



The assessment of potential sites to deliver the housing allocations for the Selected Options





Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	1
2 Assumptions	2
3 Site Selection Process.....	3
4 Option 2 - Core Strategy.....	6
5 Option 4 - SDA at Scraftoft North	16
6 Option 5 - SDA at Kibworth.....	25
7 Option 6 - SDA at Lutterworth.....	34
8 Conclusions	42
9 Appendix 1 Housing requirements by Settlement for the Selected Options	44

List of Tables

4.1 Option 2: Market Harborough Potential Allocations	7
4.2 Option 2: Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby Potential Allocations	8
4.3 Option 2: Lutterworth Potential Allocations	8
4.4 Option 2: Billesdon Potential Allocations	9
4.5 Option 2: Fleckney Potential Allocations	10
4.6 Option 2: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations	11
4.7 Option 2: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations	11
4.8 Option 2: Bitteswell Potential Allocations	12
4.9 Option 2: The Claybrookes Potential Allocation	12
4.10 Option 2: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations	13
4.11 Option 2: Hallaton Potential Allocations	14
4.12 Option 2: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations	14
5.1 Option 4: Market Harborough Potential Allocations	16
5.2 Option 4: Lutterworth Potential Allocations	17
5.3 Option 4: Billesdon Potential Allocations	17
5.4 Option 4: Fleckney Potential Allocations	18
5.5 Option 4: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations	19
5.6 Option 4: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations	19
5.7 Option 4: Bitteswell Potential Allocations	20
5.8 Option 4: The Claybrookes Potential Allocations	21
5.9 Option 4: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations	21
5.10 Option 4: Hallaton Potential Allocations	22
5.11 Option 4: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations	22
6.1 Option 5: Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby potential allocation	25
6.2 Option 5: Market Harborough Potential Allocations	26
6.3 Option 4: Lutterworth Potential Allocations	26
6.4 Option 5: Billesdon Potential Allocations	27
6.5 Option 5: Fleckney Potential Allocations	27
6.6 Option 5: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations	28
6.7 Option 5: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations	28
6.8 Option 5: Bitteswell Potential Allocations	29
6.9 Option 5: The Claybrookes Potential Allocations	30
6.10 Option 5: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations	30
6.11 Option 5: Hallaton Potential Allocations	31
6.12 Option 5: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations	31
7.1 Option 6: Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby Potential Allocations	34
7.2 Option 6: Market Harborough Potential Allocations	35
7.3 Option 6: Billesdon Potential Allocations	35
7.4 Option 6: Fleckney Potential Allocations	36
7.5 Option 6: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations	37
7.6 Option 6: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations	37
7.7 Option 6: Bitteswell Potential Allocations	38

7.8 Option 6: The Claybrookes Potential Allocations.....	38
7.9 Option 6: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations	39
7.10 Option 6: Hallaton Potential Allocations.....	40
7.11 Option 6: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations	40
8.1 Summary of Options –all potential allocations up to limit of need for each settlement.....	42
8.2 Summary of Options –all potential allocations up to limit of need for each settlement excluding sites below 50 dwellings	43
9.1 Appendix 1 Housing requirements by Settlement for the Selected Options	44

1

Introduction

The Options Consultation in September – October 2015 put forward 9 Options for the distribution of housing development during the plan period. Following consultation and further assessment by members and officers, this was reduced to the following selected options for further analysis.

- Option 2: Core Strategy Distribution;
- Option 5: Kibworth SDA (North East proposal only);
- Option 6: Lutterworth SDA; and
- a variation of Option 4: Scraftoft / Thurnby, but based on a minimum of 1,200 dwellings in the vicinity of Scraftoft North.

In the case of SDA-based options, the remaining housing requirements would be distributed to settlements in Harborough in accordance with the distribution used for the Core Strategy.

The purpose of the analysis described in this paper was to inform the assessment of the selected options and to ensure that each selected option would deliver sufficient housing land in terms of Local Plan allocations without over-reliance on the development management process and neighbourhood plans to bring sites forward. The aim was to ensure that at least two-thirds of sites were allocated in the Local Plan.

It identifies the possible site allocations that would be required to help deliver most of the housing requirement by settlement under each of the 4 selected options. The sites are based on the information in the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA) Update 2015. It describes work undertaken in summer 2016, but some information has been updated since. The updated information is indicated by the use of *italics*.

The exercise was only intended to identify if sufficient suitable sites were available at that time. Once the preferred option had been identified, then final allocations would be made based upon the latest land availability information, including commitments and progress on neighbourhood plans in the meantime.

2 Assumptions

This process was undertaken in summer 2016 and was based on the housing needs and requirements assumed at that time, prior to the full HEDNA publication and to decisions being made about introduction of additional flexibility in housing provision to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere in the HMA, the impact of potential growth at Magna Park and other factors. The potential allocations identified for each selected option are based on a requirement of 550 dwellings per annum (dpa) or 11,000 dwellings in total, *compared with the requirement in the Proposed Submission Local Plan of 557 dpa (11,140 dwellings) and the actual provision of 640 dpa (12,400 dwellings).*

The capacities of the SDAs at Kibworth and east of Lutterworth depend on assumptions made about rates of delivery during the plan period. The assumptions made at the time of the the assessment of potential allocations were that Kibworth would deliver 1,490 dwellings in the plan period, Lutterworth 1,290 and Scraftoft 1,200. Subsequent discussions with developers have increased the figures for East of Lutterworth SDAs to 1,500, but the previous figure has been retained in this report. If the higher assumption was made, the requirement for each settlement would reduce slightly.

The housing to be delivered over the Local Plan period consists of Local Plan allocated sites, allocations in neighbourhood plans, windfall sites and other contributions to the overall housing requirement through the development management process. Small site development is particularly important in Harborough District, with many developments under 10 dwellings.

Commitments and completions to 31 March 2016 amounted to 6850, thus there were some 4150 dwellings left to deliver. It was expected that windfalls would contribute some 250 dwellings towards the end of the plan period (2021 to 2031), assumed to be 25 per year on sites outside the Rural Centres, Selected Rural Villages and countryside. This would mean that 3900 homes would need to be delivered via allocations (in the Local Plan or neighbourhood plans) and sites identified in the SHLAA that would be dealt with through the development management process, as well as through windfalls within the Rural centres and Selected Rural Villages. This figure is referred to here as the 'residual requirement'.

3 Site Selection Process

The potential allocations required to deliver each of the Selected Options were tested through a site assessment process and are detailed below. In general, sites of no less than 50 dwellings were to be taken forward as Local Plan allocations, following the 'strategic sites only' approach agreed after the Scoping Consultation. However, it was also agreed that some flexibility could be used in the definition of strategic sites. Here, therefore, potential allocations for sites above 20 dwellings have been assessed in order to test the deliverability of each option.

It has been assumed that the Local Plan should aim to allocate at least two thirds of the residual requirement in total, but not necessarily in each settlement. The additional dwellings would be delivered via neighbourhood plans, windfall sites and small sites coming forward via the development management route.

Potential allocations were identified for the following settlements:

- Market Harborough, Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby (taken together) and Lutterworth. (Broughton Astley had already allocated via their Neighbourhood Plan: these figures are included in the commitments figure).
- The Rural Centres of Fleckney, Husbands Bosworth and Ullesthorpe (the other Rural Centres either had made Neighbourhood Plans or were within 3 months of submission of a draft plan to an examiner). The Rural Centre of Billesdon had a made neighbourhood plan, but the uplift in housing numbers meant that there may be an under-allocation there. It was therefore also included.
- The Selected Rural Villages of Bitteswell, Dunton Bassett, the Claybrookes, Hallaton, Tilton and Tugby where there was no neighbourhood plan proposed, or there had been little progress in taking the neighbourhood plan process forward. Since the study some of these parishes have made progress with neighbourhood plans, and this is referred to in the analysis. However these settlements remain in the report.

The SHLAA 2015 sites above 50 dwellings and between 20 and 50 dwellings were identified as potential Local Plan allocations. Each of these potential allocations was tested against a series of assessments. All sites for settlements down to Selected Rural Village were investigated (except Broughton Astley, since sufficient sites there were already allocated via the Neighbourhood Plan and included in the commitments).

The Sustainability Appraisal Appendix D (September 2105) for all sites over 50 formed the first means of assessing the sites. In general, sustainability issues are the same across all sites within or adjoining a settlement, but a smaller number of appraisal criteria were important at site level; namely access to shops, wildlife corridors, trees and wildlife sites, agricultural land, heritage assets, access to green space and leisure facilities, landscape, air quality and flooding.

Following this assessment a further analysis of the sites was completed against a subsection of criteria in the draft local plan policy proposed in the Options Consultation document to advise development management decision making for non-allocated sites in the absence of Limits to Development. The criteria (*which have subsequently been superseded by more simplified criteria In Policy GD2 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan*) were as follows:

- Is within, adjacent to or closely relates to the existing built up area of the settlement;
- Respects the shape and form of the settlement in order to maintain its distinctive character and enhance it where possible;
- Is of an appropriate scale which reflects the settlement size, character and level of service provision;
- Retains existing natural boundaries such as trees, hedges, rivers and streams which either contribute to visual amenity or are protected for their ecological value
- Maintains important views and landmarks
- Does not result in the coalescence of settlements; and protects the physical and visual separation of neighbouring settlements
- Is sensitive to the landscape setting of the settlement
- Retains and where possible, enhances the distinctive qualities of the landscape character area in which it is situated
- Preserves and where possible, enhances the Conservation Area in which it is situated or adjacent to, where relevant
- Preserves and where possible, enhances the setting of any heritage asset, where the setting of that heritage asset would be affected by the proposal
- Provides for a safe vehicular and pedestrian access to the site and enables suitable footpath links to services and facilities within the settlement

Each potential site was assessed against these criteria; evidence from settlement profiles, landscape assessments and other data was used to inform the assessment. The landscape assessments were:

- Leicester PUA Landscape Character Assessments and Landscape Capacity Studies 2009 (and addendum 2016)
- Lutterworth and Broughton Astley Landscape Character Assessments and Landscape Capacity Study 2011
- Market Harborough Landscape Character Assessments and Landscape Capacity Studies 2009
- Rural Centres Landscape Character Assessments and Landscape Capacity Studies 2014

Where necessary a site visit was made to clarify any queries. Each site was then allocated a red, amber or green rating. Red sites were unsuitable, amber sites were borderline and green sites acceptable. The number of houses for all of the sites assessed as green was accrued and those sites used in the analysis of each of the options, as illustrated below. In some cases (mainly Option 2) amber sites were included to ensure sufficient potential allocations. These sites would require a further detailed assessment before they were actually allocated.

In the case of sites of between 20 and 50, the sustainability information was not available. These sites were assessed against the draft policy criteria only in order to provide assurance that land was available, but they were not intended to be allocated in the Local Plan. Instead they were left to be brought forward through the neighbourhood plan or development management process, although consideration could have been given to allocation if the Parish Council supported this in order to achieve certainty in the absence of a Local Plan.

In most cases constraints, mitigations required to make the site acceptable, or additional information required, were included together with other comments. These include reference to updated information since the study was undertaken, such as the grant or refusal of planning permission or progress on neighbourhood plans.

In the case of the Market Harborough and Scraftoft/ Thurnby/ Bushby, the potential sites listed were tailored to fit as closely as possible to the requirement for each option. In all other settlements, the full list of potential site allocations is given. This is because either there were insufficient sites to provide a choice (Lutterworth, Dunton Bassett, and Tilton) or there was insufficient information to distinguish between them at that stage and the choice was best left to a later stage in the plan preparation or to the development control process, or to a neighbourhood plan if one was to progress. This applies to Billesdon, Fleckney, Husbands Bosworth, Ullesthorpe, Bitteswell, The Claybrookes, and Hallaton.

4

Option 2 - Core Strategy

In this option 70% of all development is expected to take place in Market Harborough, Lutterworth, Broughton Astley and Scraptoft/ Thurnby / Bushby.

After commitments are taken into account, as set out in Appendix 1, Market Harborough would need to deliver 1,395 dwellings and Scraptoft/ Thurnby/ Bushby would need to deliver 353 dwellings. (This is after an adjustment, to cut 100 dwellings from Market Harborough and to add these to Scraptoft /Thurnby / Bushby, in line with the suggestion made in the report to Executive on 9 May 2016, as a result of the difficulty of finding sites in Market Harborough.)

Lutterworth would be expected to provide 514 homes. Broughton Astley had allocated over 600 homes through the Neighbourhood plan process and needed no further allocation.

Further significant development would be required in Fleckney, with a target of 503, reflecting the limited number of completions and commitments to 31 March 2016. Fleckney had begun a neighbourhood plan, but it was at a very early stage. Moreover, some allocations would need to be made in order to give reassurance that the requirement for Fleckney was deliverable and that the Local Plan was sound. This was to be done in consultation with the Parish Council and its Neighbourhood Planning group.

Husbands Bosworth and Ullesthorpe were not then engaged in a neighbourhood plan and would have needed to find 42 and 34 respectively under this option. Billesdon had a made neighbourhood plan, but the housing figures used were based on the Core Strategy so it had not included sufficient allocations. Billesdon would require a further 41 dwellings to be provided over the plan period.

Of the Selected Rural Villages not then engaged in or advanced with neighbourhood plans, Bitteswell had a target of 46, The Claybrookes 77, Dunton Bassett 83, Hallaton 54, Tilton on the Hill 40, and Tugby 25. If this option was preferred, it may have been necessary to allocate sites to meet some or all of these requirements.

Market Harborough – requirement 1395

Table 4.1 Option 2: Market Harborough Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/MH/HSG/35 Overstone Park	525	Current planning application could deliver 600 dwellings.
A/MH/HSG/34 East of Blackberry Grange	214	Increase in size of site from that in SHLAA and use of adjoining densities could increase number of dwellings to 350.
A/MH/HSG/61 Land west of Airfield Farm	153	Within Area of Separation in Lubenham NP. Requires completion of adjoining development for access – may not be feasible within plan period. (AMBER)
A/MH/HSG/06 Burnmill Farm	90	Maximum number of dwellings fixed by highways considerations.
A/MH/HSG/05 Ridgeway	37	
A/MH/HSG/32 Hillcrest Farm/ A/HSG/MXD/50 Land west of Leicester Rd	33	Possible concerns over access in relation to SDA (AMBER)
A/MH/HSG/24 Rear of 115 Lubenham Hill	32	Careful treatment of wildlife corridors required.
A/MH/HSG/53 Avon Dale	21	Possible concerns over access (AMBER)
Total Number	1105	
Percentage of requirement	79%	

All of these sites taken together could deliver some 1105 homes, of which 982 would be on sites of 50 dwellings or more. This represents 79% and 70% respectively of the requirement for Market Harborough. In addition a further 261 dwellings were possible on smaller, mostly brownfield, sites identified in the SHLAA. Moreover the capacity of the two largest sites as estimated by the SHLAA is believed to underestimate the actual capacity based on densities of development built nearby. These could produce an additional 211 dwellings.

The sites at Hillcrest Farm/ west of Leicester Road, and Avon Dale were flagged as having issues, which might make them less suitable for

development. If these problems could be overcome a combined site for about 54 dwellings could be allocated, but the sites have been treated separately in this analysis.

Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby – requirement 353

Table 4.2 Option 2: Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TH/HSG/25 East of Charity Farm	112	
A/TH/HSG/24 Charity Farm Residual	42	
A/TH/HSG/14 and A/TH/HSG/15 Scraptoft Hill Farm sites	154	Within Area of Separation and subject to landscape impact. Access issues mean the site may not be developable within plan period. (AMBER)
Total Number	328	
Percentage of requirement	93%	

All of these sites could deliver 328 dwellings in total or 93% of the requirement. Although the 'Charity Farm Residual' site is less than 50 dwellings and therefore below the level suggested for allocation, it could be allocated as part of the larger adjoining site. *A site at Coles nursery (A/TH/HSG/07) was excluded in the light of information that the developer/owner no longer wished to pursue redevelopment of the existing business.* The remainder of the site is in the Green Wedge. *Alternative sites at Scraptoft Hill Farm (A/TH/HSG/14 and/15) have been included although assessed as amber.* Access to these sites may need to be through other committed sites and this may mean they are not developable in the plan period.

Lutterworth – requirement 514

Table 4.3 Option 2: Lutterworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/LT/HSG/15 East off Leicester Road	242	Speed limits would need altering to overcome highways concerns.
A/LT/HSG/16 Land off Brookfield Way	131	Within Area of Separation

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
Total Number	373	
Percentage of required allocation	73%	

These sites could deliver 373 dwellings or 73% of the requirement for Lutterworth. In addition there are a further 45 dwellings on smaller sites identified in the SHLAA 2015. This would lead to a shortfall of 96 dwellings in Lutterworth. However, there are indications of additional sites, not identified in the SHLAA, that could come forward, including through the neighbourhood plan that is now proposed. *Moreover, despite being classed as not developable, SHLAA site A/LT/HSG/ 17, land at Coventry Road Lutterworth, has since been given permission for 250 dwellings on appeal, providing an alternative to A/LT/HSG/ 16 and increasing supply by 119 homes.*

Billesdon – requirement 41

Table 4.4 Option 2: Billesdon Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BL/HSG/03 Gaulby Lane	46	
A/BL/HSG/13 Land at Gaulby Lane	45	Related to site A/BL/HSG/03
A/BL/HSG/16 Gaulby Rd North	40	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area and rural edge of village
Total Number	131	
Percentage of required allocation	320%	

The current Neighbourhood Plan in Billesdon does not allocate sufficient sites to meet the higher annual housing requirement. In addition Tugby is unable to find enough sites for its allocation and Billesdon is the nearest Rural Centre to Tugby so the shortfall could be added to the Billesdon requirement, increasing it to 56. There are adequate sites to meet the additional requirement at Billesdon, only one of the above sites being required assuming some small sites and windfalls in addition. The preferred manner to deal with any further allocation would be for Billesdon Parish Council to update their Neighbourhood Plan.

Fleckney – requirement 503

Table 4.5 Option 2: Fleckney Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/FK/HSG/12 off Badcock Way/ Saddington Road	225	Most of site in Saddington Parish – would reduce gap between settlements. <i>Planning application has since been refused – subject to appeal. Also being pursued for a reduced number.</i>
A/FK/HSG/14 South of Arnesby Rd	132	Need for sensitive treatment of area near stream, where landscape is more sensitive – allowed for in capacity. Access may be an issue.
A/FK/HSG/06 North of Kilby Road	117	<i>Planning application has since been approved for 150 dwellings.</i> Linked with site 09
A/FK/HSG/09 off Kilby Road	49	Linked to site 06
Total Number	523	
Percentage of required allocation	104%	

These sites could deliver 104% of the target for Fleckney with further sites coming through the development management process and windfalls. *However the site off Badcock Way/ Saddington Road has been refused permission since summer 2016 and is likely to be only acceptable with a significantly reduced capacity.* Although just under 50 dwellings, the ‘off Kilby Road’ site could be allocated/ developed with the ‘north of Kilby Road’ site. *The latter has been approved for 150 dwellings since 2016, increasing capacity by 33 dwellings.* In addition there is one smaller site that could deliver 19 dwellings in total via the development management process.

Husbands Bosworth – requirement 42

Table 4.6 Option 2: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HB/HSG/02 Theddingworth Rd	40	Careful treatment of the setting of the Hall is important
A/HB/HSG/01 Welford Lane	27	<i>Planning application since approved for 32 dwellings.</i>
Total Number	67	
Percentage of required allocation	172%	

These two sites could deliver 25 more homes than the requirement in Husbands Bosworth. This could either be achieved through the development management process or by allocating the larger site on Theddingworth Rd, if required. *Planning permission has subsequently been granted on the Welford Road site for 32 dwellings, which meets most of the requirement.*

Ullesthorpe – requirement 34

Table 4.7 Option 2: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/UL/HSG/05 North of Hall Lane	30	<i>Application for 15 dwellings refused and appeal dismissed</i>
A/UL/HSG/08 Grange Croft	29	<i>Neighbouring site A/UL/HSG/02 permitted for 45 dwellings pending S106 agreement</i>
A/UL/HSG/11 South Avenue	25	
A/UL/MXD/01 South Ashby RD	23	<i>Pending application for 24 dwellings</i>
Total Number	78	
Percentage of required allocation	229%	

There are ample sites that are each capable of delivering a significant proportion of the requirement for Ullesthorpe, along with a number of

smaller sites. A site allocation may not be required, as one or more of these sites is likely to be delivered through the development management process. *However, a neighbourhood plan has since been proposed.*

Bitteswell – requirement 46

Table 4.8 Option 2: Bitteswell Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BT/HSG/03 east of Ashby Lane	79	Site extends too far out of Bitteswell, but reduced site could be acceptable.
A/BT/HSG/02 north of valley farm	55	Part of site is in Area of Separation.
Total Number	134	
Percentage of required allocation	291%	

Both sites have some issues. The first site would not be suitable unless the extent of the site was reduced significantly. The second site is partially in the separation area from Magna Park, so careful treatment and possible reduction in size would be required. Only part of one site would need to be allocated to deliver the 45 dwellings requirement and together with smaller sites or windfalls, the development management process could deliver the requirement in Bitteswell. *However the Parish Council have since decided to prepare a Neighbour Plan to decide the issue.*

The Claybrookes – requirement 77

Table 4.9 Option 2: The Claybrookes Potential Allocation

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/CM/HSG/02 Land off Main Street	62	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. <i>Permission since granted for 38 dwellings</i>
A/CM/HSG/01 off Frolesworth lane	60	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. Further than walking distance from the primary school.
Total Number	122	

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
Percentage of required allocation	158%	

Both identified sites are large in comparison to the settlements. This scale of development on one site could have a negative impact and two smaller sites may be more suitable for development, although the Frolesworth Lane site is not as sustainable. In addition there is an existing employment site that may be redeveloped as a 'windfall'. *Planning permission has since been granted for 38 dwellings.* An allocation should not be necessary and decisions could be made through the development management process.

Dunton Bassett - requirement 83

Table 4.10 Option 2: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/DB/HSG/02 Church Lane	42	Planning permission refused for 49 dwellings –impact on listed building.
Total Number	42	
Percentage of required allocation	51%	

There is only one SHLAA site in Dunton Bassett, which was subject to a planning application for 49 dwellings in summer 2016 but has since been refused permission. Even if the concerns relating to this site (impact on Listed Building) could be overcome (which is unlikely), this would still lead to a shortfall of 41 dwellings. The shortfall in development in Dunton Bassett could be absorbed via the over allocation in the nearby village of Broughton Astley. Alternatively an allocation could be made on a site not identified through the SHLAA or one may come forward through the development management route.

Hallaton - requirement 54

Table 4.11 Option 2: Hallaton Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HA/HSG/08 off Hornighold Rd	40	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/05 north of North End	35	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/06 south of North End	24	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
Total Number	99	
Percentage of required allocation	183%	

There are three sites in Hallaton that could contribute to meeting the requirement of 54 for Hallaton, in addition to a smaller site for 5 dwellings and windfalls. This could be either the Horninghold Road site or a combination of the two sites at North End. In all cases the developments would need to be well designed to avoid impacts on heritage assets and the conservation area. The requirement for Hallaton may not require a site allocation, but rather could be delivered through the development management process *or a neighbourhood plan, which is now proposed.*

Tilton on the Hill – requirement 40

Table 4.12 Option 2: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TN/MXD/01 Oakham Road	32	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area.
Total Number	32	
Percentage of required allocation	80%	

There is one SHLAA site in Tilton on the Hill. It relates well to the village and would deliver most of the requirement, with the remainder to be found on small sites and windfalls through the development management

process. *A High Leicestershire Neighbourhood Plan (including Tilton) has since been proposed which could allocate this site (or an alternative).*

Tugby – requirement 25

There are no sites greater than 20 dwellings in Tugby and only one smaller site for 10 dwellings. Tugby does not have enough sites to deliver its requirement. Either additional sites would need to be found through the development management process and windfalls or the additional requirement could be accommodated elsewhere, such as in Billesdon as the nearest rural centre.

Option 2 Summary

The total potential allocations noted above for Option 2 equate to 2,686 dwellings, assuming that the settlements deliver no more than their requirement. The residual requirement to be met was 3,900 dwellings. The potential allocations identified here would deliver 69% of this.

If only sites of 50 dwellings or more are allocated (including the two sites less than 50 in Thurnby and Fleckney that could be allocated with adjoining land and a site of 50 in The Claybrookes), then the total potential allocations would reduce to 2,245 dwellings or 58% of the residual requirement.

If no allocations are made in The Claybrookes, then the total potential allocations would reduce to 2,195 or 56% of the residual requirement. This would be reduced further if not all the sites in Fleckney are allocated on the basis that some decisions should be left for the neighbourhood plan.

The conclusion for this option is that some allocation of sites smaller than 50 dwellings would need to be considered if over-reliance on neighbourhood plans and the development management system is to be avoided and two-thirds of the residual requirement is to be allocated in the Local Plan.

5

Option 4 - SDA at Scraptoft North

In this option, approximately 1,200 homes are expected to be delivered on a site to the north of Scraptoft. This SDA would deliver 100% of the allocation required for Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby as well as making a significant contribution to wider needs, leaving a requirement of 2,700 dwellings.

This remaining requirement would be dispersed between settlements according to the Core Strategy, 70% urban 30% rural, distribution as set out in Appendix 1. Thus Market Harborough would need to take 990 after commitments. Lutterworth would require sites for 408 new homes.

Of the Rural Centres where only limited progress had been made on neighbourhood plans, Fleckney would require sites for 453 dwellings, Husbands Bosworth 28, and Ullesthorpe 22. Billesdon would have under allocated in its neighbourhood plan by 28.

Of the Selected Rural Villages without a neighbourhood plan in progress at the time, Bitteswell would require 41 dwellings, the Claybrookes 69, Dunton Bassett 74, Hallaton 48, Tilton 33 and Tugby 21.

Market Harborough – requirement 990

Table 5.1 Option 4: Market Harborough Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/MH/HSG/35 Overstone Park	525	Current planning application could deliver 600 dwellings.
A/MH/HSG/34 East of Blackberry Grange	214	Increase in size of site from that in SHLAA and use of adjoining densities could increase number of dwellings to 350.
A/MH/HSG/06 Burnmill Farm	90	Maximum number of dwellings fixed by highways considerations.
Total Number	829	
Percentage of requirement	84%	

These sites would slightly under-deliver on the requirements of Market Harborough. However, in addition a further 384 dwellings are possible on smaller, mostly brownfield, sites identified in the SHLAA. Moreover the

capacity of the two largest sites as estimated by the SHLAA is believed to underestimate the actual capacity based on densities of development built nearby. These could produce an additional 211 dwellings.

Lutterworth – requirement 408

Table 5.2 Option 4: Lutterworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/LT/HSG/15 East off Leicester Road	242	Speed limits would need altering to overcome highways concerns.
A/LT/HSG/16 Land off Brookfield Way	131	Within Area of Separation
Total Number	373	
Percentage of required allocation	73%	

These sites would deliver most of the requirement for Lutterworth, assuming that any issues on the sites could be resolved. In addition there are a further 45 dwellings on smaller sites identified in the SHLAA 2015, bringing the total of SHLAA sites to 418. Moreover, there are indications of additional sites, not identified in the SHLAA, that could come forward, including through the neighbourhood plan that is now proposed. *Also, despite being classed as not developable, SHLAA site A/LT/HSG/ 17, land at Coventry Road Lutterworth, has since been given permission for 250 dwellings on appeal, providing an alternative to A/LT/HSG/ 16 and increasing supply by 119 homes..*

Billesdon – requirement 28

Table 5.3 Option 4: Billesdon Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BL/HSG/03 Gaulby Lane	46	
A/BL/HSG/13 Land at Gaulby Lane	45	Related to site A/BL/HSG/03
A/BL/HSG/16 Gaulby Rd North	40	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area and rural edge of village
Total Number	131	

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
Percentage of required allocation	320%	

The current Neighbourhood Plan in Billesdon does not allocate sufficient sites to meet the higher annual housing requirement. In addition Tugby is unable to find enough sites for its allocation and Billesdon is the nearest rural centre to Tugby so the shortfall could be added to the Billesdon requirement, increasing it to 39. There are adequate sites to meet the additional requirement at Billesdon. Just one of the above sites would be required. The preferred manner to deal with any further allocation would be for Billesdon Parish Council to update their Neighbourhood Plan.

Fleckney – requirement 453

Table 5.4 Option 4: Fleckney Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/FK/HSG/12 off Badcock Way/ Saddington Road	225	Most of site in Saddington Parish – would reduce gap between settlements. <i>Planning application has since been refused – subject to appeal. Also being pursued for a reduced number.</i>
A/FK/HSG/14 South of Arnesby Rd	132	Need for sensitive treatment of area near stream, where landscape is more sensitive – allowed for in capacity. Access may be an issue.
A/FK/HSG/06 North of Kilby Road	117	<i>Planning application has since been approved for 150 dwellings.</i> Linked with site 09
A/FK/HSG/09 off Kilby Road	49	Linked to site 06
Total Number	523	
Percentage of required allocation	116%	

These sites could deliver 116% of the target for Fleckney, so a selection of sites for allocation could be made based on development management comments and consultation with the Parish Council/ Neighbourhood Plan

group. However the site off Badcock Way/ Saddington Road (A/FK/HSG/12) has been refused permission since summer 2016 and is likely to be only acceptable with a significantly reduced capacity. Although just under 50 dwellings, the 'off Kilby Road' site could be allocated/ developed with the 'north of Kilby Road' site. The latter has been approved for 150 dwellings since 2016 increasing capacity by 33 dwellings. In addition there is one smaller site that could deliver 19 dwellings in total via the development management process.

Husbands Bosworth – requirement 28

Table 5.5 Option 4: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HB/HSG/02 Theddingworth Rd	40	Careful treatment of the setting of the Hall is important
A/HB/HSG/01 Welford Lane	27	<i>Planning application since approved for 32 dwellings.</i>
Total Number	67	
Percentage of required allocation	172%	

Either of these two sites could effectively deliver the requirement in Husbands Bosworth, with the Theddingworth Road site being capable of a reduction in capacity to assist in reducing impact on the setting of the listed building. This could either be achieved through the development management process or by allocating one of the sites. *Planning permission has subsequently been granted on the Welford Road site for 32 dwellings which more than meets the requirement.*

Ullesthorpe – requirement 22

Table 5.6 Option 4: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/UL/HSG/05 North of Hall Lane	30	<i>Application for 15 dwellings refused and appeal dismissed</i>
A/UL/HSG/08 Grange Croft	29	<i>Neighbouring site A/UL/HSG/02 permitted for 45 dwellings pending S106 agreement</i>
A/UL/HSG/11 South Avenue	25	

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/UL/MXD/01 South Ashby RD	23	<i>Pending application for 24 dwellings</i>
Total Number	78	
Percentage of required allocation	229%	

There are ample sites that are each capable of delivering more than the requirement for Ullesthorpe, along with a number of smaller sites. A site allocation may not be required, as at least one of these sites is likely to be delivered through the development management process. *However, a neighbourhood plan has since been proposed.*

Bitteswell – requirement 41

Table 5.7 Option 4: Bitteswell Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BT/HSG/03 east of Ashby Lane	79	Site extends too far out of Bitteswell, but reduced site could be acceptable.
A/BT/HSG/02 north of valley farm	55	Part of site is in Area of Separation.
Total Number	134	
Percentage of required allocation	291%	

Both sites in Bitteswell have some issues. The first site would not be suitable unless the extent to the site was reduced significantly. The second site is partially in the separation area with Magna Park, so careful treatment and possible reduction in size would be required. Only part of one site would need to be allocated to deliver the 41 dwellings requirement and together with the smaller sites, the development management process could deliver the requirement in Bitteswell. *However the Parish Council have since decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan to decide the issue.*

The Claybrookes - requirement 69

Table 5.8 Option 4: The Claybrookes Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/CM/HSG/02 Land off Main Street	62	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. <i>Permission since granted for 38 dwellings</i>
A/CM/HSG/01 off Frolesworth lane	60	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. Further than walking distance from the primary school.
Total Number	122	
Percentage of required allocation	158%	

Both identified sites are large in comparison to the settlement. This scale of development on one site could have a negative impact and two smaller sites may be more suitable, although the Frolesworth Lane site is not as sustainable. In addition there is an existing employment site (the saw mill) that may be redeveloped as a 'windfall'. If this comes forward, then only the Main Street site would need to be allocated. *Planning permission has since been granted on this site for 38 dwellings.* Allocation may not therefore be necessary, and decisions could be made through the development management process.

Dunton Bassett - requirement 74

Table 5.9 Option 4: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/DB/HSG/02 Church Lane	42	<i>Planning permission refused for 49 dwellings –impact on listed building.</i>
Total Number	42	
Percentage of required allocation	51%	

There is only one SHLAA site in Dunton Bassett, which was subject to a planning application for 49 dwellings in summer 2016 *but has since been refused permission.* Even if the concerns relating to this site (impact on

Listed Building) could be overcome (which is unlikely), this would still lead to a shortfall of 32 dwellings. The shortfall in development in Dunton Bassett could be absorbed via the over allocation in the nearby village of Broughton Astley. Alternatively an allocation could be made on a site not identified through the SHLAA or one may come forward through the development management route.

Hallaton - requirement 48

Table 5.10 Option 4: Hallaton Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HA/HSG/08 off Hornighold Rd	40	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/05 north of North End	35	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/06 south of North End	24	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
Total Number	99	
Percentage of required allocation	183%	

There are three sites in Hallaton that could contribute to meeting the requirement of 48 for Hallaton, in addition to a smaller site for 5 dwellings. This could be either the Horninghold Road site or a combination of the two sites at North End. In all cases the developments would need to be well designed to avoid impacts on heritage assets and the conservation area. The requirement for Hallaton would not be likely to require a site allocation, but rather could be delivered through the development management process *or a neighbourhood plan, which is now proposed.*

Tilton on the Hill – requirement 33

Table 5.11 Option 4: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TN/MXD/01 Oakham Road	32	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area.

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
Total Number	32	
Percentage of required allocation	80%	

There is one SHLAA site in Tilton on the Hill. It relates well to the village and would effectively deliver the requirement. *A High Leicestershire Neighbourhood Plan (including Tilton) has since been proposed which could allocate this site (or an alternative).*

Tugby – requirement 21

There are no sites greater than 20 dwellings in Tugby and only one smaller site for 10 dwellings. Tugby does not have enough sites to deliver its requirement. Either additional sites would need to be found through the development management process or the additional requirement could be accommodated elsewhere, such as in Billesdon as the nearest rural centre (see above).

Option 4 Summary

The total potential allocations noted above for Option 4 equate to 1,965 dwellings, assuming that the settlements deliver no more than their requirement. The requirement to be met after allocation of the SDA at Scraftoft North was 2,700 dwellings. The potential allocations identified here would deliver 73% of this. When the SDA contribution in the plan period (1,200 dwellings) is included, the total potential allocation makes up 81% of the residual requirement.

If only sites of 50 dwellings or more are allocated (including the site less than 50 in Fleckney that could be allocated with adjoining land and a site of 50 in The Claybrookes), then the total potential allocations would reduce to 1,705 dwellings plus 1,200 at the SDA or 74% of the residual requirement.

If no allocation was made in The Claybrookes, then the total potential allocations would reduce to 1,705 plus 1,200 at the SDA or 73% of the residual requirement.

This would be reduced further if not all the sites in Fleckney are allocated on the basis that some decisions should be left for the emerging neighbourhood plan. If sites for about 200 dwellings were allocated in the Local Plan, the allocations would be delivering 67% of the residual requirement.

The conclusion for this option is that one or two large sites in Fleckney would need to be allocated if over-reliance on neighbourhood plans and the development management system is to be avoided and two-thirds of the residual requirement is to be allocated in the Local Plan.

6 Option 5 - SDA at Kibworth

This option consists of a strategic development area at Kibworth, delivering 1,490 homes in the plan period, leaving a residual requirement of 2,410 dwellings. The remaining requirements are dispersed between settlements according to the Core Strategy, 70% urban 30% rural, distribution.

Market Harborough has a housing target of 817. Lutterworth would require sites for 360 new homes. Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby have a relatively low target of 80 after completions and commitments are taken into account.

Of the Rural Centres where only limited progress had been made on neighbourhood plans, Fleckney would require an allocation of sites for 413 dwellings, Husbands Bosworth 23, and Ullesthorpe 18. Billesdon would have under allocated in its neighbourhood plan by 24.

Of the Selected Rural Villages without a neighbourhood plan in progress at the time, Bitteswell would require 37 dwellings, the Claybrookes 63, Dunton Bassett 68, Hallaton 43, Tilton 30 and Tugby 19.

Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby – requirement 80

Table 6.1 Option 5: Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby potential allocation

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TH/HSG/25 East of Charity Farm	112	
Total Number	112	
Percentage of requirement	140%	

This site would deliver more than the requirement for Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby. It is assumed that it would be allocated if this Option was pursued, although the decision could be taken by the emerging Thurnby and Bushby Neighbourhood Plan.

Market Harborough – requirement 817

Table 6.2 Option 5: Market Harborough Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/MH/HSG/35 Overstone Park	525	Current planning application could deliver 600 dwellings.
A/MH/HSG/34 East of Blackberry Grange	214	Increase in size of site from that in SHLAA and use of adjoining densities could increase number of dwellings to 350.
Total Number	739	
Percentage of requirement	91%	

These sites would slightly under-deliver on the requirements of Market Harborough. However, in addition there are some further 474 dwellings possible on smaller sites identified in the SHLAA that could come forward. Moreover the capacity of the two largest sites as estimated by the SHLAA is believed to underestimate the actual capacity based on densities of development built nearby. These could produce an additional 211 dwellings.

Lutterworth – requirement 360

Table 6.3 Option 4: Lutterworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/LT/HSG/15 East off Leicester Road	242	Speed limits would need altering to overcome highways concerns.
A/LT/HSG/16 Land off Brookfield Way	131	Within Area of Separation
Total Number	373	
Percentage of required allocation	73%	

These sites would deliver 104% of the requirement for Lutterworth, assuming that any issues on the sites could be resolved. *Alternative solutions could be brought forward through the neighbourhood plan, which has since been proposed. Moreover, SHLAA site A/LT/HSG/ 17, land at Coventry Road Lutterworth, has since been given permission for 250 dwellings on appeal, providing an alternative to A/LT/HSG/ 16.*

Billesdon – requirement 24

Table 6.4 Option 5: Billesdon Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BL/HSG/03 Gaulby Lane	46	
A/BL/HSG/13 Land at Gaulby Lane	45	Related to site A/BL/HSG/03
A/BL/HSG/16 Gaulby Rd North	40	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area and rural edge of village
Total Number	131	
Percentage of required allocation	546%	

The current Neighbourhood Plan in Billesdon does not allocate sufficient sites to meet the higher annual housing requirement. In addition Tugby is unable to find enough sites for its allocation and Billesdon is the nearest rural centre to Tugby so the shortfall could be added to the Billesdon requirement, increasing it to 33. There are adequate sites to meet the additional requirement at Billesdon. Just one of the above would be required. The preferred manner to deal with any further allocation would be for Billesdon Parish Council to update their Neighbourhood Plan.

Fleckney – requirement 413

Table 6.5 Option 5: Fleckney Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/FK/HSG/14 South of Arnesby Rd	132	Need for sensitive treatment of area near stream, where landscape is more sensitive – allowed for in capacity. Access may be an issue.
A/FK/HSG/06 North of Kilby Road	117	<i>Planning application has since been approved for 150 dwellings.</i> Linked with site 09
A/FK/HSG/09 off Kilby Road	49	Linked to site 06
Total Number	298	
Percentage of	72%	

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
required allocation		

These sites could deliver at least 72% of the target for Fleckney, so additional sites, including possibly a reduced size of development at SHLAA site A/FK/HSG/12 off Badcock Way, could be allocated by the *neighbourhood plan which is now progressing*. Although just under 50 dwellings, the 'off Kilby Road' site could be allocated/ developed with the 'north of Kilby Road' site. *The latter has been approved for 150 dwellings since 2016 increasing capacity by 33 dwellings*. In addition there is one smaller site that could deliver 19 dwellings in total via the development management process.

Husbands Bosworth – requirement 23

Table 6.6 Option 5: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HB/HSG/02 Theddingworth Rd	40	Careful treatment of the setting of the Hall is important
A/HB/HSG/01 Welford Lane	27	<i>Planning application since approved for 32 dwellings.</i>
Total Number	67	
Percentage of required allocation	291%	

Either of these two sites could deliver more homes than the requirement in Husbands Bosworth. This could either be achieved through the development management process or by allocating a site. *Planning permission has subsequently been granted on the Welford Road site for 32 dwellings which more than meets the requirement.*

Ullesthorpe – requirement 18

Table 6.7 Option 5: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/UL/HSG/05 North of Hall Lane	30	<i>Application for 15 dwellings refused and appeal dismissed</i>

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/UL/HSG/08 Grange Croft	29	<i>Neighbouring site A/UL/HSG/02 permitted for 45 dwellings pending S106 agreement</i>
A/UL/HSG/11 South Avenue	25	
A/UL/MXD/01 South Ashby RD	23	<i>Pending application for 24 dwellings</i>
Total Number	78	
Percentage of required allocation	433%	

There are ample sites that are each capable of delivering more than the requirement for Ullesthorpe, along with a number of smaller sites. A site allocation may not be required, as one or more of these sites is likely to be delivered through the development management process. However, a neighbourhood plan has since been proposed.

Bitteswell – requirement 37

Table 6.8 Option 5: Bitteswell Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BT/HSG/03 east of Ashby Lane	79	Site extends too far out of Bitteswell, but reduced site could be acceptable.
A/BT/HSG/02 north of valley farm	55	Part of site is in Area of Separation.
Total Number	134	
Percentage of required allocation	362 %	

Both sites in Bitteswell have some issues. The first site would not be suitable unless the extent to the site was reduced significantly. The second site is partially in the separation area with Magna Park, so careful treatment and possible reduction in size would be required. Only part of one site would need to be allocated to deliver the 41 dwellings requirement and together with the smaller sites, the development management process could deliver the requirement in Bitteswell. *However the Parish Council have since decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan to decide the issue.*

The Claybrookes - requirement 63

Table 6.9 Option 5: The Claybrookes Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/CM/HSG/02 Land off Main Street	62	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. <i>Permission since granted for 38 dwellings</i>
A/CM/HSG/01 off Frolesworth lane	60	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. Further than walking distance from the primary school.
Total Number	122	
Percentage of required allocation	194%	

Both identified sites are large in comparison to the settlement. This scale of development on one site could have a negative impact and two smaller sites may be more suitable, although the Frolesworth Lane site is not as sustainable. In addition there is an existing employment site (the saw mill) that may be redeveloped as a 'windfall'. If this comes forward, then only the Main Street site would need to be allocated. *Planning permission has since been granted on this site for 38 dwellings.* Allocation may not therefore be necessary, and decisions could be made through the development management process.

Dunton Bassett – requirement 68

Table 6.10 Option 5: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/DB/HSG/02 Church Lane	42	<i>Planning permission refused for 49 dwellings – impact on listed building.</i>
Total Number	42	
Percentage of required allocation	62%	

There is only one SHLAA site in Dunton Bassett, which was subject to a planning application for 49 dwellings in summer 2016 *but has since been refused permission.* Even if the concerns relating to this site (impact on

Listed Building) could be overcome (which is unlikely), this would still lead to a shortfall of 27 dwellings. The shortfall in development in Dunton Bassett could be absorbed via the over allocation in the nearby village of Broughton Astley. Alternatively an allocation could be made on a site not identified through the SHLAA or one may come forward through the development management route.

Hallaton - requirement 43

Table 6.11 Option 5: Hallaton Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HA/HSG/08 off Hornighold Rd	40	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/05 north of North End	35	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/06 south of North End	24	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
Total Number	99	
Percentage of required allocation	230%	

There are three sites in Hallaton that could contribute to meeting the requirement of 44 for Hallaton, in addition to a smaller site for 5 dwellings. Only one site would be required. In all cases the developments would need to be well designed to avoid impacts on heritage assets and the conservation area. The requirement for Hallaton would not be likely to require a site allocation, but rather could be delivered through the development management process *or a neighbourhood plan, which is now proposed.*

Tilton on the Hill – requirement 30

Table 6.12 Option 5: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TN/MXD/01 Oakham Road	32	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area.
Total Number	32	

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
Percentage of required allocation	106%	

There is one SHLAA site in Tilton on the Hill. It relates well to the village and would deliver the requirement. *A High Leicestershire Neighbourhood Plan (including Tilton) has since been proposed which could allocate this site (or an alternative).*

Tugby – requirement 19

There are no sites greater than 20 dwellings in Tugby and only one smaller site for 10 dwellings. Tugby does not have enough sites to deliver its requirement. Either additional sites would need to be found through the development management process or the additional requirement could be accommodated elsewhere, such as in Billesdon as the nearest rural centre (see above).

Option 5 Summary

The total potential allocations noted above for Option 5 equate to 1,882 dwellings, assuming that the settlements deliver no more than their requirement. The requirement to be met after allocation of the SDA at Kibworth North and East was 2,410 dwellings. The potential allocations identified here would deliver 78% of this. When the SDA contribution in the plan period (1400 dwellings) is included, the total allocation makes up 86% of the residual requirement.

If only sites of 50 dwellings or more are allocated (including the site less than 50 in Fleckney that could be allocated with adjoining land and a site of 50 in The Claybrookes), then the total potential allocations would reduce to 1,652 dwellings plus 1,490 at the SDA, or 81% of the residual requirement.

If no allocations are made in the The Claybrookes, then the total potential allocations would reduce to 1,602 plus 1,490 at the SDA or 79% of the residual requirement.

This would be reduced further if not all the sites in Fleckney are allocated on the basis that most decisions should be left for the emerging neighbourhood plan. Not allocating any sites at Fleckney would still mean that 1,300 plus 1,490 at the SDA or 69% of the residual requirement would be allocated in the Local Plan.

The conclusion for this option is that no sites in Fleckney would need to be allocated in order for over-reliance on neighbourhood plans and the development management system is to be avoided and two-thirds of the residual requirement is to be allocated in the Local Plan. However it may be that an Inspector would expect at least one site to be allocated in the Local Plan. However it may be that an Inspector would expect at least one site to be allocated there given the scale of the requirement.

7

Option 6 - SDA at Lutterworth

This option consists of a strategic development area at Lutterworth, east of the M1, delivering 1,290 homes during the plan period. The SDA would deliver 100% of the allocation required for Lutterworth as well as making a significant contribution to wider needs, leaving a requirement of 2,610 dwellings.

This remaining requirement is dispersed between settlements according to the core strategy, 70% urban 30% rural, distribution. Market Harborough still has a significant requirement of 1,065 after completions and commitments (to 31 March 2016). Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby have a requirement of 121.

Of the Rural Centres without progress on a neighbourhood plan, Fleckney would need to find land for 501 homes, Husbands Bosworth would require 30 and Ullesthorpe 23. Billesdon's made neighbourhood plan would under-deliver by 30 dwellings.

Of the Selected Rural Villages with little or no progress on neighbourhood plans, Bitteswell would require 45 dwellings, The Claybrookes 76, Dunton Bassett 82, Hallaton 53, Tilton 37 and Tugby 23.

Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby – requirement 121

Table 7.1 Option 6: Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TH/HSG/25 East of Charity Farm	112	
Total Number	112	
Percentage of requirement	93%	

This site would deliver 93% the requirement for Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby. It is assumed that it would be allocated if this Option was pursued, although the decision could be taken by the emerging Thurnby and Bushby Neighbourhood Plan.

Market Harborough – requirement 1065

Table 7.2 Option 6: Market Harborough Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/MH/HSG/35 Overstone Park	525	Current planning application could deliver 600 dwellings.
A/MH/HSG/34 East of Blackberry Grange	214	Increase in size of site from that in SHLAA and use of adjoining densities could increase number of dwellings to 350.
A/MH/HSG/06 Burnmill Farm	90	Maximum number of dwellings fixed by highways considerations.
Total Number	829	
Percentage of requirement	78%	

These sites would under-deliver on the requirements of Market Harborough. However, in addition there are some further 384 dwellings possible on smaller, mostly brownfield, sites identified in the SHLAA that could come forward. Moreover the capacity of the two largest sites as estimated by the SHLAA is believed to underestimate the actual capacity based on densities of development built nearby. These could produce an additional 211 dwellings.

Billesdon – requirement 30

Table 7.3 Option 6: Billesdon Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BL/HSG/03 Gaulby Lane	46	
A/BL/HSG/13 Land at Gaulby Lane	45	Related to site A/BL/HSG/03
A/BL/HSG/16 Gaulby Rd North	40	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area and rural edge of village
Total Number	131	
Percentage of required allocation	437%	

The current Neighbourhood Plan in Billesdon does not allocate sufficient sites to meet the higher annual housing requirement. In addition Tugby is unable to find enough sites for its allocation and Billesdon is the nearest rural centre to Tugby so the shortfall could be added to the Billesdon requirement, increasing it to 43. There are adequate sites to meet the additional requirement at Billesdon. Just one of the above would be required. The preferred manner to deal with any further allocation would be for Billesdon Parish Council to update their Neighbourhood Plan.

Fleckney – requirement 501

Table 7.4 Option 6: Fleckney Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/FK/HSG/12 off Badcock Way/ Saddington Road		Most of site in Saddington Parish – would reduce gap between settlements. <i>Planning application has since been refused – subject to appeal. Also being pursued for a reduced number.</i>
A/FK/HSG/14 South of Arnesby Rd		Need for sensitive treatment of area near stream, where landscape is more sensitive – allowed for in capacity. Access may be an issue.
A/FK/HSG/06 North of Kilby Road		<i>Planning application has since been approved for 150 dwellings.</i> Linked with site 09
A/FK/HSG/09 off Kilby Road		Linked to site 06
Total Number		
Percentage of required allocation	104%	

These sites could deliver slightly more than the target for Fleckney. *However the site off Badcock Way/ Saddington Road (A/FK/HSG/12) has been refused permission since summer 2016 and is likely to be only acceptable with a significantly reduced capacity.* Although just under 50 dwellings, the ‘off Kilby Road’ site could be allocated/ developed with the ‘north of Kilby Road’ site. *The latter has been approved for 150 dwellings since 2016 increasing capacity by 33 dwellings.* In addition there is one smaller site that could deliver 19 dwellings via the development management process.

Husbands Bosworth – requirement 30

Table 7.5 Option 6: Husbands Bosworth Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HB/HSG/02 Theddingworth Rd	40	Careful treatment of the setting of the Hall is important
A/HB/HSG/01 Welford Lane	27	
Total Number	67	<i>Planning application since approved for 32 dwellings.</i>
Percentage of required allocation	223%	

Either of these two sites could effectively deliver the requirement in Husbands Bosworth. This could either be achieved through the development management process or by allocating a site. *Planning permission has subsequently been granted on the Welford Road site for 32 dwellings, which meets the requirement.*

Ullesthorpe – requirement 23

Table 7.6 Option 6: Ullesthorpe Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/UL/HSG/05 North of Hall Lane	30	<i>Application for 15 dwellings refused and appeal dismissed.</i>
A/UL/HSG/08 Grange Croft	29	<i>Neighbouring site A/UL/HSG/02 permitted for 45 dwellings pending S106 agreement.</i>
A/UL/HSG/11 South Avenue	25	
A/UL/MXD/01 South Ashby RD	23	<i>Pending application for 24 dwellings.</i>
Total Number	78	
Percentage of required allocation	339%	

There are ample sites that are each capable of delivering more than the requirement for Ullesthorpe, along with a number of smaller sites. A site

allocation may not be required, as one or more of these sites is likely to be delivered through the development management process. However, a neighbourhood plan has since been proposed

Bitteswell – requirement 45

Table 7.7 Option 6: Bitteswell Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/BT/HSG/03 east of Ashby Lane	79	Site extends too far out of Bitteswell, but reduced site could be acceptable.
A/BT/HSG/02 north of valley farm	55	Part of site is in Area of Separation.
Total Number	134	
Percentage of required allocation	298%	

These sites provide three times the amount of housing needed. However both sites have some issues. The first site would not be suitable unless the extent of the site was reduced significantly. The second site is partially in the separation area with Magna Park, so careful treatment and possible reduction in size would be required. Only part of one site would need to be allocated to deliver the 45 dwellings requirement and together with the smaller sites, the development management process could deliver the requirement in Bitteswell. *However the Parish Council have since decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan to decide the issue.*

The Claybrookes - requirement 76

Table 7.8 Option 6: The Claybrookes Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/CM/HSG/02 Land off Main Street	62	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. <i>Permission since granted for 38 dwellings</i>
A/CM/HSG/01 off Frolesworth lane	60	Site is too big, smaller development would be better. Further than walking distance from the primary school.
Total Number	122	

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
Percentage of required allocation	161%	

Both identified sites are large in comparison to the settlement. This scale of development on one site could have a negative impact and two smaller sites may be more suitable, although the Frolesworth Lane site is not as sustainable. In addition there is an existing employment site (the saw mill) that may be redeveloped as a 'windfall'. If this comes forward, then only the Main Street site would need to be allocated. *Planning permission has since been granted on this site for 38 dwellings.* Allocation may not therefore be necessary, and decisions could be made through the development management process.

Dunton Bassett – requirement 82

Table 7.9 Option 6: Dunton Bassett Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/DB/HSG/02 Church Lane	42	<i>Planning permission refused for 49 dwellings – impact on listed building.</i>
Total Number	42	
Percentage of required allocation	51%	

There is only one SHLAA site in Dunton Bassett, which was subject to a planning application for 49 dwellings in summer 2016 *but has since been refused permission.* Even if the concerns relating to this site (impact on Listed Building) could be overcome (which is unlikely), this would still lead to a shortfall of 27 dwellings. The shortfall in development in Dunton Bassett could be absorbed via the over allocation in the nearby village of Broughton Astley. Alternatively an allocation could be made on a site not identified through the SHLAA or one may come forward through the development management route.

Hallaton - requirement 53

Table 7.10 Option 6: Hallaton Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/HA/HSG/08 off Hornighold Rd	40	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/05 north of North End	35	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
A/HA/HSG/06 south of North End	24	Design important to protect heritage assets and conservation area
Total Number	99	
Percentage of required allocation	188%	

There are three sites in Hallaton that could contribute to meeting the requirement of 44 for Hallaton, in addition to a smaller site for 5 dwellings. Only one site would be required. In all cases the developments would need to be well designed to avoid impacts on heritage assets and the conservation area. The requirement for Hallaton may not require a site allocation, but rather could be delivered through the development management process *or a neighbourhood plan, which is now proposed*.

Tilton on the Hill – requirement 37

Table 7.11 Option 6: Tilton on the Hill Potential Allocations

Site	Number of dwellings in SHLAA	Comments
A/TN/MXD/01 Oakham Road	32	Careful design required due to proximity of conservation area.
Total Number	32	
Percentage of required allocation	87%	

There is one SHLAA site in Tilton on the Hill. It relates well to the village and would deliver the requirement. *A High Leicestershire Neighbourhood Plan (including Tilton) has since been proposed which could allocate this site (or an alternative).*

Tugby – requirement 23

There are no sites greater than 20 dwellings in Tugby and only one smaller site for 10 dwellings. Tugby does not have enough sites to deliver its requirement. Either additional sites would need to be found through the development management process or the additional requirement could be accommodated elsewhere, such as in Billesdon as the nearest rural centre (see above).

Option 6 Summary

The total potential allocations noted above for Option 6 equate to 1,782 dwellings, assuming that the settlements deliver no more than their requirement. The requirement to be met after allocation of the SDA East of Lutterworth was 2,610 dwellings. The potential allocations identified here would deliver 68% of this. However, when the SDA contribution in the plan period (1290 dwellings) is included, the total allocation makes up 79% of the residual requirement.

If only sites of 50 dwellings or more are allocated (including the site less than 50 in Fleckney that could be allocated with adjoining land and a site of 50 in The Claybrookes), then the total potential allocations would reduce to 1,501 dwellings (plus 1,290 at the SDA), or 74% of the residual requirement.

If no allocation was made in the The Claybrookes, then the total potential allocations would reduce to 1,451 (plus 1500 at the SDA) or 70% of the residual requirement.

This would be reduced further if not all the sites in Fleckney are allocated on the basis that most decisions should be left for the emerging neighbourhood plan. Allocating sites at Fleckney for about 400 dwellings would still mean that 1,350 dwellings (plus 1,290 at the SDA) or 68% of the residual requirement would be allocated in the Local Plan.

The conclusion for this option is that most of the sites in Fleckney would need to be allocated if over-reliance on neighbourhood plans and the development management system is to be avoided and two-thirds of the residual requirement is to be allocated in the Local Plan.

8 Conclusions

All of the selected options have sufficient sites in the SHLAA 2015 to allocate over two thirds of the residual requirement of 3900 dwellings. In many cases there are choices of sites to meet the requirement. This would allow for sites to be selected that would ensure there was also a five year supply.

Option 2 relies on many sites, some of which have been assessed as amber. In addition, delivery could rely on large number of sites below 50. This option has the least flexibility for delivery, since most sites would be allocated, with few alternative sites in reserve. In addition if the less favourable sites were excluded then Option 2 would deliver far fewer dwellings and may not meet the requirements to establish soundness.

All of the options that include an SDA, Options 4, 5 and 6, deliver the required housing more easily on fewer sites. This would lead to greater flexibility as there are suitable alternative sites that could be substituted in order to ensure a five year supply over the plan period. The delivery would also allow for more flexibility on the approach to smaller settlements, since allocations are not essential to ensure adequate delivery. There are no significant differences between these 3 options. The potential allocation as a proportion of the expected requirement is shown below both with and without the 50 dwelling threshold for allocations.

Table 8.1 Summary of Options –all potential allocations up to limit of need for each settlement

Option	Dwellings on potential allocation sites -all	Percentage of residual requirement (3,900)	Total dwellings, including commitments (6850 to 31/3/16 and windfall of 250)	Percentage of total 11,000 requirement
Option 2 - Core Strategy	2686	69%	9786	89%
Option 4 - Scraftoft North SDA	3200	82%	10300	94%
Option 5 - Kibworth SDA	3141	81%	10241	86%

Option	Dwellings on potential allocation sites -all	Percentage of residual requirement (3,900)	Total dwellings, including commitments (6850 to 31/3/16 and windfall of 250)	Percentage of total 11,000 requirement
Option 6 - Lutterworth SDA	3177	82%	10277	78%

Table 8.2 Summary of Options –all potential allocations up to limit of need for each settlement excluding sites below 50 dwellings

Option	Dwellings on potential allocation sites > 50	Percentage of residual requirement (3,900)	Total dwellings, including commitments (6850 to 31/3/16 and windfall of 250)	Percentage of total 11,000 requirement
Option 2 - Core Strategy	2245	58%	9345	89%
Option 4 - Scraftoft North SDA	2943	76%	10043	91%
Option 5 - Kibworth SDA	2948	76%	10048	91%
Option 6 - Lutterworth SDA	2866	74%	9966	91%

The potential allocations identified here are not necessarily the final allocations that would be made once a preferred option is chosen. This exercise merely shows that there are suitable sites at settlement level that could be allocated. The final choice of allocations will be depend upon the delivery across the plan period and on the required infrastructure at settlement level.

9 Appendix 1 Housing requirements by Settlement for the Selected Options

Table 9.1 Appendix 1 Housing requirements by Settlement for the Selected Options

Settlements		Completions and commitments to 01.04.2011 to 31.03.2016	OPTION 2: CORE STRATEGY (70/30% urban/rural)	OPTION 4: SCRAPTOFT N SDA (1,200 dwellings)	OPTION 5: KIBWORTH NE SDA (1,300 dwellings)	OPTION 6: EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA (1,100 dwellings)
Type	Name					
PUA	Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby	952	353	1200	80	121
SRC	Market Harborough	3023	1395	990	817	1065
KC	Lutterworth	443	514	408	360	1290
KC	Broughton Astley	607	0	0	0	0
RC	Billesdon	77	41	28	24	30
RC	Fleckney	35	503	453	413	501
RC	Great Glen	368	61	13	2	11
RC	Houghton on the Hill	92	82	64	56	70
RC	Husbands Bosworth	88	42	28	23	30
RC	Kibworth	566	78	6	1490	1
RC	Ullesthorpe	77	34	22	18	23
SRV	Bitteswell	8	46	41	37	45
SRV	Church & East Langton	5	38	34	31	38
SRV	The Claybrookes	6	77	69	63	76
SRV	Dunton Bassett	6	83	74	68	82

Settlements		Completions and commitments to 01.04.2011 to 31.03.2016	OPTION 2: CORE STRATEGY (70/30% urban/ rural)	OPTION 4: SCRAPTOFT N SDA (1,200 dwellings)	OPTION 5: KIBWORTH NE SDA (1,300 dwellings)	OPTION 6: EAST OF LUTTERWORTH SDA (1,100 dwellings)
Type	Name					
SRV	Foxton	9	44	39	35	43
SRV	Gilmorton	35	72	61	55	68
SRV	Great Bowden	79	47	33	28	36
SRV	Great Easton	30	46	39	34	42
SRV	Hallaton	13	54	48	43	53
SRV	Lubenham	41	54	44	39	49
SRV	Medbourne	18	37	32	29	35
SRV	North Kilworth	42	27	19	16	21
SRV	South Kilworth	1	52	47	43	52
SRV	Swinford	5	58	52	47	57
SRV	Tilton	27	40	33	30	37
SRV	Tugby	13	25	21	19	23
Sub-SRV settlements		137				
Countryside		47	0	0	0	0
PLUS COMMITMENTS AND COMPLETIONS			6850	6850	6850	6850
PLUS WINDFALL ALLOWANCE			250	250	250	250
TOTAL		6850	11000	11000	11000	11000



Strategic Planning

Harborough District Council

The Symington Building

Adam and Eve Street

Market Harborough

LE16 7AG

planningpolicy@harborough.gov.uk

01858828282