the Biodiversity Audit is cited it should be clear that it only covers part of the Borough and that there are additional biodiversity and geodiversity assets which are not included in the baseline.</p>	<p>The supporting text and policy wording of Local Plan Policy 37 Biodiversity and Geodiversity seeks the planting of trees by mitigating any loss of assets (trees) through applying measures for reinstatement, replacement or on / off site compensatory work. Any development proposals that effect assets (relevant to Local Plan Policy 37), would need to conform to the policy.</p> <p>It should be noted that any references within the Local Plan to evidence base documents are just references. The evidence base documents themselves will set out the level of detail that the comment (B)) is referring to. The Council does not consider that references to evidence base documents need to be accompanied by additional information that is found within the documents themselves.</p>
18.12.17	Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for giving the Environment Agency the opportunity to comment on your Local Plan Pre-Submission version.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has reviewed the Plan and associated evidence-base documents from the perspective of those environmental issues which fall within our remit.</p> <p>Whilst we do consider the Plan to be legally compliant and sound, and we are pleased to see that a lot of the comments made in our letter dated 05 January 2017 in response to the Preferred Options consultation have been incorporated into the Plan, we do wish to make the following comments.</p> <p>In order to strengthen paragraph 10.1.4 we would suggest adding at the end of that paragraph the following wording:</p>	<p>Comment of support welcomed.</p> <p>Upon the Environment Agency's advice, to strengthen the supporting text at paragraph 10.1.4 the Council would propose the minor wording addition as proposed.</p> <p>The paragraph would read –</p> <p><i>'...that may be impacted. <b>In all cases, any negative impacts to protected and priority habitats and species should be avoided.</b>'</i></p>

		<i>"In all cases, any negative impacts to protected and priority habitats and species should be avoided".</i>	
08.11.17	National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Thank you for consulting me about the latest stage of the local plan. The NFU's comments are set out below:-</p> <p>Page 114, paragraph 10.1.1. We support the principle of the paragraph but are concerned that the requirement to consult other stakeholders in the final sentence of the paragraph is not open-ended. It would be easy to stymie development by adding consultees to the list that would come back with ever more requirements that needed to be satisfied before permission could be granted.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Although the NFU comment states 'not' open ended, the way in which the following sentence of the comment is worded, the Council assumes that the 'not' should not be included in the NFU's comment.</p> <p>The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the NFU for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to amend the final sentence of paragraph 10.1.1 to –</p> <p><i>'If a development proposal has a less significant impact that can be mitigated through appropriate mitigation measures, for example habitat re-creation, the proposal will not be refused from the outset and discussion will take place between the applicant, the Council, <b>the County Council</b> and other external stakeholders, for example the Woodland Trust, the Environment Agency and Natural England.'</i></p> <p>The Council would not want to stymie development by adding consultees to an open ended, ever increasing list, therefore is proposing to specify the specific consultees in the supporting text at paragraph 10.1.1.</p>
08.11.17	National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Page 114, paragraph 10.1.5. The Woodland Trust is an estimable organisation but does it have the quasi statutory role that the Council is implying in this paragraph?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the NFU for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to amend the final sentence of paragraph 10.1.5 to –</p> <p><i>'Any development proposals that require mitigation will</i></p>

			<p><i>be required to submit the mitigation proposals to the Council and get them approved by the Council and in collaboration with the Woodland Trust.'</i></p> <p>The Council would not want to imply that the Woodland Trust is quasi-statutory, however would want its importance and value as an expert informative organisation / charity in relation to veteran trees or ancient woodland to remain.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 38 – Climate Change</p> <p>This policy is unclear in its requirements or the justification behind them. The opening paragraph of the policy requires new development proposals to achieve the national prescribed sustainable building standards for energy efficiency (presumably Building Regulation standards). In respect of climate change the next element of the policy requires that major scale planning applications be accompanied by a Sustainability/Energy Statement to demonstrate how harmful emissions will be reduced by addressing a number of issues; one of these is the 'feasibility of integrating renewable energy solutions into the development'. This suggests that this is an option to be investigated, not a requirement of development. The final element of the policy, Renewable/Low Carbon Energy, states that all developments greater than 1ha in size will be required to incorporate on-site renewable energy provision or on-site provision of buildings that reduce the need for non-renewable energy use.</p> <p>This seems to be at odds with the more flexible approach adopted earlier in the policy. It makes the policy unclear and it is not apparent for the justification behind this. To ensure that the policy is sound, this latter requirement should be deleted.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Paragraph's 93 to 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework state that Local Planning Authority's should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk. The NPPF also suggests that to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources.</p> <p>Through Local Plan Policy 38 Climate Change, Flood Risk and Renewable Low Carbon Energy, the Council is taking a proactive approach to delivering development that seeks to deliver the policy objectives in NPPF paragraph's 93 to 104.</p> <p>The Council considers that having development proposals accompanied with a Sustainability / Energy Statement enables the Council to properly assess the development proposal to ensure that it meets the policy objectives of national policy and guidance.</p> <p>Paragraph 93 of the NPPF states that: '<i>Planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising</i></p>

			<p><i>vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development’.</i></p> <p>Policy 38 of the Local Plan seeks to promote development that helps to achieve reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure. The final section of Local Plan Policy 38 seeks all development over 1 hectare in size to incorporate onsite renewable energy generation or onsite provision of buildings that reduce the need for non renewable energy use. The policy however allows flexibility in meeting this requirement on feasibility and viability grounds. The policy wording states that should onsite provision be deemed not feasible or viable then the requirement would cease to apply in that instance.</p>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 38 – CLIMATE CHANGE, FLOOD RISK AND RENEWABLE LOW CARBON ENERGY</b></p> <p>The aspiration of this policy is recognised. However, the NPPF requires (para 154) Local Plans policies to: <i>“set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a <u>clear indication</u> of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.”</i> The NPPG provides further guidance (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 12-010-20140306): <i>“In drafting policies the local planning authority should avoid undue repetition, for example by using generic policies to set out principles that may be common to different types of development. There should be no need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the National Planning</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Paragraph’s 93 to 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework state that Local Planning Authority’s should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk. The NPPF also suggests that to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources.</p> <p>Through Local Plan Policy 38 Climate Change, Flood Risk and Renewable Low Carbon Energy, the Council is taking a proactive approach to delivering development that seeks to deliver the policy objectives in NPPF</p>

		<p><i>Policy Framework.”</i></p> <p>Policy 38 does not achieve these objectives. Indeed, the first part of the policy appears to simply repeat the requirement to comply with Building Regulations. Furthermore, the requirement to submit a separate sustainability statement for major development schemes is unduly onerous, particularly where building and water efficiency standards are covered by other regulations, accessibility will be dealt with through the preparation of the Design and Access Statement and Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The last part of the policy relates to renewable and low carbon energy and requires all developments of 100 dwellings or more to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation or provision of building that reduce the need for non-renewable energy use. The policy is, however, imprecisely expressed and there is a lack of clarity in terms of the threshold and required standards. Consequently the policy could be open to wide interpretation and difficult to effectively apply in the development management process.</p> <p>Moreover, whilst the reference in the policy to taking account of the impact on feasibility of developments is welcomed, these matters will have a critical affect on the viability of new housing developments in the Borough, and the deliverability of sustainable development cannot be compromised by unduly onerous policy requirements. The Council must, therefore, demonstrate that the policy and infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan (cumulatively) in terms of financial contributions are achievable and do not render development unviable (NPPF paragraphs 158, 173-174). That must be considered at this stage. There is no evidence to that</p>	<p>paragraph’s 93 to 104.</p> <p>In addition, the Council does consider that the Policy wording avoids undue repetition and does not put unduly onerous requirements on development proposals. The Council considers that having development proposals accompanied with a Sustainability / Energy Statement enables the Council to properly assess the development proposal to ensure that it meets the policy objectives of national policy and guidance.</p> <p>The Council would like to highlight that the Policy wording does not state that the threshold for the incorporation of on-site renewable energy regeneration etc is 100 dwellings or more, as suggested by Define Planning. The threshold set out within the Policy is developments of greater than 1 hectare in size. The Council considers that the threshold is clarified within the Policy wording.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>effect at this point in time as these policy requirements have not been robustly considered Local Plan's Viability Report.</p> <p>The policy should, therefore, be recast to set out objective standards that are justified by an appropriate evidence base.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> Bloor Homes object to Policy 38, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is not <b>effective</b> as a means of ensuring development mitigates climate change without unduly restricting the viability and/or delivery of development; and</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national guidance</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government's objective to ensure the housing requirements are not prohibitive to the delivery of development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> The policy should be recast to provide the required guidance.</p>	
08.11.17	National Farmers Union (NFU)	<p>Page 117, paragraph 10.2.9. Tree, woodland and habitat planting in the wrong place can exacerbate flooding so the plan needs to have something like "... will be sought in appropriate places as they can ....." in the penultimate line of this paragraph.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the NFU for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to amend the final sentence of paragraph 10.2.9 to –</p> <p><i>'The creation of new habitats, the planting of appropriate trees, and the creation of new woodland <b>in appropriate places</b> will be sought as they can help reduce the danger of both fluvial and surface water flooding.'</i></p>

			The Council agrees that tree, woodland and / or habitat planting in the wrong place can exacerbate flooding.
18.12.17	Environment Agency	<p>We note that the comments made regarding the Water Framework Directive (WFD) in our letter of 05 January 2017 in response to the Preferred Options consultation don't appear to have been incorporated into the Pre-Submission version, and whilst this does not cause the Plan to be unsound, we do consider it to be a missed opportunity to highlight the importance of the WFD. We acknowledge the Officers responses to the Preferred Options consultations includes "<i>The Council will...ensure that it has taken account of the Water Framework Directive and its relationship to the Humber River Basin Management Plans, (*) as referenced by the Environment Agency</i>". However, having a statement over and above that provided in paragraph 10.3.3 of the Plan (or additional wording to that paragraph) explicitly emphasising the importance of adhering to the WFD and its requirement of no deterioration would have been welcomed.</p> <p>(*The latest River Basin Management Plans were released in 2015).</p>	<p>Comment of support welcomed.</p> <p>Upon the Environment Agency's advice, to strengthen the supporting text at paragraph 10.3.3 the Council would propose the minor wording addition as proposed.</p> <p>The paragraph would read –</p> <p><i>'...sustainable protection of water quality. <b>Development proposals that are likely to impact surface or groundwater should consider the requirements of the Water Framework Directive</b>'.</i></p>
13.12.17	Historic England	<p><u>Culture and Historic Environment Assets</u></p> <p>The inclusion of the 'List of locally significant buildings' is strongly welcomed within Appendix 3 together with its' link to policy 40. Policy 41 is also strongly welcomed, and in particular 'new shop fronts and advertisements in Conservation Areas'.</p> <p>The policies should be strategic and this should be made clear within the Local Plan, in order to comply with the NPPF. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF stresses that Local Plans should include strategic policies to deliver conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>Paragraph 156 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should set out strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan and this should include strategic policies. The Council considers that both Local Plan Policy 40 Culture and Historic Environment Assets and Local Plan 41 Development in Conservation Areas are strategic in nature, however that they have specific elements to them, for example new shop fronts and advertisements within the conservation area. With the Local Plan being the predominate planning policy document for all development within the Borough up to 2031, the Council considers it appropriate to</p>

			incorporate more locally specific policy elements within the two policies mentioned.
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 40 – Culture and Historic Environment Assets</p> <p>Gladman do not consider that Policy 40 fully reflects the guidance which is set out in the Framework. The Policy should be amended to reflect the comments below to ensure that it is fully consistent with current guidance.</p> <p>Paragraphs 132 to 134 of the Framework relate specifically to designated heritage assets and highlight that the more important the asset the greater the weight that should be attached to it. The policies in the Local Plan therefore need to make such a distinction so as to ensure they are consistent with the Framework.</p> <p>The Framework states that if the harm to a heritage asset is deemed to be substantial then the proposal needs to achieve substantial public benefits to outweigh that harm. If the harm is less than substantial, then the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use. The policies in the Local Plan should therefore make a distinction between the two tests included in the Framework for designated heritage assets to ensure they are sound.</p> <p>Paragraph 135 of the Framework relates specifically to non-designated heritage assets and the policy test that should be applied in these cases is that a balanced judgment should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset. Once again, policies in the Local Plan need to reflect this guidance.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is in agreement that paragraphs 132 to 134 of the NPPF relate to designated heritage assets. However it should be noted that the Council considers that paragraphs 126 to 130 of the same document relate to all heritage assets. Designated heritage assets are protected under national policy and guidance, therefore the Council does not consider repeating this in the Local Plan appropriate. Local Plan Policy 40 seeks the safeguarding, conservation or enhancement of both designated and non designated assets. As NPPF states, heritage assets are irreplaceable resource that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their importance. The Council considers that all heritage assets hold local importance and should be safeguarded and conserved.</p>
08.11.17	National Farmers Union (NFU)	Page 127, policy 42. Green wedges are not green belt and we would be looking to see that more farm diversification is allowed for in them than the list	The Council is not of the opinion that Policy 42 Green Wedges should be amended. The purpose of the Green Wedges situated within the Borough is to protect

		<p>currently in this policy. For example small farm shops should be fine to be allowed in green wedges. Otherwise the policy is too restrictive towards rural business development.</p>	<p>important areas of open land which influence development form and have a positive effect on people's health and well being. The policy allows for appropriate uses, of which retail development is not one.</p> <p>Green Wedge designations within the Borough have been in place since at least 1999, with related planning policies only allowing for appropriate uses. Of the two Green Wedge areas within the Borough, the Council is not aware of any current need or want for rural retail business development.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 42 - Green Wedges</p> <p>The principle of Green Wedges and the function they perform are supported. We also note that an updated Green Wedge review has been carried out to evaluate the Green Wedge within Oadby and Wigston Borough. It is not clear from this review however, how it has considered future development pressure that may be generated by the Borough needing to accommodate unmet need from Leicester City.</p> <p>Whilst adhering to the principles of protecting the Green Wedge, the policy should also recognise that much designated Green Wedge land is within sustainable locations and meets the objectives of green wedge designation to varying degrees. In order to be positively prepared, we are of the view that the policy should make provision for further review of the Green Wedge where this is required to deliver an increased housing requirement.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. Should a trigger be met and a review of the Council's Local Plan be required, all possible options for development would be appraised / assessed for their suitability and appropriateness. Due to this, the Council does not consider it necessary to include a statement within Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges.</p>
18.12.17	Turley Planning	<p>Policy 42 – Green Wedges</p> <p>Policy 42 states that Green Wedges protect "important areas of green land within the Borough and seek to retain these areas as open and undeveloped". It</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The purpose of the Council's Green Wedge Review is to assess the boundaries of the existing green wedge</p>

		<p>continues by setting out the objectives of all Green Wedges as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preventing the merging of settlements;</li> <li>• Guiding development form;</li> <li>• Providing a 'green lung' between the urban area and the countryside; and</li> <li>• Acting as a recreational resource.</li> </ul> <p>In order to achieve the above, Policy 42 restricts the uses that are allowed within Green Wedges to a limited range of uses, including agricultural, outdoor leisure, forestry and burial grounds. Our client does not wish to comment on the wording of Policy 42 per se, or the nature of uses permissible within defined Green Wedges. Our client, however, does not consider that the policy is 'sound' on the basis of the extent of land included within the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge. The current boundaries include land within the Green Wedge that should be removed. This is on the basis that there are sites that do not fulfil the objectives of including land within a Green Wedge.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Council has undertaken a Green Wedge Review (2017) as part of its evidence base. The purpose of the review was to assess the boundaries of the existing Green Wedge designations, as defined by the saved Local Plan Proposals Map and the Adopted Proposals Map.</p> <p>Despite undertaking this review, the Pre-Submission Plan still includes land that does not meet the objectives of including land within the Green Wedge. The Green Wedge Review breaks down the wider Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge into five sub areas.</p> <p>The sub areas are based on the defined land-use and</p>	<p>designations, as defined on Council's Saved Local Plan Proposals Map and the Council's Adopted Policies Map. The review took into account the Broad Location for Growth Areas identified within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the options for greenfield release sites identified within the Council's Preferred Options Local Plan consultation document. Each of the existing green wedges was assessed against the functions set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Green Wedge Review Joint Methodology to see whether or not the current designated boundaries should be kept the same or amended.</p> <p>As stated within the review document, for the purpose of the review document the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge was assessed at an overall 'macro' scale, however to ensure a good level of detail the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge was split down into five sub areas to aid the review process.</p> <p>The land area submitted by Turley is situated within Sub Area 1 of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge (as defined within the review document) and is specifically mention within the conclusions on page 24 of the review document. The review states that 'the most northern tip of the green wedge, for example the racecourse land and land north of Palmerston Way is key in preventing the merging of the built up areas of Oadby and Leicester City.</p> <p>It is also evident that the land area to the north of Palmerston Way effectively guides the development / urban form of Leicester City. With Palmerston Way (highway) being defined as built development, should the land area to the north be removed from the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge, the two urban areas of Leicester City and Oadby will coalesce.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>landscape areas set out in the Green Wedge Management Strategy, which dates back to 2004. It is our view that the Green Wedge includes land that fails to meet the defined objectives. By including land unnecessarily within the Green Wedge, the Pre-Submission Plan is limiting the ability of what are otherwise sustainable sites from being brought forward for development during the plan period. This is evident in the inclusion of land within our clients ownership within the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge.</p> <p>Our clients wider land holding at Leicester Racecourse is included within the defined Green Wedge. It is, however, argued that part of this land holding, extending to 3.1 ha, should be removed from the Green Wedge. It is surplus to the operational requirements of the Racecourse. The site is located to the south west of Leicester Road and is segregated from the wider Green Wedge by Palmerston Way.</p> <p>It is argued that the site could be removed from the Green Wedge without compromising the objectives of including land within the Green Wedge. This position has been considered in more detail by Tyler Grange and is addressed in a separate note attached to these representations as Appendix 2.</p> <p>The site is located in sustainable and highly accessible location. It is in close proximity to Oadby district centre and a range of employment opportunities, services and facilities. The site is bound by existing residential development to the west and main arterial roads to the north, south and east. The site is also adjoined by a petrol filling station to the north west. As stated above, the site is separated from the remainder of the Green Wedge by Palmerston Way. It therefore forms a self-contained development parcel, well located to both</p>	<p>It should be noted that the Council would not preclude development of the site proposed by Turley, however with its designation as Green Wedge, any development proposals for the site would need to comply with Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges (or current Core Strategy Policy 6 Green Wedges).</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Oadby and the Leicester City urban area.</p> <p>There are limited available land parcels that are well located to the Leicester urban area. The land within our clients control represents such a site. Its identification within the Green Wedge, however, effectively restricts its ability to accommodate future development requirements over the course of the plan period, whether to meet needs within the Borough or Leicester City.</p> <p>As set out above, part of the site is considered suitable to accommodate a deep discounter foodstore. The general location of the foodstore could be to the south west of Leicester Road close to the existing petrol filling station. The remainder of the site is also considered suitable for development, either through this plan period or future reviews. The wider site is considered suitable to accommodate a range of development uses that would complement the proposed deep discounter foodstore, including residential, commercial (including a hotel) and education uses. This position is consistent with our clients submission through the Call for Sites process.</p> <p>The land controlled by our client is located with Sub Area 1, as considered by the Green Wedge Review. The review states that a majority of the area is in use as Leicester Racecourse and the former Oadby Municipal Golf Course. It is recognised that the area has part of Palmerston Way running through it towards its northern tip.</p> <p>The Review also recognises that part of the area has been promoted for development, the northern most area of the Green Wedge boundary. It is understood that this reference relates to the land within our clients</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>ownership. There is no further reference to this parcel specifically, or its potential release for future development in the Review. The assessment of whether the designation meets the four identified objectives is undertaken for the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge as a whole. The assessment is not undertaken at a more detailed level, based on the Sub Areas previously identified. In doing so, the assessment is more broad-brush given that the Green Wedge as a whole extends to approximately 168 ha (within the Borough boundary).</p> <p>The assessment undertaken as part of the Review therefore fails to address the variations between the land included within the wider Green Wedge designation. This results in a more generic assessment, that fails to identify potential areas of land that could be released from the Green Wedge.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of how our clients site scores against the four criteria set out in the Green Wedge Review is set out in the report included at Appendix 2. In summary, the report demonstrates that the site does not contribute to the role of any of the four objectives of including land within the Green Wedge.</p> <p>Moreover, the report concludes that the site is separated from the remainder of the Green Wedge by Palmerston Way and has the potential to accommodate development that would not fundamentally impact upon the separation of Oadby and Leicester or the openness of the Green Wedge in this location. The report also notes that there are opportunities to bring forward development that could facilitate landscape and wildlife enhancements and recreational opportunities.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>In light of the above, Policy 42 is not considered 'sound' on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not positively prepared – given that the policy includes land within the defined Green Wedge that fails to meet any of the identified objectives. This unnecessarily impedes the ability of otherwise sustainable sites in meeting future development and infrastructure needs, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities, over the plan period.</li> <li>• It is not justified – given that it does not represent the most appropriate strategy, by protecting land within the existing Green Wedge unnecessarily to the detriment of bringing forward sustainable development. This is particularly so in light of the pressing need to deliver new development over the land period, both to meet the Borough's own needs and those of Leicester City.</li> <li>• It is not effective – given that the Plan identifies land within the Green Wedge that fails to meet the defined objectives and is capable of meeting future development needs for both the Borough and neighbouring authorities.</li> <li>• It is not consistent with national policy – given that the identification of land within the Green Wedge that does not serve the defined purpose, restricts the ability of the Plan to bring forward the delivery of sustainable development.</li> </ul>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 42 – Green Wedges</p> <p>Policy 42 relates to green wedge designations which are not referred to in national policy, however they are not in of themselves inconsistent with the Framework. Notwithstanding this, the boundaries of green wedges</p>	Comment noted.

		are often historic in nature due to them having been formulated alongside the now outdated evidence of development needs that underpinned previous local plans. They also often cross administrative boundaries due to them originally having been 'broadly defined' within former county-wide structure plans. The green wedges within Leicester and Leicestershire therefore continue to be a strategic issue to be considered through the Duty to Cooperate and the Strategic Growth Plan to ensure that development needs can be met in full across the HMA.	
13.12.17	Landmark Planning (Bowbridge Land)	<p><u>Page 127 - Policy 42 Green Wedges</u></p> <p>The principle of Green Wedges (and the function they perform) is supported, however, it should also be recognised that a lot of land that is designated as Green Wedge lies within sustainable locations and does not clearly meet the objectives of green wedge designation.</p> <p>The Council should ensure that going forward its evidence base is updated to incorporate an appraisal of Green Wedges to ensure that any future Green Wedge policy is robust and can meet the tests of soundness. My clients object to the designation of the land at Sutton Close within the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge for the reasons set out above. The objectives of Green Wedges are set out in policy 42 and it is clear that (particularly given the proposed allocation of land adjoining this site at Cottage Farm for residential development within the Green Wedge) the land at Sutton Close does not prevent the merging of the two settlements, it does not significantly guide development in this area, it does not demonstrably provide a 'green lung' between the urban area and the countryside, nor does it act as a recreational resource given the lack of public access to it.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>As evidence base for the Local Plan, the Council undertook a Green Wedge Review. The Review document concluded that <i>'overall the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge fulfils all of the functions as set out in the agreed Leicester and Leicestershire Green Wedge Review Joint Methodology. It provides the settlements of Leicester City, Wigston and Oadby with access to a largely undeveloped area of open space that leads out into the south Leicestershire countryside; it guides the form of development effectively, particularly the urban built form of Oadby, Wigston and Leicester City; it provides a recreational resource, with the likes of Brocks Hill Country Park, allotment spaces, a former golf course and the Leicester Racecourse; and, it ensures that the urban areas of Oadby, Wigston and Leicester City do not merge into one entity, thus losing their individual character and distinctiveness. The green wedge is also a key component of the Borough's Strategic Green Infrastructure network where it acts as a Strategic Green Infrastructure Corridor'</i>.</p> <p>The Review document also set a number of recommendations for the Oadby and Wigston Green</p>

			Wedge. None of these recommendations sought to remove any pieces of land from the existing boundary extent.
17.12.17	GVA (Land North of Newton Lane)	<p><b>Green Wedges</b></p> <p>On Pages 23 to 25 of the Pre-Submission document, the Council sets out a number of proposed 'Spatial Objectives'. The thirteenth Spatial Objective relates to Green Wedges and land in the Countryside. It states that the Council will seek to "<i>protect</i>" and "<i>enhance</i>" Green Wedges by "<i>limiting development to appropriate uses only, as well as safeguarding... other open spaces for sport and other forms of recreation</i>".</p> <p>Proposed Policy 42 states that the Council will "<i>seek to retain</i>" land in Green Wedges "<i>as open and undeveloped</i>", and that only development associated with five particular types of uses will be permitted within designated areas.</p> <p>The Council has proposed some release of land from the Green Wedge, to enable the allocation of the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth. The Council also proposes the formation of a new area of Green Wedge between Oadby and Wigston, and which wraps around the southern edge of the proposed Cottage Farm Direction for Growth. A small part of the proposed new Green Wedge falls within the proposed development area (hatched red on the plan at Appendix II) which is being promoted by Jelson, in conjunction with Davidsons.</p> <p>The Council states that its approach to Green Wedge policy is justified by a Green Wedge review, which forms part of the evidence base that underpins the draft Local Plan. It appears that the Green Wedge review has been carried out by the Council itself, rather</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The purpose of the Council's Green Wedge Review is to assess the boundaries of the existing green wedge designations, as defined on Council's Saved Local Plan Proposals Map and the Council's Adopted Policies Map. The review took into account the Broad Location for Growth Areas identified within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the options for greenfield release sites identified within the Council's Preferred Options Local Plan consultation document. Each of the existing green wedges was assessed against the functions set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Green Wedge Review Joint Methodology to see whether or not the current designated boundaries should be kept the same or amended. As stated within the review document, for the purpose of the review document the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge was assessed at an overall 'macro' scale, however to ensure a good level of detail the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge was split down into five sub areas to aid the review process.</p> <p>The review document assessed the two green wedges of the Borough against the four objectives illustrated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent the merging of settlements,</li> <li>• Guide development form,</li> <li>• Provide a 'green lung' between the urban area and the countryside,</li> <li>• Act as a recreational resource.</li> </ul> <p>The conclusions for the Oadby and Wigston Green</p>

		<p>than by technical consultants on the Council's behalf.</p> <p>In short, the Review breaks each of the Green Wedges into 'sub-areas' and briefly describes the characteristics of each, with reference to their land use, boundaries, topography, rights of way, ecology and development pressure. It then goes on to assess the performance of each of the Green Wedges against the four criteria for Green Wedges (as set out in proposed Policy 42).</p> <p>In relation to the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge (in which the land which Jelson is promoting is located (in part)), the Review concludes that the narrowest point between the urban edges of Oadby and Wigston is 145 metres. It also states that the southern part of the wedge (again, in which the land which Jelson is promoting is located) "<i>is important as it reduces the likelihood of 'wrap' round built development that would essentially join the two settlements</i>".</p> <p>As we have explained in earlier sections, the separation distance between the land which Jelson is promoting, and the urban edge of Oadby, is more than double 145 metres, and so well in excess of the existing narrowest point. Moreover, the Landscape Framework Plan prepared by Golby and Luck (Appendix III) shows how development on the site could be arranged without materially reducing the separation between Oadby and Wigston, or leading to any perception of coalescence between the two.</p> <p>In our view, this exposes a weakness in the evidence base prepared by the Council. Although the Review purports to examine the performance of the Green Wedge across specific sub-areas, it fails, at a micro level, to test the impacts on the performance of the Green Wedge if development was to be brought</p>	<p>Wedge suggest that <i>'the majority of the green wedge is relatively wide and forms an effective and valuable separation of the two settlements of Wigston and Oadby. Throughout the length of the green wedge there are minimal pinch points, the narrowest point being approximately 145 metres between Wigston and Oadby. Such 'pinch points' should not be increased through removal of areas of green wedge in the future. The southern area of the green wedge, where it abuts the Borough's countryside designation is also important as it reduces the likelihood of 'wrap' round built development that would essentially join the two settlements. Having this area of green wedge is also important as it allows people that reside in the urban areas, particularly the area near to Beauchamp College in Oadby, access into the countryside'</i>.</p> <p>In addition the document suggests that throughout the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge, the urban edge / green wedge boundary is visually strong and well defined. There is no 'blurring' of the lines or urban fringe, it is very much urban one side, open green wedge (and its associated infrastructure) the other.</p> <p>The review document goes on to suggest recommendations for the Green Wedge, of which the extension south in is one. The extension of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge has been allocated by the Council as it considers that it will guide development form in future years by preventing any future coalescence of the two settlements of Wigston and Oadby. It will also act as a recreational resource and provide a 'green lung' between the urban area and the countryside.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council would not preclude development of green wedge areas, however any</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>forward within it. In our view, the Landscape Framework Plan prepared by Golby and Luck demonstrates that part of the Green Wedge could accommodate development, without harming the purposes of the designation.</p> <p>Having undertaken its analysis, the Council goes on to set out three recommendations in relation to the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge. The first recommendation is that “<i>the boundaries are not amended to include or exclude any areas of the current green wedge [sic]</i>”. Although the wording perhaps lacks precision, our reading of this recommendation is that the boundaries of the Green Wedge should be preserved as they are. However, the second recommendation is to include land at Lucas Marsh Nature Reserve in the wedge. The third recommendation is that land to the south of the Cottage Farm Direction for Growth should be brought into the Green Wedge.</p> <p>On the face of it, recommendations two and three are in conflict with recommendation one, which states that the boundaries of the Green Wedge should not be amended. Notwithstanding that we disagree with a conclusion that there should be no amendments to the boundaries of the Green Wedge, the apparent conflict between the recommendations of the Review further highlight, in our view, that it does not provide robust evidence for the purpose of plan-making.</p> <p>Because the Review fails to undertake any detailed analysis of the Green Wedge at a micro-level, it fails, in our view, to fully justify the proposal to extend to the Green Wedge to the south of Cottage Farm, or to justify the boundaries of that extension. The Review states that an extension to the wedge is needed to</p>	<p>development proposals would need to comply with Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges (or current Core Strategy Policy 6 Green Wedges).</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>"prevent coalescence"</i> of the settlements following the development of Cottage Farm, and similar wording appears at Paragraph 7.5.11 of the Pre-Submission document when referring to the extension of the Green Wedge.</p> <p>However, neither the Review, nor the Plan, explain how the extension to the Green Wedge would contribute to the other purposes of the designated area, or why the boundary of that extension needs to include part of the land which Jelson is promoting in order to achieve the stated objective of preventing coalescence. Again, this leads us to conclude that the evidence base prepared by the Council is not robust.</p> <p>Finally, the Green Wedge Review also addresses the Oadby, Thurnby and Stoughton Green Wedge, in which the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth site is located. The Review carries out the same analysis across a number of sub-areas. It concludes that the Green Wedge satisfies all of the criteria for including land within the designated area. Again, the Council makes three recommendations, the first of which is to leave the boundaries of the wedge as they are. The second recommendation is to remove a small amount of existing built development from the wedge. The third recommendation is to release a significant amount of land from the wedge to facilitate delivery of the Stoughton Grange Direction for Growth. The only reason given for that recommendation is that it <i>"would not allow for settlement coalescence"</i>.</p> <p>As we have explained above, it is not appropriate for the Council to make recommendations which are, on the face of it, in conflict with each other, particularly where they significantly vary in outcome. More significantly, however, is that the Review fails to</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>provide any analysis to justify the release of a significant swathe of the wedge to facilitate development at Stoughton Grange. For the same reason that we concluded that the analysis is not robust in relation to the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge, we reach the same view on the Oadby, Thurnby and Stoughton Green Wedge; it is unreasonable to justify a significant change to the Green Wedge in a single sentence. This reaffirms, in our view, that the Green Wedge Review does not provide robust evidence for the retention, extension, or removal of land in the Green Wedge that is proposed by the Council.</p> <p>Instead it would appear that the Green Wedge Review does nothing more than reflect the Council's predetermined allocation strategy rather than in any way informing the location of planned growth.</p> <p>Consequently, we conclude that the Proposals Map (insofar as it relates to amended Green Wedge boundaries), and therefore the Plan, are unsound, because they are not based on robust evidence base.</p> <p>This conclusion is significant in the context of our analysis in Section 4 in relation to housing need and supply. Given that we think the Council has failed to demonstrate any flexibility in relation to the delivery of housing, we conclude that it is imperative that it undertakes, without delay, a robust, comprehensive analysis of its Green Wedges in order to fully test the potential for releases of land from the wedges and their allocation so that the Council is able to demonstrate a flexible approach to housing delivery over the plan period.</p> <p><b>Representation</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><i>As a consequence of all of the above, we conclude that Policies 18, 21 (insofar as they relate to redrawing Green Wedge boundaries) and 42 of the Plan, and their supporting text, are not justified, because they are not based on proportionate evidence.</i></p> <p><i>We conclude that the Council must revise its evidence base in relation to the Green Wedge and undertake a thorough, robust analysis of the wedges at a detailed, micro level, in order to fully determine the extent to which elements of the designated areas could be released and allocated for new housing.</i></p>	
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 42: GREEN WEDGES</b></p> <p>The historic role of Green Wedges as an effective policy tool in the Borough is recognised. However, the proposal to extend the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge is objected to.</p> <p>The evidence base sets out an assessment of the role of the extant Green Wedge designation against the assessment methodology agreed across the County and the stated policy objectives. However, no justification whatsoever is given for the proposed extension of that Green Wedge in terms of the specific merits of this area in relation to the express purposes of the designation.</p> <p>In considering the four specific aims set out in Policy 42, the extension of the area of protection is not necessary to prevent the merging of settlements or to guide the form of development. Even with the allocation of the Cottage Farm Direction for Growth there would still be a wide expanse of countryside between Oadby and Wigston (much wider than the</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council is surprised by Define Planning's representation suggesting that the extension to the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge is not justified.</p> <p>The Council has been working collaboratively with Bloor Homes (and Define Planning) throughout the preparation of the Local Plan (specifically relating to the Cottage Farm Direction for Growth area) and has previously specified the Council's requirement to extend the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge. At no point during those previous discussions had Bloor Homes (or Define Planning) objected to the extension of the green wedge.</p> <p>The Council agrees that once the Cottage Farm Direction for Growth is built out as planned for in the Local Plan, there would be no physical coalescence, however the objectives of a green wedge comprise of more than just coalescence. There are four objectives</p>

		<p>area to the north that is currently designated as Green Wedge). There would be no physical coalescence or, indeed, a perception of coalescences given the limited inter-visibility between the two urban areas in this locality.</p> <p>Nor is the designation of the area required to provide a green lung between the urban area and countryside, or provide a recreational resource. It would remain a fully functional part of the wider countryside in agricultural use and with public access limited to the few existing public rights of way that run through the area.</p> <p>As such the designation of this area as an extension to the Green Wedge is neither necessary nor justified. Moreover, there are sufficient policies within the Local Plan to appropriately guide development management decisions in this area without the imposition of further restrictive measures.</p> <p><b>Soundness</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 42, which is considered unsound on the basis that it is not <b>justified</b> in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not properly considered reasonable alternative strategies.</p> <p><b>Proposed Change</b> Delete the extension to the Green Wedge designation that applies to the area between Oadby and Wigston.</p>	<p>of a green wedge specified within Local Plan Policy 42 Green Wedges –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent the merging of settlements,</li> <li>• Guide development form,</li> <li>• Provide a ‘green lung’ between the urban area and the countryside,</li> <li>• Act as a recreational resource.</li> </ul> <p>The extension of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge has been allocated by the Council as it considers that it is required to guard against future coalescence of the two settlements, guide development form, act as a recreational resource and provide a ‘green lung’ between the urban area and the countryside. It should be noted that the Council’s Green Wedge Review 2017 recommends the extension of the Oadby and Wigston Green Wedge, as it will guide development form in future years by defining development limits, as well as preventing any future coalescence of the two settlements of Wigston and Oadby.</p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 43 – Countryside</p> <p>Gladman wish to point out that impact on the landscape is one factor that should be considered by the decision maker when determining any planning proposal and ultimately it is a balance of the harm of development against the benefits. It is only where the</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that the Policy wording of Local Plan Policy 43 Countryside allows sufficient flexibility for planning balance in decision making. The Policy allows for some forms of required development in Countryside</p>

		<p>harm significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits should planning permission be refused.</p> <p>Policy 43 states that development should not adversely affect landscape, wildlife, the ecological, geological, environmental, archaeological, or historic resources of the site and the surrounding area. However, it should be recognised that any adverse impacts that a proposal has on these issues should be factored into the planning balance when making a decision rather than it being a sole reason for refusing any application.</p>	<p>locations and states that any development proposal causing adverse impacts will only be permitted where there is justifiable need which outweighs the impacts.</p>
18.12.17	Landmark Planning (North of Newton Lane)	<p>Policy 43 – Countryside</p> <p>The balanced approach to development in the countryside is welcomed and is consistent with the approach taken in the NPPF. The recognition within the policy itself that there is potential for a justifiable need to outweigh adverse impacts on the countryside is supported. This is particularly important at Wigston where it is recognised that new development in the countryside will be required on the edge of the urban area.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 43 COUNTRYSIDE</b></p> <p>Objection is raised to Policy 43 as it seeks to impose a pre-NPPF style “blanket” protection of the countryside and constraint on development. That approach clearly does not comply with the policy requirements of the NPPF which no longer uses the language of seeking to protect the countryside simply because it is countryside. Instead, in trying to balance the need for development, it refers to recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it (at paragraph 17 point 5). As such it does not preclude development in the countryside and it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to seek to do so.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Due to the Borough being relatively small in size and compact and urban in nature, green open spaces are extremely important to the communities that reside in the Borough and the biodiversity also. Bearing this in mind, the Council considers that Local Plan Policy 43 Countryside is not a ‘blanket’ protection policy as suggested by the representation. The Policy seeks to protect and manage the countryside from inappropriate development. The 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph clarifies the position regarding development within the countryside – <i>‘some forms of development may be required in the Countryside. Development justified as necessary in the</i></p>

		<p>Furthermore, it is inevitable that development in the countryside will have some impact on the matters highlighted in the policy, and that needs to be recognised within the terms of the policy. Moreover, whilst the policy acknowledges that a need for the development may outweigh any adverse impacts that would arise, it should also recognise the potential for other socio-economic benefits to influence that judgement.</p> <p><b>Soundness</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 43, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- has not been <b>positively prepared</b> as it is not based on a strategy that will ensure that the objectively assessed housing needs, including unmet development requirements arising in Leicester, will be met within the plan period;</li> <li>- is <b>inconsistent with national policy</b> in that it does not fully reflect the Government’s priorities and policies in terms of enabling sustainable development and boosting the supply of housing to meet identified needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Proposed Change</b> The policy should be revised to more closely reflect the policy approach required by the NPPF.</p>	<p><i>Countryside must be appropriate in terms of layout, scale height, materials, form, impact and setting’.</i></p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 44 – Landscape and Character</p> <p>Similar to the comments set out above in relation to Policy 43, Gladman also object to Policy 44. The Policy as currently set out, seeks to conserve and enhance the distinctive landscapes in the borough. Impact on the landscape is just one factor that should be considered</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character does not seek to protect countryside from development for its own sake. The policy states that all development proposals within the Borough will be considered against</p>

		<p>by the decision maker when determining any planning proposal and ultimately it is a balance of the harm of development against the benefits. It is only where the harm significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits should planning permission be refused. The Policy should therefore be reworded to properly reflect the guidance set out in the Framework at paragraphs 109 and 113.</p> <p>Paragraph 109 of the Framework seeks to contribute to and enhance the natural and local landscape whilst protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. Paragraph 113 goes on to set out that distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status.</p> <p>In order to have regard to national policies and guidance, it is not enough to simply seek to protect countryside from development for its own sake; rather, in order to warrant protection, it must at the very least, exhibit some demonstrable physical attributes which elevate its importance above simply being an area of undeveloped countryside.</p>	<p>the need to conserve and enhance the distinctive landscapes of the Borough. This reflects the policy objective of NPPF paragraph 109.</p> <p>In addition, Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character is seeking to ensure that all development proposals reflect the prevailing quality, character and landscape features such as settlement patterns, important views, open spaces and significant natural habitats. The policy seeks development that is not only sustainable but is in keeping with the area in which it is situated. The Council considers that this approach is appropriate due to the diverse and distinct character areas of the Borough area.</p>
02.11.17	Kevin South (local resident)	<p>Granville Road should be in the Borough Plan – and policies to protect the road.</p> <p>Granville Road is a extremely unique Road in the Borough of Oadby and Wigston as part of the borough Plan and planning, that “planning and a strategy” be put in place to encourage the Council to have new policies to protect and encourage the Protection of this hedge and tree lined Lane - founded by the Leicester and Leicestershire Freehold land Society.</p> <p>The Borough of Oadby and Wigston does not have any other road like this in Character and Granville Road Is</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council recognises the uniqueness of Granville Road and the valuable contribution it makes to the Borough’s landscape.</p> <p>The significance of Granville Road is expressed within the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment as well as policy guidance to protect it from unsuitable development in the future.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character seeks to</p>

		<p>unique in Character in County.</p> <p>Not any other Street in the Borough has unique challenges to protect the Road/ lane and the habitats and trees that line the Road/ Lane.</p> <p>Granville Rd has a unique History from 1855.</p> <p>The Borough Council should protect and recognise the Uniqueness of the road and the landscape of the road and value to the borough with Planning polices and a strategy for Granville Road.</p>	<p>protect existing quality and character areas within the Borough and states that development proposals will only be permitted should they be in keeping with the area in which they are situated. The policy also states that development proposals that are contrary to the policy guidance set out within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment...will not be approved.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Council is of the opinion that there is sufficient policy protection for Granville Road.</p>
02.11.17	Trevor Mildred (local resident)	<p>Mr Kevin South has passed on a copy of your letter regarding the Planning Policy Consultation process. As a result, I would ask that the council consider giving Granville Road the status of a significant street. This is because Granville Road is a unique street within the borough due to its history and character and should be recognised as such.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council does not award 'significant street' status and is unaware of such status in other local authority areas.</p> <p>The Council however recognises the uniqueness of Granville Road and the valuable contribution it makes to the Borough's landscape.</p> <p>The significance of Granville Road is expressed within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment as well as policy guidance to protect it from unsuitable development in the future.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character seeks to protect existing quality and character areas within the Borough and states that development proposals will only be permitted should they be in keeping with the area in which they are situated. The policy also states that development proposals that are contrary to the policy guidance set out within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment...will not be approved.</p>

			Taking account of the above, the Council is of the opinion that there is sufficient policy protection for Granville Road.
07.11.17	Trevor Mildred (local resident)	Mr Kevin South has passed on a copy of your letter regarding the Planning Policy Consultation process. As a result, I would ask that the council consider giving Granville Road the status of a significant street. This is because Granville Road is a unique street within the borough due to its history and character and should be recognised as such.	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council does not award 'significant street' status and is unaware of such status in other local authority areas.</p> <p>The Council however recognises the uniqueness of Granville Road and the valuable contribution it makes to the Borough's landscape.</p> <p>The significance of Granville Road is expressed within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment as well as policy guidance to protect it from unsuitable development in the future.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character seeks to protect existing quality and character areas within the Borough and states that development proposals will only be permitted should they be in keeping with the area in which they are situated. The policy also states that development proposals that are contrary to the policy guidance set out within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment...will not be approved.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Council is of the opinion that there is sufficient policy protection for Granville Road.</p>
08.11.17	National Farmers Union (NFU)	Page 130, policy 44. All development will have an impact on the landscape but what the Council is trying to prevent, surely, is an adverse impact, so in the last sentence of this policy it should be "Development proposals that have a potential significant adverse impact on ..... Otherwise most development could fall at	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from the NFU for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council agrees that only development having an adverse impact should be managed appropriately,</p>

		<p>this hurdle, surely.</p>	<p>therefore is proposing the following wording for the final paragraph in Policy 44 Landscape and Character.</p> <p><i>'Development proposals that have a potential <b>adverse</b> impact on nationally designated areas or features of landscape and cultural significance will not be permitted.'</i></p>
14.11.17	Kevin South (local resident)	<p>Granville Rd needs to be in Borough Plan</p> <p>I wish to comment further about the Borough Plan Consultation Granville Road that dates back to 163 years with its lost in time feel of land mark trees and hedges that's today really out of place – compared to the other streets in the borough.</p> <p>Country lane feel in a large town.</p> <p>The hedges and trees are important contribution to the borough and should be considered to be a Asset. Granville Rd possibly has more trees and hedges than any other Road in Borough and should be in borough plan in</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Culture and Historic Environment Assets</li> <li>2. Landscape and Character.</li> </ol> <p>Granville Road possible is a habitat for many species of animals with it hedges ( like a country lane without any public paths ) and many properties are regarded as Significant today ( possibly more than any other Road / Street )</p> <p>From Historical Asset the Lane was founded by Leicestershire and Leicester freehold Land Society and famous Leicester mayor John Briggs was involved – the plan was for a much bigger project almost a new village</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council recognises the uniqueness of Granville Road and the valuable contribution it makes to the Borough's landscape.</p> <p>The significance of Granville Road is expressed within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment as well as policy guidance to protect it from unsuitable development in the future.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character seeks to protect existing quality and character areas within the Borough and states that development proposals will only be permitted should they be in keeping with the area in which they are situated. The policy also states that development proposals that are contrary to the policy guidance set out within the Council's Landscape Character Assessment...will not be approved.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Council is of the opinion that there is sufficient policy protection for Granville Road.</p>

		<p>– Lane was separated into 14 plots for “Settlers or people” who had shares in the Society</p> <p>Recently Granville Road has lost huge length of original field hedging and the lane is threatened with advance form of “Street Greying.” Council should encourage Residents to look after the lane- adapt planning policy towards protecting this important lane in the borough.</p> <p>Granville Rd is an important asset to the borough and is in similar league to the Wigston Frame workers Cottage.</p> <p>The Borough Council need to adapt planning policy as part of Borough Plan towards Granville Rd.</p>	
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 44 LANDSCAPE AND CHARACTER</b></p> <p>The aspiration to support the conservation and enhancement of valued landscapes as provided for by paragraph 109 of the NPPF is recognised</p> <p>However, the NPPF states (para 113) that Local Plans should include criteria based policies where the level of protection is commensurate with the status of the landscape areas. Policy 44 goes beyond that in stating that development will not be permitted unless it is “in keeping” with the area in which it is situated. It is inevitable that the development of a greenfield site will have some impact on the landscape character of the site and the locality, and that needs to be recognised within the terms of the policy. Moreover, there is no balancing reference to the potential wider benefits of the development which may outweigh any specific harm. As a result, the application of the policy will unduly prevent / delay otherwise sustainable development.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Borough area is extremely diverse in terms of landscape character and the Council considers it imperative that this diversity is conserved and strengthened where possible.</p> <p>The Council considers that Local Plan Policy 44 Landscape and Character proactively seeks to conserve and enhance and does not unduly prevent or delay sustainable development. The Council does not seek development that ‘standardises’ development across the Borough area. The Council is aware that development within greenfield areas will have an impact on the open rural landscape, however such development will be required to be in keeping with the existing adjacent urban form.</p>

		<p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 44, which is considered unsound on the basis that it is inconsistent with national policy.</p> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> The policy should be revised to more closely reflect the proportional approach required by the NPPF.</p>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Policy 45 – Local Green Space</p> <p>Gladman take this opportunity to remind the Council of the tests which need to be met when seeking to designate Local Green Space (LGS).</p> <p>Paragraph 77 of the Framework sets out the following in terms of when it is appropriate or not to designate land as a LGS.</p> <p>“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</p> <p>a. Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</p> <p>b. Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p> <p>c. Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further guidance on LGS designations including paragraph ID. 37-015-20140306,</p> <p>“There are no hard and fast rules about how big a Local</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the criteria set out within the NPPF. As illustrated within the Local Green Space Assessment the Council assessed each of the land areas submitted to the Council by the local community. The land areas that were considered to have met the criteria as expressed within the NPPF (paragraph 77) were then proposed for Local Green Space designation on the Council’s Local Plan Adopted Policies Map.</p>

		Green Space can be because places are different and a degree of judgement will inevitably be needed. However, paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space Designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new are of Green Belt by another name."	
24.11.17	Landmark Planning	Policy 45 of the Pre Submission Local Plan makes provision for a number of sites to be designated as Local Green Spaces (LGS). It is clear that in order for a site to be designated as a LGS, it should satisfy the criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Where such designation applies, planning permission will not be permitted for a development proposal that results in the loss of the area unless the benefits of the development outweigh its loss. In the case of the proposed LGS at Saffron Road (SW3), the area of land lies within a commercial rather than residential area and accordingly, its proximity to the local community is questioned. Furthermore, it is hard to see how the existing area is demonstrably special to the local community or what significance it holds. The land at Saffron Road that includes area SW3 was originally Ministry of Defence Land. It was purchased in 1998 my clients, Draper Commercial (part of Draper Property) and over time, new buildings have been built and the land developed to form the attractive commercial area that exists today. Draper Property need to retain the flexibility to alter the layout of the Tigers Road site as tenants' needs change. This includes the ability to be able to use the area that the Council intend to designate as LGS. Any future development of this land would, of	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As illustrated within the Local Green Space Assessment the Council was of the opinion that the community has demonstrated that SW3 meets the three criteria as set out in the NPPF (below).</p> <p><i>'- Where the green space is in reasonable close proximity to the community it serves;</i></p> <p><i>- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>- beauty;</i></li> <li><i>- historic significance;</i></li> <li><i>- recreational value (including as a playing field);</i></li> <li><i>- tranquillity;</i></li> <li><i>- or richness of its wildlife;</i></li> </ul> <p><i>- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'</i></p> <p>However, the Council would not want to hinder the appropriate expansion or extension of an existing identified employment area and / or business should there be a need to do so in the future. The Council is</p>

		course, be the subject of a planning application and such development proposals would include appropriate boundary treatment and landscaping. This would ensure that any redevelopment proposals retained the attractive appearance of the site without the need for the imposition of a restrictive LGS designation.	mindful of the important role that local businesses play within the communities in which they are situated and the contribution they make to the local economy.  The Local Green Space Policy as proposed within the Local Plan allows a level of flexibility, by suggesting that if the harm of losing the asset is significantly outweighed by the benefits of proposed development, then planning permission could be granted.
24.11.17	Landmark Planning	Policy 45 of the Pre Submission Local Plan makes provision for a number of sites to be designated as Local Green Spaces (LGS). It is clear that in order for a site to be designated as a LGS, it should satisfy the criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Where such designation applies, planning permission will not be permitted for a development proposal that results in the loss of the area unless the benefits of the development outweigh its loss. In the case of the proposed LGS at Tigers Road (SW6), the area of land lies within a commercial rather than residential area and accordingly, its proximity to the local community is questioned. Furthermore, it is hard to see how the existing area is demonstrably special to the local community or what significance it holds. The land at Tigers Way that includes area SW6 was purchased in 2002 from the Secretary of State by my clients, Draper Commercial (part of Draper Property) and over time, new buildings have been built and the land developed to form the attractive commercial area that exists today. Draper Property need to retain the flexibility to alter the layout of the Tigers Road site as tenants' needs change. This includes the ability to be able to use the area that the Council intend to designate as LGS. Any future development of this land would, of course, be the subject of a planning application and such development proposals would include appropriate boundary	Comment noted.  As illustrated within the Local Green Space Assessment the Council was of the opinion that the community has demonstrated that SW6 meets the three criteria as set out in the NPPF (below).  <i>'- Where the green space is in reasonable close proximity to the community it serves;</i>  <i>- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its;</i> <i>- beauty;</i> <i>- historic significance;</i> <i>- recreational value (including as a playing field);</i> <i>- tranquillity;</i> <i>- or richness of its wildlife;</i>  <i>- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'</i>  However, the Council would not want to hinder the appropriate expansion or extension of an existing identified employment area and / or business should there be a need to do so in the future. The Council is mindful of the important role that local businesses play within the communities in which they are situated and

		<p>treatment and landscaping. This would ensure that any redevelopment proposals retained the attractive appearance of the site without the need for the imposition of a restrictive LGS designation.</p>	<p>the contribution they make to the local economy.</p> <p>The Local Green Space Policy as proposed within the Local Plan allows a level of flexibility, by suggesting that if the harm of losing the asset is significantly outweighed by the benefits of proposed development, then planning permission could be granted.</p>
06.12.17	Mr Kotak (local landowner)	<p>Thank you for your letter dated on 8th November 2017. I have a few concerns that I would like to bring to your attention with regards to the proposal of Local Green Space on 1 Ladysmith Road, LE18 4UZ.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How has this proposal come about?</li> <li>2. Why has this proposal come about?</li> <li>3. How would this affect the future valuation of my land/property for future sale?</li> <li>4. Who has proposed this plan?</li> <li>5. How exactly would this benefit me?</li> <li>6. How exactly would this benefit the local residents?</li> <li>7. How many other gardens in the area have been proposed for Local Green Space?</li> </ol> <p>My concerns are based on my personal circumstances going forward, but also, there has been an active planning application that has recently been appealed... a further planning application is also being proposed, how would this be affected?</p> <p>Based on the information provided to me via post on 8th November 2017, I would like to state that I politely OBJECT to the proposal of MY land being used as Local Green Space.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Upon the receipt of Mr Kotak's questions, the Council responded to Mr Kotak with the following.</p> <p><i>'Thank you for getting in touch with the Council regarding the proposed Local Green Space designation at Ladysmith Road, South Wigston (SW10). I will endeavour to answer all of your questions below.</i></p> <p><u><i>How has the proposal come about and, why has the proposal come about?</i></u></p> <p><i>National government in its planning policy document, the National Planning Policy Framework (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2</a>), sets out the national planning policy relating to Local Green Spaces. The document in paragraph 76, states that –</i></p> <p><i>'76. Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green</i></p>

			<p><i>Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.'</i></p> <p><i>As the Council is currently producing its New Local Plan, land areas for Local Green Space designation can be identified. Through the production of the New Local Plan, local community groups proposed a number of areas of land for Local Green Space designation and submitted them to the Council. Within each of the site submissions received, the local community group set out why the land area was special to them and the value that the area held within the community. Once the Council had received the submissions, the proposed sites were assessed against nationally set criteria. The criteria is set out within the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 77. I have set out the criteria for you below.</i></p> <p><i>'77. The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i></li> <li><i>• where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i></li> <li><i>• where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'</i> <p><i>The proposed sites that met the nationally set criteria were then put forward for Local Green Space designation as part of the New Local Plan. As part of the process the Council contacted all of the landowners of the proposed sites, for comment.</i></p> </li></ul>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>It should be noted that further information regarding Local Green Spaces can be found in the national governments National Planning Practice Guidance on the following link - <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance</a>.</i></p> <p><u><i>How would this affect the future valuation of my land / property for future sale?</i></u></p> <p><i>It is not a question that can be answered by the Council as it is unknown whether or not it would affect the value of land.</i></p> <p><u><i>Who has proposed this Plan?</i></u></p> <p><i>The Council is producing the New Local Plan, which the Local Green Space designation forms part of, however the Council did not initially propose sites for Local Green Space designation; sites were submitted by local community groups. The Council assessed the proposed sites against the nationally set criteria.</i></p> <p><u><i>How exactly would this benefit me and how exactly would this benefit the local residents?</i></u></p> <p><i>The Local Green Space designation is a way that the local community can protect areas of green space that are of particular importance to them.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted though, that the Local Green Space designation would not normally be appropriate on land that has planning permission for development. The Council would also not encourage the use of Local Green Space designations on private residential garden land.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>How many other gardens in the area have been proposed for Local Green Space?</u></p> <p><i>As far as the Council is aware, none of the Local Green Space designations being proposed within the Council's New Local Plan are areas of private residential garden land.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to the above, I would like to reiterate, that the Council would not encourage the use of Local Green Space designations on private residential garden land or land that has extant planning permission for development. If the land in question (SW10), is private residential garden land or it has extant planning permission for development please could you inform us. The more information that you submit to the Council regarding the site, the more informed we can be.</i></p> <p><i>If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to get in contact.'</i></p> <p>The Council would like to reiterate that the Local Green Space designation would not normally be appropriate on land that has planning permission for development. The Council would also not encourage the use of Local Green Space designations on private residential garden land.</p> <p>The Council has received no further evidence to suggest that the land in question (proposed for Local Green Space designation) has extant planning permission or is a residential garden.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Council considers that the land comprising SW10 conforms to national policy and guidance regarding Local Green Space designation.</p>
10.12.17	Highcroft	Thanks for sending me details of the Local Plan. I am	Comment of support noted.

	Householders Association	<p>delighted that Highcroft Park has been proposed as a Local Green Space and it is interesting to read about the wider plans across the borough.</p> <p>I wonder if I could pass on one specific point in relation to the proposals for Highcroft Park. On the map showing the park as a Local Green Space the shaded area does not seem to include the two access paths to the park from Park Crescent and Glen Way. This may seem like a small point, but it is important to us that these two paths also come under the same designation. Is it possible on the plan that these paths can also be shaded the same colour?</p>	The Council would not object to the two pathways into the park being designated within the Local Green Space designation (O1).
15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>Local Green Space Designation</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> Good that the majority of the submitted Local Green Spaces in South Wigston are included as fulfilling the Government criteria, and are formally proposed as allocations on the Adopted Policies Map.</p> <p><b>B)</b> Good that Local Green Spaces are now in Chapter 10, Protected Places – a much more appropriate position than Chapter 5, Healthy Communities, in the previous iteration of the Plan.</p> <p><b>C) Policy 45, page 131.</b> This is now weaker because instead of just stating that any development proposal which will result in the loss of a Local Green Space will not be permitted, the following wording has been added: “...unless the harm of losing the asset is significantly outweighed by the benefits of the proposed development.” This addition seems to be in direct contradiction of the NPPF guidance that this designation would have a high degree of protection from new development. In addition, local authorities are left to determine how to implement this in partnership with local communities. In our view the</p>	<p>Comment of support for points A and B welcomed.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 78 states that <i>'local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts'</i>. At paragraph 87 of the NPPF it is stated that <i>'as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'</i>.</p> <p>In addition NPPF paragraph 89 to 91 specify the types of development that would be appropriate (by exception) with Green Belt designation areas.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with national planning policy, the Council amended the previous Local Green Space wording (Preferred Options Local Plan document) to add a level of flexibility that does not preclude all development. The Council considers that not having the amended wording that allows some development, ie, should the harm of losing the asset be significantly outweighed by the benefits of the development, would not be consistent with the NPPF.</p>

		<p>Council should use this autonomy to plan for full protection – and remove the added wording in the quote. That would fit with the outline of NPPF guidance in paras 1.28 and 1.29 of the Non technical SA summary, that the NPPF requires policies to deliver : <i>"conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment"....</i></p> <p>And  <i>"identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance:</i></p> <p>It's notable that the wording on Conservation areas in Policy 41, was much more robust – listing circumstances in which development <i>"will not be permitted."</i> There isn't a comparable caveat <i>"unless the harm outweighs the benefits."</i> If this can be left out for Conservation Areas – surely it can be left out for Local Green Space?</p> <p><b>D)</b> Local Green Spaces are currently in a silo – there is no cross referencing in any other part of the Plan. The designation needs to be more fully integrated - with references at appropriate points in the text of other chapters.</p>	
18.12.17	Define Planning (Bloor Homes)	<p><b>POLICY 48 INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>The intent of Policy 48 is supported as it is critical that the future growth in the Borough is appropriately supported by the necessary community, highway and utilities infrastructure.</p> <p>However, the critical role of other bodies in the planning, funding and delivery of infrastructure should also be explicitly referred to in the policy in order to encourage their proactive involvement. For example, the policy should reflect that it is the responsibility of the utilities company to provide the necessary water supply and wastewater infrastructure to support</p>	<p>Comment noted. No proposed change to the Local Plan document for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>The Council considers that it has demonstrated that the policy and infrastructure requirements of the Local Plan are viable and achievable. Such has been demonstrated within the Council's Whole Plan Viability report evidence base document.</p> <p>For clarity, the Council propose the inclusion of some minor wording to paragraph 11.1.6, as follows –</p> <p><i>'...as set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, as well as guidance set out in the National</i></p>

		<p>development. Their investment programmes are not necessarily integrated with Local Plans, and often will not address the development requirements for an area until specific proposals become committed, normally through the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Moreover, the Borough Council must demonstrate that the policy and infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan (cumulatively) are achievable and do not render sustainable development unviable (NPPF paragraphs 158, 173-174). That must be considered at this stage.</p> <p><b>Soundness:</b> For the reasons set out above, Bloor Homes object to Policy 44, which is considered unsound on the basis that it has not been <b>positively prepared</b> as it is not based on a strategy that will ensure that the objectively assessed housing needs will be met within the plan period.</p> <p><b>Proposed Change:</b> The policy and infrastructure requirements of the plan should be tested to ensure that they do not unduly restrict sustainable development coming forward and Policy 44 should be revised as set out the role of the infrastructure providers and the Borough Council.</p>	<p><i>Planning Practice Guidance. Any contributions sought by the Council will be done so through the guidance set out in the Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document'.</i></p>
15.12.17	Leicester City Council	<p><b>Chapter Eleven – Delivery Plan</b> Paragraph 11.1.10 - 11.1.12</p> <p>The City Council supports the recognition that development in the Borough could have negative impacts on infrastructure in other local authority areas.</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>The Council notes the suite of policies relating to strategic infrastructure, and will seek to work closely</p>	<p>Comment of support welcomed.</p>

		with the Borough on infrastructure requirements that may impact on the City arising from growth.	
18.12.17	Harborough District Council	<p><u>Policy 46 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions</u></p> <p>The addition of the following wording is suggested in the final sentence after: 'Any development that has an impact within the Borough . . .', suggest adding 'or outside the Borough'. This would mirror the wording of the Harborough Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy IN1 Infrastructure provision which refers to ' . . . whether within Harborough District or outside'.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council is proposing minor modifications to the Local Plan from the comments received from Harborough District Council for the reasoning set out below.</p> <p>To ensure that both the Borough's Local Plan and Harborough District's Local Plan hold a consistent approach to infrastructure mitigation and developer contributions, the following wording will be added.</p> <p><i>'Any development that has an impact within the Borough (<b>or neighbouring authority areas</b>) will be required to contribute towards the provision of and / or financial contribution towards necessary mitigation infrastructure measures'.</i></p>
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Monitoring Framework</p> <p>The Council has not included, within the Monitoring Framework section of the Plan, a policy relating to an early review of the Local Plan. This is considered to be a fundamental omission from the Plan and one which could make the Plan unsound as it stands.</p> <p>The Council highlight the issues relating to the review of the Local Plan in paragraphs 1.5.6 and 1.5.7 of the Local Plan which state that the Council will commence a review of the Plan no later than five years from the adoption of this Plan or potentially earlier if the Plan is found not to be delivering its targets, there is evidence of unmet housing need which cannot be met in the other authorities within the HMA or the post 2031 strategy set out in the SGP comes forward at a faster rate than currently anticipated. This approach is considered to be inadequate for a number of reasons.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work closely with all authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, not only in providing the required number of homes up to 2031, but post 2031 in line with the Strategic Growth plan. In Local Plan paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 the Council has committed to a review of the Local Plan no later than 5 year from adoption (consistent with national policy and guidance) and has also set out what would trigger an earlier review. The Council considers that the commitment shown in paragraphs 1.5.6 to 1.5.7 illustrate the Council's intentions in an appropriate manner. However, the Council would not object if the wording was required to be set out within a new Local Plan policy.</p> <p>In December 2017, the Council approved the Joint Statement of Co-operation Relating to Objectively</p>

		<p>Firstly, all Local Plans should be reviewed every five years in line with Government guidance. Therefore, the statement does no more than re-iterate current guidance. Secondly, in order to carry full weight and to ensure that any review is carried out in accordance with this intention, any review mechanism should be included within the Plan as a Policy.</p> <p>The statements included in paragraph 1.5.6 also contain no firm commitment on the timing and completion of the Local Plan review. The Policy refers to commencing a review within 5 years of the adoption of the Plan but there is no specific timeframe for completion of the review. This means that the Council has no specific imperative to do anything but start the review process which may, under the current policy, never be completed. There is of course no definition of the term 'commenced' which could, in its simplest terms, mean beginning the collection of evidence. With a fair wind, it would be at least 3 years before any Local Plan review would be adopted. Added to the potential 5 years for the Council to commence a review, this could lead to eight years before a Local Plan review is adopted.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that in order to be as effective as possible, the review mechanism should be contained in a policy within the Monitoring Framework section and should be far more robust and set within a definitive timescale.</p> <p>Any review clause should therefore be based upon an end date which is in the control of the LPA i.e. the date of submission of the Local Plan review. This approach would provide certainty that any need to accommodate unmet housing needs from other authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA would be addressed</p>	<p>Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017). The joint statement sets out that up to 2031 the local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area have sufficient capacity to meet the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area OAN for housing.</p> <p>The statement sets out that the theoretical total housing capacity of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area exceeded the OAN for housing by over 100,000 new homes. In addition, all local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA have been working together on the production of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan. The relationship of the Strategic Growth Plan to Local Plans is set out at paragraph 1.5.2 of the Local Plan, which states <i>'although the Strategic Growth Plan deals with the time period up to 2050, it treats the period's pre 2031 and post 2031 very differently. Pre 2031, the housing and employment Objectively Assessed Needs for the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA, set out within the HEDNA, will be delivered through each of the local authorities individual Local Plan's. The Strategic Growth Plan therefore focuses on the period post 2031, for which it identifies a 'notional housing need'. It recognises that for this period there are no reliable estimates of population growth or household change, thus it estimates future housing needs by projecting forwards the annual figures set out within the HEDNA'.</i></p> <p>Taking account of the above, the Council does not consider it necessary to commit to an early review of the Local Plan upon adoption of the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan due to the growth plans strategy being in place from the 2031 time period.</p> <p>In addition it should be noted that the Department for</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>in an expeditious manner. Given that Leicester City has already identified that it will have unmet housing needs and will need help from other HMA partners to deliver its unmet need up to 2031 (see paragraph 4.2.5 of the OWLP), this approach is even more essential.</p> <p>Review policies have to be treated with a degree of caution as there are examples of other authorities where, despite their Local Plans including review policies, significant delays associated with Local Plan progress have occurred. This has included Local Plans in the following locations as examples:</p> <p>(1) Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) - the adopted Core Strategy states that a partial review will be adopted in 2016. No significant progress made to date.</p> <p>(2) Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy (2014) - Policy SS2 states that the Council will undertake and complete an early and comprehensive review of the Core Strategy by 2016 – No significant progress has been made to date.</p> <p>These examples go to highlight the importance of a suitably worded policy which compels the LPA to complete a review for submission by a specific timeframe. This will ensure that any unmet housing needs are addressed as quickly as possible in line with the Government’s commitment to tackling the housing crisis.</p> <p>Gladman consider that the wording of the review mechanism therefore needs to be clear, easily understandable, effective and be enforceable. This issue was discussed at length at the North West Leicestershire Local Plan Examination with the Inspector keen to ensure that any review policy was meaningful.</p>	<p>Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has specified the introduction of regulations that require local authorities to review Local Plans at least every five years. DCLG suggest (in a letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> December 2017) that, every 5 years from adoption, authorities must carry out an assessment of whether the Plan remains relevant and effectively addresses the needs of the local community or whether policies need updating. Depending on the assessment outcome, the local authority will publish their reasons for not updating policies, or update their Local Development Schemes to set out the timetable for updating their Plan (and then should update their Plan). The Council is not aware of any recent DCLG statement that suggests that local authorities should set out Local Plan review completion / end dates within its Local Plan.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>North West Leicestershire have subsequently adopted their Local Plan including wording for the local plan review mechanism. Although Gladman still have a number of concerns with the review policy as it is now written, it is fundamentally a policy that is clear, understandable and sets a number of triggers and targets which means it will be "effective". The wording of the review mechanism now contains a start date, an end date that is in the control of the Local Planning Authority and sets out the consequences of failing to meet the target dates.</p> <p>Given the recognition that there will be unmet housing need within the HMA and the fact that all Leicester and Leicestershire authorities are committed to the preparation of a Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) to address the spatial distribution of housing and employment needs across the HMA, it is essential for the review mechanism to make reference to the SGP as the adoption of this document should be the trigger for the commencement of the OWLP review. It is Gladman's opinion that the review mechanism in the OWLP, and indeed all Leicester and Leicestershire Local Plans should mirror that in the North West Leicestershire Local Plan with the amendment to make specific reference to the SGP. This will ensure that all of the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities are aligned in their approach to addressing the outcomes of the SGP and that all Local Plan reviews would be triggered on a common basis in line with the agreement of the Memorandum of Understanding.</p> <p>The OWLP Review Mechanism should therefore read:</p> <p>Oadby and Wigston Borough Council are committed to working with all Leicester and Leicestershire Local Planning Authorities on the preparation of the Strategic</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Growth Plan which is anticipated will be adopted in [insert anticipated adoption date]. Once adopted, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council will commit to the delivery of the Strategic Growth Plan through the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with all the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. The Strategic Growth Plan will then provide the fundamental basis for the review of the Oadby and Wigston Borough Local Plan and the preparation of the subsequent Local Plans for all other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. The Borough Council will commence a review of this Local Plan (defined as being publication of an invitation to make representations in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations (2012)) within 3 months of the adoption of this Local Plan. The Plan Review will be submitted for Examination within two years from the commencement of the review. In the event that the reviewed plan is not submitted within two years then this plan will be deemed out of date.</p>	
11.12.17	Natural England	<p>We note and welcome the completion of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the pre-submission version of the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan. Natural England concurs with the report's conclusion that the Local Plan includes a wide range of development management policies, aiming to protect and enhance the economic, social and environmental conditions of the Borough. These should go a long way towards mitigating the potential negative effects of the overall scale of development proposed. We welcome the commitment to give further consideration to potential mitigation measures as well as the approach to monitoring the likely significant effects of the plan following this pre-submission consultation.</p>	Comment noted.
11.12.17	Natural England	<p>Natural England welcomes the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan and considers that the scope of the report, its</p>	Comment noted.

		<p>methodology and conclusions meet the requirements of the Habitats Directive and associated guidance. We note the conclusion that the potential for the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan to have likely significant effects on European sites in combination with the Local Plan for Rutland County cannot yet be ruled out, due to the early stage of the Rutland Local Plan and the lack of solid HRA conclusions. We welcome the commitment to revisit the issue during forthcoming stages of the HRA for the Rutland Local Plan. Any further iterations of the HRA for the Oadby and Wigston Local Plan should consider new evidence relating to the Rutland Local Plan as this becomes available.</p>	
18.12.17	Gladman	<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Under Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan's proposals on sustainable development when judged against reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The Council need to ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Council's decision making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p> <p>Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The SA Report has been undertaken as a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In line with the PPG the document has been prepared as a joint SA/SEA process. It is therefore required to address the requirements of the SEA Regulations (Art. 5 and Annex I) which are detailed in Table 1.1 of the SA Report. The table shows where the requirements of these regulations have been met in the SA Report.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the SA Report has presented the findings in relation to the reasonable alternative Policy Options for the Local Plan. The findings have been reached in line with the methodology for the SA which is presented in Chapter 2 of the SA Report and was applied in a consistent and transparent manner throughout the process. The detailed matrices showing the justifications for each of the scores given in relation to the SA objectives against which each policy option has been considered are presented in Appendix 7. The Council's reasons for selecting or rejecting policy options are presented in Appendix 8. The detailed SA</p>

		satisfactory SA has resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at Examination or being subjected to legal challenge.	matrices for the policies taken forward in the Pre-Submission version of the Local Plan are presented in Appendix 9 while a summary of the likely sustainability effects of the these policies are presented in Chapter 4. As such it has been demonstrated that the SA Report meets the requirements of the Regulations and SEA Directive.
18.12.17	Leicestershire County Council	The Sustainability Assessment shows that a decline in biodiversity is expected as a result of the local plan. This seems to be accepted as just what's going to happen.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The levels of growth that the Council is expected to accommodate over the Plan period up to 2031 has required the Council to look beyond the existing extent of the urban area and allocate greenfield land. The Council however is committed in providing development that has the minimum negative impact to the Borough's green and open spaces and areas that are important due to their biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 8 Green Infrastructure seeks a net gain in Green Infrastructure through the preservation and enhancement of open spaces and assets that comprise the Borough's Green Infrastructure and its network.</p> <p>Local Plan Policy 37 Biodiversity and Geodiversity supports development proposals that proactively seek a net gain in geodiversity and biodiversity. The policy also states that development that conserves, protects and enhances biodiversity and geodiversity will be supported by the Council.</p>
18.12.17	Pegasus Group (Oadby Grange)	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal that supports the Pre Submission Plan does not assess the land at Oadby Grange.</p> <p>It does assess the land beyond the Oadby Grange site</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The reasons why the Land at Oadby Grange has not been appraised as a reasonable alternative in the SA Report have been set out above.</p> <p>While site OWBC23 (which the objector has used as a</p>

		<p>to the east (site ref. OWBC23) which is detached from the urban area and thus clearly less suitable. Whilst that site was discounted, it acts as a crude proxy for how the Oadby Grange site might have been assessed. When that site is compared with some of the larger allocations (including OWBC 24, 28 and 44) it can be seen that on balance even that land outperformed some of the allocated sites.</p> <p>The Oadby Grange site would have similar locational characteristics, but being located immediately adjacent to the PUA, it would represent a more logical and appropriate location for development.</p>	<p>proxy to compare the Land at Oadby Grange to sites which have been included for allocation) performs favourably in comparison to the noted allocated sites for some of the SA objectives the allocation of specific sites is outside of the scope of the SA Report. Appendix 6 presents a summary of the Council's reasoning for allocating or discounting sites as communicated to LUC during preparation of the SA. The SA Report does not present a ranking of sites for allocation but merely forms part of the evidence base for the selection of sites. Issues beyond the findings of the SA Report have been taken into consideration as part of this decision making process and have thereby influenced which sites have been allocated.</p>
13.12.17	North West Leicestershire District Council	<p>We have reviewed the document from a strategic aspect, assessing any potential implications for this district. It is noted that you propose to meet your identified housing and employment needs in full. We support this approach and have no further comments to make at this stage.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
06.11.17	Amec Foster Wheeler	<p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf.</p> <p>We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult with National Grid on any future plans or strategies.</p>
06.11.17	Severn Trent	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation.</p> <p>We currently have no specific comments to make, but please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to consult with Severn Trent on any future plans or strategies.</p>
15.12.17	Blaby Parish Council	<p>Blaby Parish Council is pleased to see there are no current plans to develop the open countryside adjacent to our Parish.</p>	<p>Comment of support noted.</p> <p>The South East Leicestershire Transport Study</p>

		<p>We are pleased to note that Oadby and Wigston are planning to meet their housing need but are concerned that may impact on Welford Road and Hospital Lane in Blaby Parish.</p> <p>We would therefore like to be kept informed and consulted on any further or future developments.</p>	<p>undertaken as evidence base for the Local Plan highlights the severity of the congestion within the Borough, specifically along its routes as well as at its junctions.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the limitations of the existing highway network and has sought to locate development within locations that have the least detrimental impact.</p>
18.12.17	Davidsons Group		<p>Comments made by Davidsons Group have been incorporated into the Landmark Planning (Land North of Newton Lane) comments and responses. Landmark Planning has submitted comments on behalf of Davidsons Group for Land North of Newton Lane, however due to IT issues could not supply the accompanying Transport Appraisal and Landscape Framework Plan. Davidsons Group submitted the accompanying appraisal and framework plan.</p>
15.12.17	Saffron Tree Action Group (STAG)	<p><b><u>The Sustainability Assessment Non-Technical Summary</u></b></p> <p><b>A)</b> Our view remains strongly that the changes to the wording used by LUC at SA 8 severely undermines the protection of green assets. As we argued in response to the previous draft, by opting for "biodiversity and geodiversity" the potential for protection is seriously weakened, because the bar is set way higher on designated sites – whereas the majority of natural green space throughout the Borough is non-designated, not least because of the limits of the Biodiversity Audits and the Green Infrastructure Plan. We are still of the view that the previous wording should be re-instated: <i>"To protect and enhance the natural landscape and green spaces and provide opportunities for public access to the countryside"</i>. That wording is entirely consistent with the NPPF strategic priority re protecting the environment. We don't view justification of the</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As has been clarified following consultation representations received at the Preferred Options SA stage the Council received specific advice concerning the changes to the SA Objectives in the SA Framework and their associated SA Assumptions prior to the commencement of that consultation period and are in agreement with LUC that the changes were necessary. In order to make the SA Objectives more robust, focused and compliant with the SEA Regulations, LUC advised the Council to amend SA2 and SA8 and a further SA Objective (SA9) was added. This allowed for a SA Framework which is more precisely focussed on the individual SEA topics thereby allowing the effects of the new Local Plan to be identified, pulled out and appropriately considered. Previously, SA8 would have considered both SEA topics (a) biodiversity and (l) landscape together meaning that effects on these</p>

		<p>changed wording of SA8 in terms of ease of monitoring as sound.</p> <p><b>B)</b> The SA papers fail to take full account of the historic and environmental significance of Local Green Spaces. It looks as though the designation is being treated by LUC assessors as if it's still in Chapter 5, Healthy Communities. In the table on page 17 there is a green assessment against SA6 and SA7 (re healthy community) – but only a weak assessment against SA7, 8, and 9 re historic environment, biodiversity and geodiversity, and Landscape. These are key features of the designation and the community commitment to protecting them – so they should be given due significance in the SA assessments.</p> <p><b>C)</b> Very few references to Local Green Spaces – (only at para 1.86). Local Green Spaces should be cited, for example, in para 1.6; and Policy 45 should be referenced as significant in the third, seventh, eighth, and ninth right hand boxes of Table 1 summarising Sustainability Issues on pp 6 and 7.</p> <p><b>D)</b> P. 40 monitoring table – re SA8 – should include monitoring re conditions protecting hedgerows and requiring succession tree planting.</p>	<p>topics would be more difficult to distinguish from each other.</p> <p>The Council and LUC are confident that the changes and the updated approach to the SA framework allow for a more rigorous assessment of the Local Plan's impact on biodiversity (SA8), access to the countryside (SA2) and impact upon the landscape (SA9). The SA framework is presented in Table 2.2 in the full SA Report (Table 2 in the SA Report: Non-Technical Summary). In regard to this comment (particularly with regard to the issue of impact on the countryside and green space and related impacts on access and biodiversity) the SA framework should be considered in combination with the SA Assumptions in Table A4.1 of Appendix 4 of the full SA Report. The SA Assumptions have not been included in the Non-Technical Summary given the summary nature of this document. The SA Assumptions demonstrate how access to the countryside has been considered as part of the appraisal for SA2, as well as how development within the countryside or a green space which has the potential to adversely impact upon biodiversity has been considered as part of the appraisal of SA8. SA8 does not focus solely on designated sites given that the assumption includes the consideration for 'development site options within the countryside or a green space (which) could have a minor negative effect on biodiversity'. Ultimately none of the key content of the 'old' version of SA8 has been deleted, it has just been re-ordered to better reflect the SEA Regulations and the individual SEA topics.</p> <p>The individual SA objectives are part of the larger SA framework and are considered together to appraise a site or policy option. All sites and policies considered have been appraised against each of the SA Objectives.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>The Pre-Submission Local Plan includes Policy 45 to ensure the protection of Local Green Spaces in Chapter 10. The SA Report has reflected this including the corrected new policy number (45 – the policy number was previously 5.7 in the Preferred Options Local Plan). Please see Table 4 in the Non-Technical Summary and Table 4.10 in the full SA Report.</p> <p>The full SA Report shows that Policy 45 has been considered as sitting as part of Chapter 10 – Protected Places in the Local Plan. Please see Table 4.8 which shows a summary of the likely sustainability effects of the policies in this chapter as well as the preceding text from paragraph 4.86 which gives a summary of the likely sustainability effects of the policies in this chapter. Detailed justification in relation to each SA Objective against which Policy 45 has been appraised is presented in Appendix 9 of the full SA Report (page 955). This information has not been re-presented in SA Report: Non-Technical Summary given the summary nature of this document.</p> <p>Policy 45 in the Local Plan sets out the Council’s approach to the designation of Local Green Spaces and how/in what circumstances they should be protected. As such this policy and therefore the protection which Local Green Spaces are afforded in the Local Plan have been given the same level of consideration as other policies contained in the Local Plan. The SA Report: Non-Technical Summary presents only a summarised version of the likely sustainability effects of each policy and site contained in the Local Plan. In this regard the cumulative effects considering the policies in the plan and the allocated sites are presented from paragraph 1.47. The positive effects that Policy 45 and the protection of Local Green Spaces are likely to have with</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>regard to SA5 (social inclusion), SA6 (integrated communities) and SA9 (landscape) in paragraphs 1.63, 1.68 and 1.86 respectively have been highlighted given that these are the SA objectives against which Policy 45 is expected to have the most significant positive effects. The full appraisal of this policy and the justification for the sustainability effects recorded against each of the SA objectives is presented in Appendix 9 from page 952 of the full SA Report.</p> <p>Table 1 in the SA Report: Non-Technical Summary presents an overview of the key sustainability issues for the Borough. These issues have been highlighted following an establishment of the baseline conditions for the Borough as presented in Appendix 3 of the full SA Report. The right hand column reflects the likely evolution of each issue identified if the Local Plan was not put in place. The right hand column does not make reference to any policies in the emerging Local Plan as in this scenario the policies in this document have not been adopted. For example pressure for development on open space in Oadby and Wigston has been identified as a key sustainability issue which Local Green Spaces might play a role in preventing. Policy 45 is not reflected in the right hand column however given that the Local Plan would not be in place and instead existing policies in the Core Strategy would be depended upon to address this issue.</p> <p>The SEA Regulations require that “the responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme”. As such it is considered appropriate for the Proposed Monitoring Framework presented in Table 10 in the SA Report: Non-Technical Summary and Table 7.1 of the full SA Report to focus on indicators for monitoring the potential significant sustainability effects</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>of implementing the Local Plan. As highlighted in paragraph 1.151 while no significant cumulative adverse effects have been identified through the SA Report a precautionary approach has been taken to monitor indicators where uncertainty has been recorded against the related SA objective.</p> <p>The proposed monitoring indicators are those which can be actively monitored; i.e. those for which data is forthcoming. Monitoring relating to the condition of protecting hedgerows and requirements to plant trees is considered to be overly onerous and potentially unmeasurable given that data to support this monitoring is unlikely to be available.</p>
--	--	--	---