

Spatial Strategy Topic Paper
TPC1



Harbrough Local Plan
2011-2031
Submission

HARBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2011-31

TOPIC PAPER: SPATIAL STRATEGY

1. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

- 1.1 Topic Papers are an important source of information helping to outline and explain how policies in the Proposed Submission version of the Harborough Local Plan (2011-2031) have been prepared. For each topic the papers tell the 'end to end' story of how the policies have evolved, setting out the important milestones along the way.
- 1.2 Preparation of the plan has taken place over several years. The Topic Papers set out, for each topic identified, the approach taken to developing policies and the response to various overlapping factors that have been relevant to the process, such as:
 - Updating or refinement of evidence as the plan was being prepared. Decisions at different points in the plan preparation process can only take account of evidence available at that point in time.
 - Changes in planning legislation, regulations and government policy and indications of future changes, such as the Housing White Paper.
 - Development proposals emerging during plan preparation, which may present alternatives not previously considered, and as part of the development management process.
 - Taking account of how evidence and emerging proposals relate to plan-making activities in nearby authorities as part of the Duty to Co-operate.
 - The relationship with infrastructure provision, including the existing position, programme for future work and sources of available and required funding.
- 1.3 The Council has prepared a series of Topic Papers. The Spatial Strategy Topic Paper sets out the context to the plan's preparation as a whole. This is then supplemented by Topic Papers relating to Housing, Business and Employment, Countryside Protection, and Transport. There is also a separate Duty to Co-operate Statement (S2) and a Consultation Statement (S3).
- 1.4 The intention is to signpost rather than to duplicate the detailed technical evidence which is already available in the evidence base and not to repeat the Explanation given under each policy in the Local Plan itself. The main aim is to assist the Inspector carrying out the examination into the Local Plan, as well as others taking part in the Examination Hearing. It is assumed that these parties are familiar with the National Planning Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance, so these are not repeated.
- 1.5 The Topic Papers have a common structure:
 - identifying the topic(s) covered and the Local Plan policies concerned (Section 2),
 - describing the main issues addressed in the paper (Section 3),
 - listing the evidence especially relevant to the topic(s) (Section 4),
 - addressing the issues in the main body of the report (Section 5), and
 - making concluding remarks (Section 6).

2. THE TOPIC AND POLICIES

- 2.1 This Topic Paper addresses the Spatial Strategy and covers the formulation of and justification for the following policies:
 - SS1 Spatial Strategy
 - SC1 Scraftoft North SDA
 - L1 East of Lutterworth SDA

3. THE MAIN ISSUES

3.1 The following key questions are addressed in the Section 5 of this Topic Paper:

- How was the settlement hierarchy established and how has it evolved?
- What options were considered and how were the alternative options assessed at each stage in the process?
- How was the preferred option selected?

4. KEY EVIDENCE STUDIES

4.1 There is a comprehensive evidence base that sits behind the Local Plan. All the main documents are available from the Council's website at the following url:

http://www.harborough.gov.uk/directory/4/our_policies_plans_and_strategies/category/29

4.2 The evidence documents and reports relevant to this topic (in chronological order) are:

Harborough District Local Development Framework: Core Strategy 2006- 2028, November 2011;

Harborough Housing Requirements Study: Final Report, March 2013;

Harborough Local Plan Scoping Consultation Report, 2013 (PRE2);

Report to Local Plan Advisory Panel 12 June 2013: New Local Plan for Harborough District Scoping Consultation – Summary of Responses (PRE2)

Report to Local Plan Advisory Panel 3 July 2013: New Local Plan for Harborough District Scoping Consultation – Implications of Scoping Consultation (PRE9);

Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), 2014 (EMP8);

The Leicester and Leicestershire City Deal, 2014 (EMP4);

The Leicester and Leicestershire Growth Deal, 2014, 2015 and 2017 (EMP5);

Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), June 2014;

Settlement Profiles, 2015 (PPL1);

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 18 March 2015: District Settlement Hierarchy – A framework to promote sustainable development;

LLEP Logistics & Distribution Sector Growth Plan, 2015 (EMP9);

Report to Council 27 July 2015;

Harborough District Potential Development Options Strategic Transport Assessment 2015 (TRP3);

Harborough Local Plan - Options Consultation, September 2015 (PRE3);

Sustainability Appraisal – Interim Report, September 2015;

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 24 February 2016: Workshops and Options Assessment Methodology;

Responses to Options Consultation Paper, April 2016 (PRE4);

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), May 2016 (HSG5);

Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Statement, 2016 (HSG9);

Report to Executive May 2016: Local Plan Options Assessment and Selection (& supporting papers) (PRE10);

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 19 September 2016: Assessment of Selected Spatial Options (& supporting papers) (PRE6);

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 17 October 2016: Assessment of Selected Spatial Options: Update (& supporting papers) (PRE7);

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 17 October 2016: Settlement Hierarchy – Village Groups;

Harborough District Local Plan Preliminary Traffic Impact Assessment, November 2016 (TRP2);

Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Need Assessment (HEDNA) 2017 (HSG8);

Harborough Strategic Employment Land Availability Assessment (SELAA), 2017 (EMP1);

The Midlands Connect Strategy, 2017 (TRP13);

The Midlands Engine for Growth, 2017 (EMP10);

Sustainability Appraisal, 2017 (S6);

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 3rd April 2017: Selected Spatial Options: Reassessment and Preferred Option for Submission Draft Local Plan (& supporting papers);

Report to Executive 16th May 2017: Selected Spatial Options: Reassessment and Preferred Option for Submission Draft Local Plan (& supporting papers)

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 24th July 2017: Harborough District Local Plan: Draft Proposed Submission –Employment Sensitivity;

Magna Park Employment Sensitivity Study, August 2017 (HSG12);

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 23rd August 2017: Harborough District Local Plan: Proposed Submission;

Report to Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel 4th September 2017: Harborough District Local Plan: Proposed Submission;

Duty to Cooperate Statement (S2)

5. EVOLUTION OF THE SPATIAL STRATEGY

The Starting Point

- 5.1 The existing Core Strategy was adopted in November 2011. It was based on the Regional Spatial Strategy (East Midlands Regional Plan) which required that Market Harborough be the main focus for development including a Strategic Development Area (SDA) for a minimum of 1,000 dwellings to the north-west of the town. It also provided for development of an appropriate scale and type in Scraftoft and Thurnby/ Bushby that supports the regeneration of Leicester, and development in Key Centres (Lutterworth and Broughton Astley) and Rural Centres that serves each centre and its catchment area. It also gave priority to the use of previously developed land, supported in principle the designation of Green Wedges around Leicester and separation between certain settlements elsewhere, and proposed to enhance Green Infrastructure. Losses in the stock of employment land were to be replaced and Key Employment Areas safeguarded.
- 5.2 In September 2012, the Council resolved policy relating to the Market Harborough SDA. This included agreeing to a scale of development of between 1,500 and 1,800 houses and 13.4 hectares of employment land. This development was to be guided by a masterplan.

- 5.3 As the Core Strategy pre-dated the NPPF and the proposed revocation of the East Midlands Regional Plan (which took place in April 2013), the Council decided in November 2012 that it needed to be replaced. This was to be in the form of a strategic and streamlined new Local Plan, which would:
- refresh and update the Harborough Core Strategy, while retaining its Vision, Strategic Objectives, settlement hierarchy and overall structure;
 - replace both the Harborough Core Strategy and the remaining saved policies of the Harborough District Local Plan (adopted April 2001);
 - roll forward the end date of the Core Strategy from 2028 to 2031;
 - include strategic allocations of land for residential, employment, retail, leisure and other land uses to meet strategic development requirements.
- 5.4 In order to enable work on the new Local Plan and to pre-empt a decision to prepare a HMA-wide SHMA, a Harborough Housing Requirements Study¹ was commissioned, taking into account 2011 Census data where available and the most recent information relating to household formation rates, economic growth projections, migration trends and population projections. This 2013 study concluded that a realistic assessment of housing requirements for the District would be for provision of between 8,000 – 10,000 homes over the 2011-31 period (400-500 per annum), as opposed to 7,000 (350 pa) in the Core Strategy. The Study recommended that provision of 440 homes per annum over the 2011-31 period would provide a positive, realistic and defensible framework for strategic planning.

Scoping Consultation

- 5.5 A Scoping Consultation (PRE2) was the first stage in preparing the new Local Plan and was undertaken in March and April 2013, concurrently with consultation on the draft North West Market Harborough SDA Master Plan. Its purpose was to seek the views of interested parties on the proposed contents of the new Local Plan. It is described in more detail in the Consultation Statement. The main matter of relevance to the spatial strategy was that, given that the new Local Plan looks to 2031 and that an increase in the annual housing requirement figure was likely, the new Local Plan needed to address the distribution of new housing between settlements. Whilst the Core Strategy identified a strategy able to accommodate 350 dwellings per annum to 2028, further work would be needed to establish the most appropriate distribution strategy for accommodating any increase in housing numbers.
- 5.6 The consultation responses demonstrated consultee support for an update of housing policy to reflect:
- revised housing requirements to 2031;
 - the distribution of total housing requirements between sustainable settlements based upon the current settlement hierarchy;
 - phasing across the plan period; and
 - the delivery of development through Neighbourhood Development Plans.
- 5.7 The response from consultees was more evenly divided on questions relating to:
- removal of limits to development' around settlements;
 - phasing of development over the plan period; and
 - identifying strategic housing, employment and other allocations based on whether delivery of the site is considered essential to the achievement of the Local Plan's objectives and overall spatial strategy.

¹ Archived study, available at:

http://www.harborough.gov.uk/directory_record/464/harborough_housing_requirements_study

- 5.9 As a result the Council decided to continue with the overall scope of the new Local Plan, as set out in the Scoping Consultation, with the following notable changes relevant to the spatial strategy:
- the proposed phasing of development sites across the plan period is unnecessary;
 - greater flexibility be given to the identification of sites as strategic, dependent upon the nature and scale of each settlement; and
 - policies for business and employment development to consider existing and emerging evidence on sub-regional employment land requirements and local economic strategy prepared by Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership.
- 5.10 It was also agreed that additional evidence documents were needed to support the preparation of the new Local Plan including:
- Updated Harborough Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA);
 - Settlement capacity assessment;
 - Updated Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA);
 - Discussion and agreement under the Duty to Co-operate between Leicester and Leicestershire local authorities about appropriate distribution of housing growth across the HMA;
 - Transport Assessment of housing distribution options through the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM).
- 5.11 As a result of the number of evidence studies required and in particular the length of time needed to scope and prepare a SHMA across the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area, there was recognition that there would be an inevitable delay to the preparation of the Local Plan. This also allowed time for development levels and options to be tested through the Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model.
- 5.12 Further work was undertaken in 2013, 2014 and early 2015 on such matters as the approach to limits of development, Local Green Space designations, retail impact, employment land need and availability, the strategic distribution sector, potential growth of Magna Park, Areas of Separation/ Green Wedges, the SHLAA, duty to cooperate, scoping for Sustainability Appraisal and settlement profiles / hierarchy.

Settlement Hierarchy

- 5.13 Further development of the options was supported by the settlement profiles which were intended to provide:
- An update of the evidence behind the settlement hierarchy (as identified by the Core Strategy) in order to confirm or, if necessary, amend the settlement hierarchy for the new Local Plan;
 - An understanding of which settlements could accommodate new development;
 - An understanding of which settlements could accommodate new development provided certain infrastructure was put in place;
 - An understanding of which settlements could accommodate very little development;
 - The assessment of housing distribution options to ensure that housing and other forms of development are distributed in a sustainable manner, ensuring access to and support for services and facilities.
- 5.14 The settlement profiles were updated in 2014 and consulted on with Parish Councils and ward members in January and February 2015. Following this and some minor amendments to the criteria to include public transport, it was noted that the current hierarchy had proven effective in distributing development across the District, that no major change was considered necessary, and that the approach to rural development

had been endorsed at appeal and was supported by development management. The only change to the hierarchy was to include Houghton on the Hill as a rural centre.

- 5.15 The methodology for the Settlement Hierarchy and the hierarchy itself are set out in Appendix F of the Submission Local Plan. This includes an explanation as to why the composite Selected Rural Villages of Church and East Langton, the Claybrookes, and Great Easton (with Bringhurst) were defined. Further detail on this is contained in a report to the Local Plan Executive Advisory Panel on 17th October 2016².

Preparation of Alternative Options

- 5.16 Initial work on developing alternative options for accommodating growth began with a report in January 2014 on residual housing requirements based on figures of 440 and 500 dwellings per annum³. The former reflected the OAN arrived at by the Harborough Housing Requirements Study 2013⁴, while the latter related to the anticipated increase in needs arising from the updated Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA.
- 5.17 Subsequently, the HMA-wide SHMA⁵ was produced in June 2014. This increased the OAN and the housing requirement to 475 pa, this being the higher level of a range to take account of the market signals, economic evidence and affordable housing need.
- 5.18 A ‘call for sites’ was undertaken in January-February 2015. This resulted in a total of 278 sites in the SHLAA, of which 92 were assessed as not currently developable. The sites included 4 potential Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) as follows:

SHLAA 2015 Strategic Development Areas submitted for assessment	
Site name	SHLAA ref number
Land east of Scraftoft (Leicester Principal Urban Area)	A/SC/HSG/13
Lutterworth East (East of M1 junct 20, near Misterton)	A/LT/MXD/03
Land north and east of Kibworth Harcourt	A/KB/MXD/27
Strategic Development Area West of Kibworth	A/KB/MXD/22

- 5.19 Initially 11 options for development, including combinations of the above SDAs, were considered. Two of the options were not carried forward. These were:
- An option relying on development in the countryside including in settlements below selected rural village level. This would be dealt with in a separate section rather than as a specific development option, thus allowing housing development in the countryside to be considered on its own terms.
 - An option for development of three strategic development areas. This was considered “unreasonable” since it would suggest almost no further development at most settlements in the District and could prejudice the maintenance of a short term housing supply.
- 5.20 The options document introduces the options by covering the vision and objectives of the proposed Plan and the settlement hierarchy which forms a framework against

² Report: ‘Settlement Hierarchy – Village Groups’, available at: <https://cmis.harborough.gov.uk/cm5/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/4211/Committee/810/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

³ Report: ‘Residual housing growth requirements report to AP 30 1 14 - revised figures’: available at: <https://cmis.harborough.gov.uk/cm5/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/3907/Committee/810/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

⁵ Archived study, available at: http://www.harborough.gov.uk/directory_record/2989/leicester_and_leicestershire_strategic_housing_market_assessment_2014

which development options are made. Sections then cover options for distribution of future housing and employment growth and indicate which sites may need to be allocated in the Plan to help deliver that option. Questions are asked within the document where options are available. The options are presented by location together with a brief analysis of the opportunities or risks they may bring, based on work on profiling each settlement. It was stressed that a hybrid or combination of options may be chosen as the preferred strategy for the Plan.

- 5.21 A key component of the development options was the opportunity to focus development in one or more SDAs which provide not only significant housing provision but also bring opportunity for local employment, community, leisure, shopping and primary education provision. Several new options for SDAs were identified - not simply providing housing and other uses but also important new links in the highway network which both access and mitigate the proposal themselves and provide new links for existing traffic, offering relief to existing communities. Critical to the success of these proposals was that they offered opportunities for comprehensively planned development which move logically from allocation in the development plan, through master-planning and community engagement to consideration of planning applications.

Options Consultation

- 5.22 An options consultation was carried out in September and October 2015. The paper (PRE3) focused on meeting the District's future need for homes and jobs, setting out 9 alternative options for locating housing and employment across the District to 2031. The findings of the sustainability appraisal (SA) process in relation to the 9 distribution options were set out in the Sustainability Appraisal – Interim Report (September 2015) (PRE11) which was consulted on at the same time as the Local Plan Options paper. This consultation is set out in more detail in the Consultation Statement (S3).
- 5.23 The 9 alternative Options consulted on during September / October 2015 were:

Set A: Variations on the current distribution strategy

OPTION 1: RURAL - Variation on the current distribution strategy - with an enhanced rural focus.

OPTION 2: CORE STRATEGY DISTRIBUTION - Continue to use the current (Core Strategy) distribution strategy.

OPTION 3: URBAN - Variation on the current distribution strategy - with an enhanced urban focus.

Set B: Options with 1 Strategic Development Area

OPTION 4: SCRAPTOFT / THURNBY SDA - Scraptoft / Thurnby Strategic Development Area and reduced growth in other parts of the District.

OPTION 5: KIBWORTH SDA - Kibworth Strategic Development Area and reduced growth in other parts of the District.

OPTION 6: LUTTERWORTH SDA - Lutterworth Strategic Development Area and reduced growth in other parts of the District.

Set C: Options with 2 Strategic Development Areas

OPTION 7: SCRAPTOFT / THURNBY SDA AND KIBWORTH SDA - Strategic Development Areas at Scraptoft / Thurnby and Kibworth and limited growth in other parts of the District.

OPTION 8 SCRAPTOFT / THURNBY SDA AND LUTTERWORTH SDA - Strategic Development Areas at Scraptoft / Thurnby and Lutterworth and limited growth in other parts of the District.

OPTION 9: LUTTERWORTH SDA AND KIBWORTH SDA - Strategic Development Areas at Lutterworth and Kibworth and limited growth in other parts of the District.

5.24 The consultation response to these options is described in the Consultation Statement.

Options Assessment

5.25 The assessment of the 9 options was undertaken using a pre-approved methodology. It was based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development as a golden thread running through plan-making, its 12 core planning principles that should underpin plan-making, its emphasis on viability and costs to ensure that plans are deliverable, and its tests of soundness. These were used to arrive at the following framework of factors:

A. Deliverability, comprising evidence on:

- 1) *Land availability* - using evidence from the latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and housing trajectories
- 2) *Infrastructure* - using evidence from: infrastructure providers' consultation responses; the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment; and the Strategic Transport Assessment
- 3) *Viability*– using evidence from the initial Viability Assessment

B. Consultation – assessing the quantity and quality of the key issues raised during the Options Consultation in relation to each of the 9 Options.

C. Planning Principles, comprising an assessment against:

- 1) *Sustainability*, using evidence from the SA Interim Report (September 2015) which accompanied the Options Consultation Document
- 2) *NPPF Core Principles*– using an assessment of each Option against each core principle
- 3) *Local Plan Objectives*– using an assessment of each Option against each Objective (as amended in light of consultation responses)

5.26 The assessment made use of the information in the SA, but the assessment became the basis for the decision on which of the development options to pursue through the Local Plan, rather than the SA in isolation.

5.27 Each Option was assessed against each of the seven factors listed above. The detailed way in which they were assessed varied from factor to factor, but the outcome for each was a 'traffic light' score against each option broadly indicating as follows:

Red: the option performs poorly in relation to this factor.

Amber: the option does not perform well in relation to this factor, but could perform better with mitigation.

White: the option is neutral in relation to this factor, or there is insufficient information to make a judgement.

Light green: the option performs adequately in relation to this factor.

Dark green: the option performs well in relation to this factor.

5.28 The information used for the assessment was set out in a detailed 'template' for each option that was presented to two members' workshops, the outcome of which were considered as part of the reports on options assessment.

5.29 The 'templates' set out the following information for each option:

- **Description** of the option

- **Land Availability:** using the SHLAA and emerging alternative housing trajectories, assesses the extent to which the amount of housing development can be met from sites in the locations suggested by the option, whether there is sufficient capacity to meet each settlement's requirement and whether the option would provide a 5 Year Supply of Housing Land for the period immediately post-submission of the Local Plan.
- **Infrastructure:** using the responses from statutory consultees, assesses the extent to which the option presents problems for the delivery of infrastructure, including highways and transport, education, power, water, drainage, and flood defences.
- **Viability:** based on hypothetical typologies in the Interim Report on Local Plan Viability shows the Residual Land Values and surpluses/ deficits in relation to Threshold Land Values, giving a percentage of dwellings likely to be viable in relation to each measure.
- **Strategic Transport Assessment (STA):** using the Strategic Transport Assessment which sets out a number of growth scenarios, summarises the highway link flow capacity results for the option.
- **Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA):** using the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2009) and the Water Cycle Study (2016), draws out the key flood risks for the option.
- **Options Consultation Responses,** setting out the number of respondents, the total representations, the number objecting, supporting and commenting; and the key issues raised in objections, support and comment.
- **Planning Principles:** using the Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report (Sept 2015), provides a summary of the predicted sustainability effects on the baseline position of the District.
- **NPPF Core Principles:** examines the option in relation to the Core Planning Principles (NPPF, para 17). The extent to which the option is likely to support delivery of each Principle is summarised and given a score. An overall summary of how well the option performs in relation to delivery of the Core Planning Principles is provided.
- **Local Plan Objectives:** assesses the overall performance of the option against the emerging Local Plan Objectives. The extent to which the option is likely to meet each objective is summarised and given a score. An overall summary of how well the option performs in relation to achieving Local Plan Objectives is provided.
- **Local Issues:** using the Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report (Sept. 2015), sets out where sustainability effects are identified for particular settlements under the option.

Options Selection

- 5.30 In April 2016 an assessment was undertaken based on the above methodology and the outcome of the Members' workshops. It was also decided that, pending receipt of the HEDNA, the Council should be planning for flexibility by making provision for housing development above the current OAN of about 15%, giving a figure of 550 dwellings per annum, or 11,000 over the Plan Period.
- 5.31 The Member workshops came to the view that Options 1, 3, 7 and, marginally, Option 2 should not be taken forward. Of the remaining five options, Options 6, 8 and 9 were preferred. Members also expressed the view that, within any option involving the Kibworth SDA, the choice was based on the Kibworth North East scheme, providing a by-pass, and not that at Kibworth North and West.
- 5.32 Following the workshops further information was received on the viability of Options 1, 2 and 3 and the data on the viability of the Scraftoft/ Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA was revised. It was also possible to review the data on land availability, especially by revising the trajectories of housing delivery based on the SHLAA.

5.33 Based on the workshop reports, the detailed templates and the traffic light analysis described above, six options were excluded . These are as follows, with a summary of the reasons for rejection:

Option 1 (Rural) performed poorly in relation to infrastructure and planning principles. It also did not perform well in terms of being able to meet some housing targets for settlements, flooding problems and was the most unsustainable option according to the Sustainability Appraisal. It also had relatively low levels of public support.

Option 3 (Urban) would not deliver the required amount of housing land of insufficient SHLAA sites in Market Harborough. It would also fail to deliver a 5 year land supply at the date of adoption and did not perform well in relation to infrastructure.

Option 4 (Scraptoft / Thurnby SDA) performed poorly or not well in relation to 7 of the 11 factors considered and did not perform well in relation to any of them. This SDA was fundamentally not viable and had the least support from the public (NB a variation of this SDA, on a completely different site subsequently came forward for assessment – see paragraph 5.35 below)

Option 7 (Scraptoft/ Thurnby SDA and Kibworth SDA) performed poorly or not well in relation to 8 of the 12 factors considered and did not perform well in relation to any of them, not quite delivering a 5 year housing land supply at the date of adoption, not performing well in relation to the NPPF Core Principles, and performing poorly in relation to viability, public support and transport infrastructure.

Option 8 (Scraptoft/Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA) performed poorly or not well in relation to 8 out of 12 of the factors considered, being especially poor in relation to transport in both SDAs, flooding in Lutterworth, and viability and public support in Scraptoft/ Thurnby. It did not perform well in relation to the NPPF Core Principles and Local Plan Objectives. However, unlike other two-SDA options it would deliver a 5 year land supply at the date of plan adoption.

Option 9 (Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA) performed poorly or not well in 7 out of 12 factors, including performing poorly with regard to transport impacts (at Lutterworth and to a lesser extent at Kibworth) and flood risk at Lutterworth. It would not quite achieve a five year supply at the date of adoption. However it was one of the Members' preferred options and performed well in relation to public support, the sustainability appraisal, and to some extent viability (on the basis of the Kibworth N & E scheme). Although on balance recommended for exclusion, it would in effect be assessed by the separate analysis of Options 5 and 6 (although this would not take into account any cumulative impacts).

5.34 Three options were recommended to be taken forward for further analysis. These are set out as follows with a summary of the reasons for their selection:

Option 2 (Core Strategy) despite being rejected by the Members' workshop, it would have been difficult to justify excluding Option 2 from further analysis given that it performed well or adequately in relation to planning principles and well in terms of viability. While it did not perform well on infrastructure, it was one of only two options that did not perform poorly on any factor.

Option 5 (Kibworth SDA) also did not perform poorly on any factor and performed well on viability. Of the two Kibworth SDA proposals, the north and east scheme offered clear advantages because it would deliver a by-pass and associated benefits for the centre of the village, while the north-west scheme was only marginally viable and has no beneficial traffic effects. Possible knock-on traffic impacts further along the A6 in Leicester, needed further investigation.

Option 6 (Lutterworth SDA) performed well with regard to public support and was favoured by the Members' workshop. However, it performed poorly in relation to

impacts on the local road network and potential flooding problems. It contains an SSSI, resulting in an objection from Natural England. There were doubts over the ability to provide good amenity for future residents given the proximity to the M1 and relatively poor connectivity to Lutterworth. Some of these problems were considered to be potentially resolvable through good master-planning and mitigation. It performed adequately with regard to the viability and the sustainability appraisal.

Scraptoft North SDA

5.35 A proposal had recently been received for an addition to the Scraptoft/ Thurnby SDA that had already been subject to consultation as Option 4. This proposed a further 1200 dwellings on land, including the Scraptoft Golf Club, to the north, west and east of Scraptoft village, much of which forms part of the Green Wedge between Scraptoft and Leicester city. The scheme together with the original Thurnby / Scraptoft SDA would provide 2,900 dwellings, far more than could be developed within the plan period. This would be in addition to the 945 dwellings already committed within Scraptoft and Thurnby, most of which had not yet commenced on site. While a scheme on this scale would not be necessary to meet the requirements of the Local Plan, there was merit in further investigation of the new proposals, both separately from and in combination with the Thurnby / Scraptoft SDA. An enlarged SDA could assist with viability through reduced per-dwelling infrastructure costs or those costs may be brought down by a different disposition of land.

Selected Options

5.36 In May 2016 (PRE10) the Council's Executive agreed the following four Selected Options for further assessment:

- Option 2: Core Strategy Distribution
- Option 5: Kibworth SDA (North East proposal only)
- Option 6: Lutterworth SDA
- a modification of Option 4, based on a minimum of 1,200 dwellings in the vicinity of Scraptoft North.

5.37 In relation to Thurnby/Scraptoft, it was considered that the emerging proposals for Scraptoft North merited further examination, but that it currently extended too far to the east and that in combination with the original Scraptoft/Thurnby SDA it would constitute too much development concentrated in the same area of the District, raising questions about its deliverability. It should therefore be pursued in addition to Options 2, 5 and 6, but as an alternative to (not in combination with) the original Scraptoft/Thurnby SDA.

5.38 It was also agreed that these Selected Options, based on provision of housing land at a rate of 550 dwellings per annum, be subject to further tests of land availability, infrastructure requirements, transport impact, flood risk, viability, landscape impact, environmental sensitivity/ mitigation and sustainability before arriving at a single preferred option. This could be one of the options, or a combination of options, or some other hybrid solution based on them.

Selected Options Assessment

5.39 During summer 2016 work was done on the formulation in more detail of a revised Option 4 based on the land in the vicinity of Scraptoft North, rather than the SDA consulted on in the Options Consultation Paper. There was also proactive discussion with the promoters of the Lutterworth, Kibworth North and East and Scraptoft North SDAs but on the clear understanding that there is no commitment to any of these schemes being allocated in the Local Plan. In particular a series of 'developer surgeries' were held during June 2016 at which the promoters for each of the selected SDAs presented their schemes and responded to a series of pre-set questions from

the Council's consultants, Peter Brett Associates, focusing upon questions around deliverability.

Assessment Methodology

5.40 The methodology for selecting a preferred option from the four Selected Options (PRE5) built on that which was used for the original 9 Options, but went into more depth in several aspects and gave additional weight to site-specific matters which would have been difficult to consider for the original 9 options. It took into account the following additional evidence:

- **Developability assessment** – the ‘developer surgeries’ with each of the potential SDA promoters to explore constraints to development, including land ownership, availability of utilities, transport infrastructure, education and social infrastructure and the cost of new infrastructure provision.
- **Landscape assessment** – two studies: one looking at the landscape sensitivity and capacity for development in landscape terms of the Scraftoft North area and other fields in Scraftoft not previously assessed (LAN7); and the other enabling a comparison between the 3 potential SDAs of the landscape impacts on a robust and consistent basis (LAN10).
- **Sustainability appraisal** – assessing each of the 4 selected options against the SA objectives and taking into account the need for the residential ‘flexibility allowance’ of 550 dwellings per annum. This built on the detailed settlement by settlement analysis included in the interim SA produced in September 2015, updating this to take account of the potential distribution of housing development in each of the four Selected Options.
- **Viability assessment** of the Scraftoft North scheme, taking into account residential values in this area, especially in new build developments nearby, together with the likely infrastructure costs of the scheme. In addition consultants undertook a review of the relative viability of the SDAs at Kibworth and Lutterworth, based on updated development costs information for each SDA (HSG11).
- **Land availability**- detailed assessment of the ability of each option to meet housing requirements, not just overall, but also on a settlement by settlement basis while maintaining a 5 year land supply over the whole plan period across the district. This included:
 - the results of the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (HSG5),
 - undertaking an assessment of housing trajectories over the plan period,
 - identification of potential strategic sites below SDA level for each selected option,
 - assessing the capacity of certain villages to absorb enough housing to meet their needs, and
 - a residential windfall sites analysis.
- **Transport studies** as follows:
 - Preliminary Transport Impact Assessment for the selected options by Jacobs (TRP2) (on behalf of HDC and in partnership with Leicestershire County Council using the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model);
 - South East Leicester Transport Study by Edwards and Edwards (TRP15) (on behalf of HDC and Oadby and Wigston BC, in partnership with Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council);
 - The Market Harborough Transportation Strategy (TRP12) (on behalf of Leicestershire County Council and HDC).

5.41 In addition use was made of the analysis undertaken for the 9 options assessment in relation to the NPPF Core Principles.

5.42 Each Option was assessed against each of the 11 combined factors:

- Transport impacts and benefits
- Housing land availability
- Infrastructure constraints and costs
- Viability
- Flood risk
- Landscape capacity
- Natural environment
- Climate change
- Housing and economy
- Health and Well-being
- NPPF Principles

5.43 The outcome for each factor would be a ‘traffic light’ score against each option. However in this case, in order to arrive at a clear and robust preferred option, it is proposed that the colours will indicate comparative performance, as follows:

Red: the option performs worst in relation to this factor.

Amber: the option performs second worst in relation to this factor.

Light green: the option performs second best in relation to this factor.

Dark green: the option performs best in relation to this factor.

5.44 The preferred spatial option derived from this process would be based on that (or those) that have the highest number of green or light green scores. In addition a numerical score could be given, but this would need to be done by ‘category’ (i.e. transport, developability, environmental, socio-economic and planning principles) in order to give each of these equal weight. In the event of two or more options scoring equally, or nearly so, then consideration could be given to a hybrid solution. Where a preferred option also had one or more red scores, then the Council would have to be satisfied that, in relation to that factor, there are clear and sufficient proposals for mitigation that would need to be incorporated into the policy for the site or sites concerned.

Assessment

5.45 In September 2016 the latest available information was used in order to assess the options based on the agreed methodology described above. The scores derived from a ranking of which option performed best (1) to which performed worst (4) for each factor, but with some scoring equally (in which case the ‘ranking points’ were shared equally), so the best scoring options are those that scored lowest. The scores for each factor within a category were then averaged to give an average ranking for that category. A summary table then summed these 5 averages to give a total score, which could theoretically range between 5 (best) to 20 (worst). The summary of Ranking Scores was as follows:

	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variation): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North & East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Category of factors	<i>Average ranking</i>	<i>Average ranking</i>	<i>Average ranking</i>	<i>Average ranking</i>
<i>Transport</i>	2.50	2.83	2.50	2.17
<i>Deliverability</i>	2.64	2.43	2.36	2.57
<i>Environmental</i>	3.60	1.80	2.20	2.40
<i>Socio-Economic</i>	2.40	3.20	2.60	1.80
<i>Planning Principles</i>	2.86	2.00	2.79	2.36
Total	14.00	12.26	12.44	11.58

5.46 The analysis indicated that Options 4 and 6 offered the best way forward, while Option 5 was slightly worse and Option 2 significantly worse. However Option 4 would be less desirable in terms of meeting need and providing choice, because a large proportion of new development in Harborough District would be located in the extreme north-west corner of the district and in the form of a type of suburb to Leicester City rather than supporting the District's second largest town. Moreover, the Lutterworth proposal is a mixed use development of a scale likely to come forward over the longer term, beyond the plan period, which would be more sustainable as a form of development.

5.47 Nevertheless there were risks associated with the Lutterworth SDA. These included:

- *The scale of infrastructure investment required.* Further clarity needed about the costs of the motorway bridge, signal controlled junctions and the utility connections across the motorway to the site.
- *The Misterton Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).* Natural England had stated that there was no objection in principle but that a feasibility study was required to demonstrate how the SSSI can be protected and if possible enhanced.
- *The traffic impacts on Lutterworth town centre.* The consultants were asked to look at the operation of the new junctions proposed.
- *Assumptions on delivery.* Amended assumptions included an average density of 35 dph and the total capacity of 2,750 dwellings. The viability assessment was undertaken on this basis.
- *Landowner cooperation.* It was understood that the owners of the land to the north-west of the SDA did not wish to be part of the development, wishing to develop their land independently. However, they were believed to be willing to make land available for access across the M1.

5.48 In order to reflect the risks involved in the delivery of the East of Lutterworth SDA as well as more recent transport modelling, updated housing delivery projections, and other matters, some adjustments were made to the assessment factors and comparative scores in October 2017. These changes were fed into the assessment matrix and revised average rankings produced. The summary of Ranking Scores (calculated as described in paragraph 5.45 above) was amended to read as follows:

Category of factors	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variation): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North & East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
	Average ranking	Average ranking	Average ranking	Average ranking
Transport	2.38	2.38	2.75	2.50
Deliverability	2.69	2.31	2.19	2.81
Environmental	3.50	1.80	2.40	2.30
Socio-Economic	2.27	3.27	2.55	1.91
Planning Principles	3.07	2.00	2.79	2.14
Total	13.91	11.76	12.67	11.66

5.49 In view of the likelihood that some authorities in the Housing Market Area (HMA) would be unable to meet their housing need as identified in the then emerging HEDNA and that in such an event authorities across the HMA would be expected to co-operate by accommodating additional development to meet any, as yet unquantified, unmet need, it was decided to allocate a Reserve Site/Sites in the Local Plan which is/are likely to be sufficient to meet unmet need.

5.50 Based on this and on the findings of the assessment, the Local Plan preparation progressed on the basis of:

- Option 6, involving a Strategic Development Area on land east of Lutterworth, as the preferred option for meeting Harborough District's housing and employment needs over the Plan period to 2031 and beyond; and
- Scraftoft North SDA being allocated as a reserve site for 1200 dwellings, only to be released if needed to contribute to meeting housing need from other local authorities as agreed within a Memorandum of Understanding or equivalent.

5.51 However, the risks associated with this option were still being tested. It was necessary to work closely with the promoters to arrive at an agreed basis for the SDAs, to be reflected in the site-specific policy, and to investigate the scope for public funding, if necessary, to secure the earlier delivery of road infrastructure.

Preferred Option

Further Work

5.52 Clarification meetings were held not only with the promoters of the East of Lutterworth SDA (recommended preferred option) and Scraftoft North SDA (reserve site), but also with the promoters of the potential Kibworth North and East.

East of Lutterworth SDA

5.53 Through the East of Lutterworth meetings, involving also the County Council as highway authority and on occasion Highways England, the Council continued to work proactively with the promoters of the SDA (referred to as the Consortium). This was in recognition that this SDA offered the best strategic option but presented various challenges in relation to delivery, including those referred to in paragraph 5.47 above. In particular it emerged that the owners of the land to the west of the M1, required in order to enable the northern access to the SDA, may be no longer willing to make land available for this route subject to a separate application for housing development, as had previously been indicated.

5.54 These discussions were focussed on the following issues:

- *Viability of the scheme*, including threshold values, infrastructure costs and cash-flow information.
- *Deliverability of the Relief Road*, including landowner ownership, and the potential availability of public sector funding to secure its delivery earlier on the build-out of the scheme.
- *Effectiveness of the Relief Road*, including its design and town centre traffic management measures.
- *Transport connectivity/ sustainability*, including a more detailed accessibility strategy and works to enable sustainable travel on the Gilmorton Road motorway crossing.
- *Capacity and delivery assumptions*, including housing, employment and infrastructure delivery and specific justification for the strategic distribution development being proposed for the land south –east of junction 20 on the M1.
- *Environmental matters*, including commitment to delivery of the Misterton Marshes mitigation strategy, flood risk management, and mitigation of noise and air pollution for future residents of parts of the SDA adjoining the M1.

5.55 An initial response to these matters was received from the promoters early in 2017, together with an Executive Summary of the Strategic Transport Assessment and Appendices (TRP10) and a revised Vision document and concept plan.

5.56 In January 2017 the agent for the owners of land to the west of the M1 confirmed that the owners are not prepared for any of their land to be put forward to provide a bridge to access the east of Lutterworth SDA. The promoters therefore also requested that Council initiates use of its Compulsory Purchase Order powers under the Town and

Country Planning Act in order to secure land required for the motorway bridge and completion of the spine road to the north of the site.

Scraptoft North SDA

- 5.57 Outstanding issues for this SDA were identified relating to: Transport Assessment, traffic modelling and mitigation; the replacement golf course; de-designation of the Local Nature Reserve; uses in the retained part of the Green Wedge; master-planning; and education contributions.
- 5.58 These matters were pursued through regular meetings held with the site promoters, and with both Leicester City Council and Leicestershire County Council Highways and Education officers. Advice was sought from Natural England on the de-declaration of the Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Detailed work was prepared by the site promoters, including the alignment of the access road, further transport modelling, ecological surveys and proposals for public engagement in the master-planning process. Confirmation of the willingness of the landowners of the replacement golf course site was received, together with completion of the Scraptoft Golf Club membership vote, confirming a majority in favour of moving to the new site.
- 5.59 As a result of the Focused Engagement on an early version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan during May 2017, concerns were raised by the County Ecologist about the loss of some of the grassland covered by the Local Nature Reserve. This is dealt with further in 5.91 below.

Kibworth North and East SDA

- 5.60 Following further meetings with the site promoters, additional information was submitted on scheme assumptions, land ownership and viability, transport impacts and proposals for down-grading the existing A6 through Kibworth.
- 5.61 The revised scheme assumptions and layout increased the site capacity slightly to 1,665 dwellings, increased the open space provision and proposed some 20 extra hectares of employment land. One of the landowners who had been previously reluctant confirmed to the promoters that he was willing to release his land and to enter into a section 106 agreement. Other smaller landowners had confirmed in writing their willingness to be part of the proposed development. The key landowners (Merton College and the Leicester Diocesan Board) confirmed that they were comfortable with the Council's viability assessment and had agreed Heads of Terms on a collaboration agreement.
- 5.62 A Technical Note from the promoters on transport included a critique of previous transport studies and suggested that the proposed extra employment land would foster a high degree of self-sufficiency, improving the balance between housing and jobs and allowing 'a significant proportion' of residents to work locally. However no transport modelling was undertaken to support this. In conjunction with the provision of a new bypass, it was proposed to downgrade the existing section of the A6 that runs through Kibworth. A package of measures was proposed on the existing A6 to reduce speeds, discourage through traffic and improve the connectivity between the site and the existing settlement of Kibworth.

Risk Assessment

- 5.63 This further information enabled a risk assessment to be undertaken of the three potential SDAs. Most of the risks associated with the Scraptoft North and Kibworth North and East SDAs were considered to be 'green', the exception being an 'amber' risk associated with the lack of transport modelling.
- 5.64 The main risks were associated with the East of Lutterworth SDA. All of these were considered to be capable of further mitigation by the receipt of more information and

evidence from the promoter. With the exception of a few outstanding points, this was provided in February 2017.

- 5.65 With regard to the risks around the CPO, advice on the use of CPO powers had been acquired from counsel and a specialist chartered surveyor. Following agreement from the promoters to enter into an indemnity agreement in accordance with a required timetable, the Executive on 15th May 2017 resolved (inter alia): “to promote the use by the Council of its compulsory purchase order making powers under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in order to acquire land needed for essential infrastructure associated with the proposed East of Lutterworth SDA, subject to: the allocation of the East of Lutterworth SDA in the new Local Plan; (and) putting in place the necessary agreements with the developers of the East of Lutterworth SDA to meet all of the Council’s associated costs.....”
- 5.66 With regard to the few outstanding points, further information was received setting out the Consortium’s position relating to the concern about the development ‘stalling’ before the motorway crossing and spine road, with its traffic and environmental benefits for Lutterworth town centre, is achieved. A confidential cash-flow statement was also provided.
- 5.67 In order to address concerns about highways infrastructure costs, at the end of May the Council commissioned consultants Jacobs to carry out a high level independent assessment of these costs (INF1). This work was received in late June/ early July and broadly confirmed the costs used by the developers. They were fed into the viability assessment.
- 5.68 Confirmation was also received from Highways England that the proposed highway improvements to serve the East of Lutterworth SDA are likely to be suitable, although the interaction between junctions would have to be appropriately designed, and that they have no objections in principle to the motorway crossing in order to access the northern part of the SDA (Appendix C of the Transport Topic Paper).

Housing Need and Requirements

- 5.69 In February 2017 the Executive noted the outcome of the recently completed Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) (HSG8) and that the objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing and employment land will form the requirement of the Local Plan. This gives a figure of 532 dwellings per annum for the period to 2031, a total of 10,640 dwellings (including completions and commitments). Any further requirement arising from unmet need from elsewhere in the HMA was to be identified within a formal Memorandum of Understanding; this could not be prepared until any level of ‘unmet need’ has been identified.
- 5.70 With regard to unmet need from Leicester City, a letter was received from the City’s Head of Planning which stated that:
- “Whilst the City is currently unable to provide a definitive figure for the shortfall in the city (in advance of work on the emerging local plan), the scale of the need set out in the HEDNA is of such magnitude that it is concluded that there will be an unmet need arising in the city.... The City Council looks forward to working closely with yourselves and the other HMA partners on ensuring the full OAN for the HMA is accommodated within the HMA by ensuring emerging plans are flexible enough to respond to addressing any unmet need which may be required to be addressed within those plans.”*
- 5.71 In order to take account of this and provide flexibility, an uplift of 20% over the Objectively Assessed Housing Need was made, bringing the total provision in the draft submission to 12,800 dwellings to allow for:
- i. a contingency to meet unforeseen circumstances; and

- ii. flexibility to make a contribution towards any unmet needs across the Housing Market Area (HMA), should they arise, in accordance with the statutory Duty to Cooperate.

5.72 The advantages of a flexibility allowance include:

- avoiding an early review of the Local Plan and its associated costs;
- demonstrating that the Council is meeting its Duty to Cooperate;
- increasing the likelihood of the plan being found to be positively prepared, effective and consistent with government policy, thus meeting three of the four tests of soundness;

Re-assessment and Identification of Preferred Option

5.73 The further work on the risks involved in the previously preferred strategic option at East of Lutterworth, as well as on the potential SDAs at Scraftoft North and Kibworth North and East, together with other more recent information such as the final HEDNA, was fed into a re-assessment of the factors previously taken into account in arriving at a decision on the preferred option.

5.74 The summary of the revised scores (calculated as described in paragraph 5.45 above) is set out in the table below and the detailed evaluation is in Appendix B.

	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variation): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North & East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Category of factors	<i>Average ranking</i>	<i>Average ranking</i>	<i>Average ranking</i>	<i>Average ranking</i>
<i>Transport</i>	2.38	2.38	2.75	2.50
<i>Deliverability</i>	2.19	2.19	2.56	3.06
<i>Environmental</i>	3.40	2.00	2.60	2.00
<i>Socio-Economic</i>	2.75	2.88	2.63*	1.75*
<i>Planning Principles</i>	3.29*	2.00*	2.43*	2.29*
Total	14.01	11.45	12.97	11.60

(* = figures corrected from Panel report- totals were correct)

5.75 The previous assessments in September and October 2016 had excluded reference to the Local Plan Objectives as criteria for assessing the Selected Options against each other. This was because they repeated factors included elsewhere and because there was little to distinguish between the options on the basis of these Objectives. However, a separate assessment was undertaken as to whether the four options met the 14 draft Local Plan objectives and, where this was not the case, gave a brief explanation. This is reproduced here as Appendix C.

5.76 The following paragraphs summarise the findings of the revised assessment and of the assessment against objectives, as well as commenting on the strategic pros and cons of each of the Selected Options.

5.77 **Option 2 (Core Strategy distribution)** was worst in terms of average ranking scores. It was best in relation to transport overall because much of the development would be in Market Harborough which has good public transport. It also scored well in terms of deliverability overall but, crucially, was worst in terms of housing land availability because there are insufficient SHLAA sites in Market Harborough. It scored poorly in terms of the environment and planning principles. It would only meet 5 Local Plan Objectives and would fail to meet 5 of them, including those in relation to housing and employment land. In strategic terms it adds more housing growth in Market Harborough than would be the case if an SDA was allocated, rather than where most employment opportunities will occur, namely the South West Leicestershire Growth Area (within the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan), the M1 and A5 corridors and the

Leicester City Principal Urban Area. Market Harborough has already received a large SDA allocation through the existing Core Strategy.

- 5.78 **Option 5 (Kibworth North and East)** performed third in terms of average ranking scores. Despite adding in more employment land, the potential SDA was still likely to result in longer journeys to work, although it would require further traffic modelling to be sure. While solving traffic (and associated air quality) problems locally, it scored poorly in relation to strategic transport impacts, particularly in South East Leicester. Because Kibworth is an expanded village not offering the same range of existing facilities as Market Harborough (Option 2), Leicester City (Option 4) or Lutterworth (Option 6), this option was considered likely to result in more unsustainable travel by private car. It also has greater environmental impacts than the other SDA options because of its higher landscape quality and its proximity to a conservation area and listed buildings. It would meet 8 Local Plan Objectives and only fail in relation to 3. In strategic terms it adds more housing growth near to Market Harborough, rather than in the South West Leicestershire Growth Area, the M1 and A5 corridors and the Principal Urban Area.
- 5.79 **Option 6 (East of Lutterworth)**, having previously performed slightly better than Option 4, now came marginally second in terms of average ranking scores. Nevertheless, this option continued to score best in relation to socio-economic factors because of its proximity to employment, retail, education and community facilities. It also scored well with regard to environmental factors (although poorly on the natural environment) and planning principles. However, it scored less well with regard to deliverability due the challenges described in the Risk Assessment. It would meet 9 Local Plan Objectives and only fail in relation to 2. In strategic terms, Option 6 locates development where employment opportunities will occur, namely the South West Leicestershire Growth Area and the M1 and A5 corridors. It also offers the one of the best opportunities for further long-term growth in the context of Leicester and Leicestershire's emerging Strategic Growth Plan.
- 5.80 **Option 4 (Scraptoft North)** now scored best in terms of average ranking (although only slightly better than Option 6). Its previous poor scoring in relation to the best location to meet Harborough's needs was reconsidered in the light of evidence in the recently published HEDNA. It seemed likely that much of Harborough's need would arise from households moving out of the City. In the light of this evidence it was suggested that the Scraptoft area may be well located for meeting Harborough's needs. If the Scraptoft North SDA were no longer restricted to meeting unmet needs from elsewhere, it would not be necessary for an allocation to be made in addition to the SDA to meet local needs in Scraptoft/ Thurnby/ Bushby.
- 5.81 Option 4 scored equal first in relation to transport because of its ability to be accessed by extending bus services into the site and its low impact on Harborough's roads. It also scored equal first in relation to deliverability and was best on environmental factors and planning principles. However it performed poorly in relation to the provision of employment, with insufficient suitable land in this option to meet the HEDNA requirements. It would meet 7 Local Plan Objectives and only fail in relation to 3. In strategic terms it is well located to support employment growth in Leicester City. By the same token, however, it is also well-placed to cater for any unmet needs arising from the City.
- 5.82 The above assessments were taken into account in giving consideration to the following choices of strategic spatial option:
1. continuing the currently preferred strategic approach;
 2. reversing the roles of the SDAs so that Scraptoft North would meet Harborough's needs and East of Lutterworth would be a reserve site to meet unmet needs from elsewhere;
 3. replacing East of Lutterworth with Scraptoft North and committing to an early review of the plan to meet unmet needs from elsewhere;

4. replacing East of Lutterworth with Kibworth North and East and retaining Scraftoft North as a reserve site to meet unmet needs;
 5. retaining the east of Lutterworth SDA but also releasing Scraftoft North to meet Harborough's needs as well as unmet needs from elsewhere; and
 6. allocating all three SDAs, with Scraftoft as a reserve site.
- 5.83 The pros and cons of these choices are attached here as a table in Appendix D. The conclusion reached was that the hybrid choice in 5. above should be selected. This option would retain the East of Lutterworth SDA but also release Scraftoft North at the same time. This would meet Harborough's needs as well as a level of unmet need now known to be arising from other parts of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA.
- 5.84 The advantages of this option were that it:
- reflected the Options Assessment ranking;
 - maximised the extent to which Local Plan Objectives are met;
 - located housing to meet unmet needs close to Leicester City, while also meeting Harborough's own needs arising from migration out of Leicester;
 - was well related to employment growth areas (SW Leicestershire and M1 / A5 corridor) and Magna Park;
 - had potential benefits for Lutterworth town centre;
 - mitigated the risks associated with the short/medium term delivery of the East of Lutterworth SDA by offering an additional large site in the form of Scraftoft North SDA with relatively few delivery challenges;
 - mitigated the concern that Option 4 (Scraftoft North) does not meet employment land needs;
 - removed the need to make further allocations (about 110 dwellings) to meet Scraftoft/Thurnby/Bushby's requirements;
 - negated the need for an early review of the plan (subject to HDC's contribution to meeting any unmet needs arising from other parts of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA not being excessive); and
 - provided potential to meet longer term needs beyond the plan period, including possible extensions to both sites in a future review of the Local Plan.
- 5.85 The main disadvantage of this hybrid approach was that, although no more land would be released than would have been done under the previous approach (which involved the release of a reserve site once the need for that release is established), the level of land release under the hybrid approach became unconditional. It would no longer be dependent on the need, timing and location being established through the Memorandum of Understanding.
- 5.86 The hybrid option set out in paragraph 5.85 above therefore became the preferred option as one which allocates development for the plan period and beyond in locations which meet strategic objectives for Lutterworth, the Leicester Principal Urban Area, Harborough District and, potentially, Leicestershire as a whole.

Focussed Engagement with Stakeholders and Duty to Cooperate

- 5.87 This enabled work to be completed on the 2nd draft of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (the first draft having been prepared at the end of 2016). This was then used in May 2017 as the basis for focussed engagement with all 'specific consultation bodies' (as set out in in Part 1.2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012), with the exception of parish councils. This included a Duty to Cooperate workshop held on 23rd May 2017.
- 5.88 Comments received as a result of this were fed into further revisions to the plan and/ or reported to the Panel at a briefing prior to the meeting on 19th June 2017. The key comments relating to the Spatial Strategy were:

- Concern from the County Ecologist about the loss of the Local Nature Reserve at Scraftoft North; it was considered that a large area of the site should be re-designated as a Local Wildlife Site.
 - Concern from neighbouring authorities outside the HMA about the open-ended nature of Policy BE2 on Magna Park on the basis that this could have adverse impacts for other (rail-based) strategic distribution sites and proposals, on the A5 outside Harborough and on the need for housing development in their area.
- 5.89 As result of the first point, meetings were held with the promoters of the Scraftoft North SDA and their ecological consultants and an area was defined for retention and / or enhancement as a Local Wildlife Site. These proposals would form part of the background to the proposed de-designation of the Local Nature Reserve, on which consultation took place as part of the consultation on the Proposed Submission Local Plan. This was possible without loss of housing capacity within the Scraftoft North SDA.
- 5.90 Following on from the second concern, a revised Policy BE2 was formulated to prevent the 'open-ended' expansion of Magna Park and ensure that the amount of Strategic Distribution did not become so great, that could impact upon housing needs in the area. The Magna Park Employment Growth Sensitivity Study (HSG12) considered the potential impact on housing requirements of strategic storage and distribution growth at Magna Park. It indicated that with up to 700,000 sq.m of Strategic Distribution could be accommodated, without a significant impact on housing need. However, taking into account of Objective 2 of the Local Plan and the need to reduce out-commuting, there was a need for a small re-distribution of housing growth across the HMA which increased the housing requirement (not the OAN) from 532 (the same as OAN) to 557 dwellings per annum. In this respect, the level of housing provision in the Local Plan is 20% above the OAN and 15% above the housing requirement.
- 5.91 Other issues raised during the focused engagement were addressed by amendments made prior to publication of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, as described in the Duty to Cooperate Statement.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

- 6.1 The identification of the preferred spatial distribution of housing and, to a lesser extent, business and employment development has followed an objective, robust, logical but also flexible and pragmatic approach. It has been founded on national planning principles and local planning objectives, as well as the objectives and guiding criteria contained within the Sustainability Appraisal. It has used the available evidence at each stage in the process to enable a judgement to be made about how an initially large number of options should be whittled down to a smaller number of selected options and, eventually, to a single preferred option.
- 6.2 In doing so the process has responded to the views expressed at the Options consultation and to the views of elected members, based on a thorough presentation of the evidence. The process has also responded to changes in circumstances as they have emerged. These have included the introduction of a variation of one option, initially as an extension of one of the original SDA options, but eventually as a replacement for it. This has involved a radical but practical re-distribution of land uses in the Scraftoft area in order to help deliver a significant increase in housing provision while maintaining the local distinctiveness and recreational opportunities that are valued by residents.
- 6.3 The process has also responded pragmatically to emerging challenges arising from a change in views from a key land-owner, maintaining dialogue with potential alternative SDA promoters while working to overcome the risks to delivery that had been identified at the East of Lutterworth SDA. The increase in the flexibility allowance in terms of

housing provision and the associated change in status of the Scraptoft North SDA from a reserve site to an allocation was also part of this pragmatic approach.

- 6.4 Another such response was the decision to commission the Magna Park Sensitivity Study at very short notice in order to be able to put a quantitative cap on further strategic distribution development there and so address the concerns of Duty to Cooperate partners. In all this an imperative has been to keep the Local Plan timetable on target (although there have been a few minor slippages), while ensuring that the proposed strategic developments delivered the housing needed as well as the environmental benefits sought in return.
- 6.5 While it has reassessed its previous decisions as evidence is refined and further information has come forward, it has resisted the temptation to go back to square one and introduce new strategic sites late in the process. This is mainly, but not entirely, because this would lead significant delays in the getting the Local Plan adopted so that a plan-led approach, rather than planning by appeal, can be followed as soon as possible. The opportunity to assess and potentially allocate additional land will come about as part of the Strategic Growth Plan for the 2031 – 2050 period.
- 6.6 In the meantime, the Council considers that the Spatial Strategy set out in the Submission Local Plan, based as it is on SDAs within two broad growth areas determined by sub-regional policy, and located where local need will arise from Magna Park and the Leicester Principal Urban Area, is sound. It is fully justified as being the most appropriate strategy when considered against all the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence at each stage. It is also positively prepared in order to deliver the needed housing, business and employment, retail and other development and is effective in that it is deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary priorities. Moreover both the Spatial Strategy and the Local Plan Objectives which it meets are firmly grounded in national planning policy as currently set out in the NPPF and national Planning Practice Guidance.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Analysis of Alternative Options Summary Table (April 2016)

Appendix B: Revised Selected Options Assessment Matrix (April 2017)

Appendix C: Assessment of Selected Options against Local Plan objectives (April 2017)

Appendix D: Pros and Cons of Choices following Reassessment of Selected Options (April 2017)

APPENDIX A: Analysis of Alternative Options Summary Table (April 2016)

Option	Consul-tation	Deliverability						Planning Principles					
		Land Availability			Infrastructure			Viability		SA	NPPF	Local Plan	
		Total housing	By settle-ment	5 year supply	General	Transport	Flooding						
1 Rural		OK	Shortfall in Husbands Bosworth & some SRVs	> 6 years	Capacity issues for schools & water / sewage	Promotes car journeys. 3 sites> 70% capacity	Problems in SE Kib, PUA, MH, Fleckney & some SRVs	Financially viable based on typologies, except Blaby Borders (marginally viable)		Most unsustain-able. Effects insufficient to bring benefits.	Contibutes least to delivery of core principles	Contibutes least to delivery of objectives	
2 Core Strategy		OK	Shortfall in Mkt Harb', H Bosw'th & some SRVs	> 6 years	Education issues in Market Harborough	3 sites> 70% capacity	Problems in SE Kib, PUA, MH & Fleckney	Financially viable based on typologies, except Blaby Borders (marginally viable)		More positive for urban areas, but less so for rural areas.	Performs well in promoting urban vitality/supporting rural communities	Contributes most to delivery of objectives	
3 Urban		Fails to deliver	Significant shortfalls in Mkt Harb' & Lutterworth	Fails to deliver	Education & sewage problems in Mkt Harb'	3 sites> 70% capacity	High risks in Mkt Harb', & downstream from PUA	Financially viable based on typologies, except Blaby Borders (marginally viable)		Concentrated in sustainable locations	Performs well but reliance on MH & S/T/B could have flooding impacts	Performs well but increasing impacts for MH and S/T/B	
4 Scraftoft/ Thurnby	Least support	OK	Shortfall in Husbands Bosworth & some SRVs	> 6 years	Needs primary school & WTW upgrade in Thurnby	A47 at 84% capacity. 3 sites> 70%	Downstream flood risk in Leicester city	S/T SDA fundamentally not viable due to low land values, 40% AH and infrastructure costs		Some negative effects at S/T/B. Effects less extreme overall	Delivers dev't but impacts on local historic & natural environment	Performs well but impacts on landscape/ hist. env/flood risk	
5 Kibworth		OK	Shortfall in Husbands Bosworth & some SRVs	OK	Needs primary school & sewer /WTW imp'ts. 2ndry ed issue	Impacts on city network: 4 sites> 70% capacity	Problems in SE Kibworth, Mkt Harb' & Fleckney	Kibworth NW SDA marginally viable.	Kibworth N/E SDA viable	Some negative effects at Kibw'th Effects less extreme overall	Delivers dev't but potential historic environment impacts	Performs well but impacts on landscape/ historic env	
6 Lutter-worth	Most support	OK	Shortfall in some SRVs	> 6 years	Scope for growth at Lutt-erworth re-education.	Highways impacts on J20 & A426	Extensive flood zone 2 & 3 at Lutter-worth	SDA financially viable (v Residual Land value) / marginally not viable (v Threshold L SV)		Some negative effects at Lutt. Effects less extreme overall	Delivers development but potential flood and SSSI impacts	Performs less well due to impacts on SSSI and flooding	
7 Scraftoft + Kibworth	Least support	OK	Shortfall in some SRVs	Marginal supply only	Need primary schools/WTW imp'ts. Kibw'th 2ndry ed issue	Impacts on Leicester network from 2 SDAs	Down stream flood risk in Leicester city	S/T SDA fundamentally not viable	Kib NW margin-ally viable	Kib N/E viable	Fewer & less extreme effects.	Delivers dev't but potential historic environment/ flooding issues	Performs well but impacts on landscape/ hist env't /flooding
8 Scraftoft + Lutterw'th		OK	Shortfall in some SRVs	OK	Need primary schools & WTW upgrade in Thurnby.	Highways impacts on J20 & A426; + Leic city	Extensive flood zone 2 & 3 at Lutter-worth.	S/T SDA fundamentally not viable	Lutterworth SDA viable / marginally not viable	Fewer effects at the extremes.	Delivers development but flooding/ hist. env/SSSI impacts	Performs less well. Impacts on SSSI, flooding & historic env	
9 Lutterw'th + Kibworth	Most support	OK	Shortfall in some SRVs	Marginal supply only	Need primary schs. WTW imp'ts Kibw'th 2ndry ed issue	Highways impacts on J20 & A426; + Leic city	Extensive flood zone 2 & 3 at Lutter-worth.	Lutterworth SDA viable / marginally not viable	Kib NW margin-ally viable	Kib N/E viable	Least effects District-wide	Delivers dev. but potential flood/ historic. env/SSSI impacts.	Performs less well. Impacts on SSSI, flooding & historic env't

APPENDIX B: Revised Selected Options Assessment Matrix (April 2017)

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraptoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Selected Options Transport Assessment (Consultant: Jacobs)	No critical issues identified. Link capacity issues at Market Harborough Rockingham Road and Melton Road islands (>90%). Negligible impact on Market Harborough Town Centre. Minor issues at Fleckney, Kibworth and Lutterworth. Impacts upon Northamptonshire network.	No critical issues identified. Localised impact on A47/ Station Road and Stoughton T-junction only, with minor impact on rest of District. Minor link capacity issues in Kibworth, Market Harborough town centre and Lutterworth. Increased impact on Leicester City, increasing junction delay. Highest average speeds and lowest travel times across District. More opportunity for modal shift to sustainable transport.	No critical issues identified. Link capacity issues on A6 north and south of Kibworth, and S of Oadby, and Rockingham Road and Melton Road islands in Market Harborough. Reduction in congestion within Kibworth on A6 as traffic moved to bypass. Highest level of journey travel times across the District due to Kibworth location and distance to employment opportunities.	No critical issues identified. Localised issues on A4304 at Whittle roundabout and proposed roundabouts to access the SDA and existing M1 J20. Significant increase in delay at junctions without mitigation. Impact on rural routes from SDA to Leicester (Gilmorton Rd etc). Minor issues in Fleckney and Market Harborough. No significant issues for M1 J20, but only because of delays at new junctions. (Additional Jacobs Technical Note - junctions, December 2016): Re-models 4 key junctions to demonstrate significant improvements after mitigation (mostly changes to signal phasing), with all junctions operating within capacity after improvements.
<i>Ranking</i>	1.5=	1.5=	3.5=	3.5=
South East Leicester Study: Stresses (Consultant: Edwards and Edwards)	Not included in the Assessment, but there is specific assessment of impact from Fleckney development. This impacts upon local junctions, specifically on Newton Lane/A6 junction; but distribution is dispersed, with marginal wider impact. Impacts also likely from additional housing in Scraptoft (330 more dwellings proposed), but at a lower level than Option 4.	Impact on eastern side of Leicester City, within and outside of City border relative to access to City and A47. Largely independent impact in relation to the district and the other proposed developments. Impact on rural roads around the development, and poor connectivity to west of Leicester and wider road network, including ring road impact. Some conflict with potential land release in North Oadby.	Impact on edge of the Leicester PUA through the centre of Leicester along A6 corridor, but higher proportion of traffic heading south, away from Leicester to Market Harborough and Northamptonshire. Conflict with potential land releases in Oadby and Wigston are minimised because direction of traffic flow is the same. Impact on rural roads, specifically for western direction movements towards Oadby / Wigston / Blaby / Countesthorpe.	Little association with Leicester PUA, and low impact of development on Oadby and Wigston or Leicester PUA. Impact on rural routes from SDA into Leicester (Gilmorton Rd etc).
<i>Ranking</i>	2	4	3	1
Accessibility by Sustainable Modes, including South East Leicester Study	Not included in assessment, but refers to Fleckney. Fleckney (c 550 dwellings proposed) has limited access to employment and whilst having access to public transport,	Offers wider access to employment through sustainable transport, especially by cycle but also bus. Will require provision of express bus services to ensure 30 minutes to town	Access to employment opportunities on site and access to public transport. Opportunities to extend bus service into new housing have been discussed with operator. Employment	Access to employment opportunities by public transport likely to be limited, but a bus service will be a provided to serve the SDA, with priority access over the M1 via Gilmorton Rd in the

(Consultant: Edwards and Edwards)	there are no employment sites within 30 mins. Good access within Market Harborough (1770 dwellings) but generally poor in rural areas.	centre.	in Fleckney within 30 minutes cycling but unable to access wider employment opportunities within 30 minutes. New 20 ha employment allocation may improve this.	long term towards the end of the Plan period. Access within 30 minutes cycling to employment in Lutterworth and Magna Park.
<i>Ranking</i>	2	1	3.5=	3.5=
Local transport benefits	Because of the difficulties of securing sufficient funding from dispersed development, improvements to transport infrastructure will be confined to site-specific matters, unless CIL is introduced or any future developer contributions mechanism.	Will assist in improving traffic circulation in Scraptoft village and in providing parking facilities on roads in Leicester leading to / from the site.	Provides a by-pass for Kibworth, enabling downgrading of the existing A6 and improved pedestrian and cycle links within the village. Introduction of road diversion, traffic calming, crossing facilities and footways/ cycleways proposed to existing A6 together with pedestrian and cycle connections from existing settlement to the SDA.	Provides a relief road for Lutterworth. Potential of up to 34% reduction in traffic in the town centre (south of Gilmorton Road junction) southbound in the morning peak and northbound in the evening peak when measured against the 2031 reference case.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	3	1	2
Average Ranking: Transport	2.38	2.38	2.75	2.50

DELIVERABILITY ASSESSMENT	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraptoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Housing Land availability: SHLAA sites compared to settlement requirement	Major shortfalls in SHLAA sites to meet requirements in Market Harborough and minor shortfalls in a few villages (even with adjustments to Selected Rural Villages requirements to reflect estimated capacity).	Sufficient SHLAA sites to meet requirements apart from a few villages(even with adjustments to Selected Rural Villages requirements to reflect estimated capacity).	Sufficient SHLAA sites to meet requirements apart from a few villages(even with adjustments to SRV requirements to reflect estimated capacity).	Sufficient SHLAA sites to meet requirements apart from a few villages(even with adjustments to SRV requirements to reflect estimated capacity).
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2 =	2 =	2 =
Housing land availability: 5 year land supply	5 Year housing land supply at date of adoption (and every year until 2024/25 - exceeds NPPF requirements)	5 Year housing land supply at date of adoption (and every year until 2024/25 - exceeds NPPF requirements)	5 Year housing land supply at date of adoption (and every year until 2024/25 - exceeds NPPF requirements)	5 Year housing land supply at date of adoption (and every year until 2024/25 - exceeds NPPF requirements)
<i>Ranking</i>	2.5 =	2.5 =	2.5 =	2.5 =
Housing Delivery, Trajectory Review (Peter Brett Associates)	Not covered by PBA review. Demand likely to be strong in MH and rural areas. Delivery on most sites not affected by major constraints.	Delivery likely to be strong, similar to Hamilton across Leicester City border. Commencement affected by golf course relocation and minerals assessment but only limited	Demand will be very strong, similar to MH. Commencement affected by minerals assessment, archaeology, and by-pass construction. 1st houses proposed for 2021-22 providing 1500	Market similar to Lutterworth (less strong than Market Harborough and Kibworth). Commencement affected by flood mitigation / ground modelling, off-site highways works, utilities

		strategic infrastructure needs. 1st houses proposed for 2020-21 providing the full site of 1200 within the Plan period.	within the Plan period.	connections, minerals assessment, sensitive management of SSSI, and need to have statutory consultee input (HE, NE, EA, National Grid) to manage risks. 1st houses proposed for 2022-23 providing 1200-1500 dwellings in the Plan period.
<i>Ranking</i>	1	2.5 =	2.5 =	4
Potential Allocations (in addition to SDAs) (for information, not scored)	Overstone Park, MH; E of Blackberry Grange, Northampton Rd, MH; W of Airfield Farm (extension to SDA), MH; Burnmill Farm, N of MH 2 small sites N of MH; E of Leicester Rd, Lutterworth; Kilby Road, N of Fleckney; S of Arnesby Rd, Fleckney; E of Charity Fm, Bushby; Scraftoft Hill Fm.	Overstone Park, MH; E of Blackberry Grange, Northampton Rd, MH; W of Airfield Farm (extension to SDA), MH; Burnmill Farm, N of MH E of Leicester Rd, Lutterworth; Kilby Road, N of Fleckney; S of Arnesby Rd, Fleckney.	Overstone Park, MH; E of Blackberry Grange, Northampton Rd, MH; E of Leicester Rd, Lutterworth; Kilby Road, N of Fleckney; S of Arnesby Rd, Fleckney.	Overstone Park, MH; E of Blackberry Grange, Northampton Rd, MH; Kilby Road, N of Fleckney; S of Arnesby Rd, Fleckney.
Infrastructure constraints (excluding transport, discussed in Section 1 above)	Moderate constraint re existing primary school capacity in Market Harborough, Kibworth and Gilmorton, with limited or no scope for expansion; so a new primary school would be a requirement of development in MH.	No major constraints. Utilities network connections are all nearby. need to upgrade waste water treatment works; but this is in programme. Minor constraint re existing primary school capacity with limited or no scope for expansion in Market Harborough and Gilmorton; so a new primary school would be a requirement of development in MH. Secondary school available adjoining site (Hamilton College), but SDA is within Oadby catchment; contributions would be needed towards extensions to Hamilton College or Oadby schools.	No major constraints. Utilities network connections are all nearby. Possible need for upgrade to waste water treatment works. Need to extend secondary school. Minor constraint re existing primary school capacity with limited or no scope for expansion in Market Harborough and Gilmorton; so a new primary school would be a requirement of development in MH. New primary school for Kibworth would be provided by SDA developers.	High voltage 400 kV transmission line (nationally critical infrastructure) running diagonally across the site. Utilities network upgrades are needed and may be costly with long lead-in times. Minor constraint re existing primary school capacity with limited or no scope for expansion in Market Harborough and Gilmorton; so a new primary school would be a requirement of development in MH. SDA would provide 2 new primary schools (1 in plan period).
<i>Ranking</i>	3	1.5=	1.5=	4
Infrastructure costs: (figures rounded to the nearest £10,000)	Unknown, but likely to be less than SDAs. In any event would be split between a large number of developers. Could be funded through CIL or any future replacement development contributions mechanism.	Transport: £6m; education: £9.24m, utilities: £2.5m; drainage: £1.25m; other S106: £3.28m; landscaping and earthworks: £1.5m. TOTAL:£23.77m, total/dwelling: £19.8k	Transport: £12.1m; education: £11.64m; utilities: £3.5m; drainage: £1.67m; other S106: £4.27m; landscaping: £0.16m. TOTAL: £33.34m, total/dwelling: £20.8k	Transport: £37.38m; education: £10.95m; utilities: £5m; drainage: £4.49m; other S106: £6.88m; landscaping: £1.5m; noise mitigation: £0.93m. TOTAL: £67.13m, total/dwelling: £24.4k
<i>Ranking</i>	1	2	3	4

Viability	<p>Viable (based on assessment of hypothetical typologies and provision of 20% starter homes and 30% affordable housing). RLV/ha range from £741,300 to £1,878,950 across the District. All Viable when Threshold Land Value (TLV) compared with RLV</p>	<p>SDA Viable (based on provision of 20% starter homes and 30% affordable housing) in terms of residual land value. Total Residual Land Value (RLV) = £17m. RLV/ha = £487,331. Not Viable when Threshold Land Value (TLV) compared with RLV, but may not be relevant given owners' characteristics and aspirations as public sector land owners. Remaining housing development to be provided on other sites is Viable against RLV and TLV.</p>	<p>SDA Viable (based on provision of 20% starter homes and 30% affordable housing) in terms of residual land value. Total Residual Land Value (RLV) = £25m. RLV/ha = £494,367. Not Viable when Threshold Land Value (TLV) compared with RLV, but may not be relevant given owners' characteristics and aspirations. (Figures based on 08/16 infrastructure costs). Remaining housing development to be provided on other sites is Viable against RLV and TLV.</p>	<p>SDA Viable (based on provision of 20% starter homes and 30% affordable housing) in terms of residual land value. Total Residual Land Value (RLV) = £39m. RLV/ha = £499,222. Not Viable when Threshold Land Value (TLV) compared with RLV, but may not be relevant given owners' characteristics and aspirations as public sector land owners. (Figures based on 08/16 infrastructure costs) Remaining housing development to be provided on other sites is Viable against RLV and TLV.</p>
<i>Ranking</i>	1	3 =	3 =	3 =
Land Ownership: potential challenges	<p>Assumed to be none since all sites are in the SHLAA and many are subject to applications/ pre-application consultations.</p>	<p>2 landowners – Scraftoft Golf Club and Leicester City Council. Scraftoft Golf Course Members have voted in favour of the relocation and redevelopment of the current site. Relocation of the Golf Course relies on planning permission being granted for a new site. Promotion agreement agreed in principle with both landowners.</p>	<p>7 landowners. The 2 major landowners have agreed Heads of Terms for a collaboration agreement and continue to jointly promote the land. One landowner whose intentions were previously unknown is now understood to be willing to release their land and to sign the s106 Agreement. A confirmation letter from them is expected. 2 smaller landowners have provided written evidence of their willingness.</p>	<p>5 landowners. An agreement between 4 landowners is expected to be signed by May 2017. However, owners of the land to the north of Lutterworth, required to provide access from the A426 and provision of the M1 bridge have confirmed they are unwilling for any of their land to be put forward to provide a bridge for the Lutterworth East scheme. A CPO is likely to be required to implement this scheme.</p>
<i>Ranking</i>	1	2	3	4
Potential for longer term housing delivery beyond the plan period (2031)	<p>No capacity for further growth in Market Harborough, Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby, and Lutterworth.</p>	<p>1200 expected to be delivered prior to 2031. Further land potentially available to the east of the SDA site; could accommodate a further 600 - 800 dwellings.</p>	<p>1500 expected to be delivered prior to 2031, 165 after.</p>	<p>1500 expected to be delivered prior to 2031, 1250 after.</p>
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2	3	1
Average ranking: Deliverability	2.19	2.19	2.56	3.06

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant) Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Flood risk: on site and off site (climate change resilience)	EA have highlighted that additional development in Market Harborough, together with climate change, increases the risk of flooding. Significant potential allocations are close to River Jordan, which is very sensitive to additional rainfall.	Development at Scraftoft North is low flood risk, but there is a need to ensure that on-site drainage is handled in such a way that the flood risk downstream in Leicester City is reduced. This will be covered by the masterplan/ SPD and by policy criteria.	Low risk of flooding, although surface water treatment will be important.	EA advice indicates that the crossing of the River Swift (providing access to the site from A4304) must be designed to take into account climate projections and land in the flood plain used for the river crossing would need to be compensated for. EA advise that the Swift Valley Park should be designed to allow for the flood zones around the Swift to be managed.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2	1	3
Landscape capacity: comparative assessment	Potential allocations under this option will avoid areas of low and medium low landscape capacity as defined in available landscape capacity studies (PUA, Market Harborough, Lutterworth/ Broughton Astley, Rural Centres). Housing sites will therefore be located on the least sensitive sites in landscape terms where possible. Overall landscape impact should be medium to medium/ low.	SDA split into 2 sub areas with following capacity: A (north - majority of site) medium (medium/high if green wedge policy not taken into account)- area is generally well contained/enclosed from wider landscape. B (south) medium (medium/high if green wedge policy not taken into account) – enclosed from wider landscape and proximity to existing urban structure.	SDA split into 3 sub areas with following capacity: A (north) medium/low - isolated position beyond ridge line facing wider rural valley to north. B (central) medium/low - close relationship with Conservation Area and intact historic field pattern. C (south) medium - well contained by land form and relates well to existing village edge.	SDA split into 3 sub areas with following capacity: A (central - most of site) medium-enclosed by vegetation, restricted private views and good scope to mitigate large development in wider landscape. But lacks relationship with existing settlement and could impact on Misterton. B (north -road only) medium/high -adjacent to urban area and well suited in terms of topography and enclosure. C (south) high - few landscape or visual constraints, relatively isolated but good location for free-standing commercial development.
<i>Ranking</i>	2.5 =	1	4	2.5 =
SA assessment of effects on built and natural heritage	Major negative effect overall. Negative effects at the majority of Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages due to scale of growth potentially affecting character of settlements. Minor negative effects on character of MH, Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby and Lutterworth relating to landscape.	Moderate negative effect overall. Impact on landscape/ green wedge at SDA and potential impacts on conservation area would lead to moderate negative effects for Scraftoft but neutral effects predicted at MH, Lutterworth and Kibworth.	Moderate negative effect overall. Major negative effect in Kibworth as areas of sensitive landscape and historic environment would be impacted. Neutral effects predicted at MH, Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby Lutterworth and Kibworth..	Moderate negative effect overall. Moderate negative effects predicted for Lutterworth due to effects on landscape character(?), while effects on built heritage are less prominent (than Option 5 including the Kibworth SDA). Neutral impacts predicted for MH, Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby and Kibworth.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2	3	1

SA assessment on effects on natural environment and on-site designations	Moderate negative effect overall due to potential for cumulative negative effects on biodiversity at many SRVs, Rural Centres and Key Centres, loss of best agricultural land and exacerbation of air quality issues at Lutterworth and Leicester Principal Urban Area (substantial growth without upgrades to highway network or improvements to Green Infrastructure).	Moderate negative effect overall across district taking into account cumulative effects on agricultural land and local wildlife sites. Could be moderate negative effects associated with SDA but a comprehensive GI plan ought to ensure that these effects are reduced. There is potential for a positive effect to be generated. Scraptoft Local Nature Reserve would be lost but it has limited value, especially its eastern half, and natural environment could be enhanced by Green Infrastructure proposals; will require that redundant constructed features in Scraptoft Brook (weirs etc) be removed and the link with the wildlife corridor into Leicester to be preserved.	Moderate negative effect overall across district. Moderate negative effect at Kibworth linked to potential loss of best agricultural land. A comprehensive Green Infrastructure plan ought to ensure that any negative effects are mitigated.	Moderate negative effect overall across district. Major negative effects at Lutterworth reflecting the effects on biodiversity (including presence of SSSI) and agricultural land. Potential for positive effects on air quality and for enhancements to Green Infrastructure. Sensitive development which enhances Green Infrastructure could minimise negative effects, but presence of SSSI may present more difficulties than at other SDAs. Natural England have withdrawn their objection based on a feasibility study of mitigation measures to protect the SDA.
<i>Ranking</i>	2.5=	2.5 =	2.5 =	2.5=
SA assessment of effects on resource use (climate change mitigation)	Minor negative effect predicted overall. As the option distributes more housing to rural villages, it could lead to an increase in carbon emissions. This increase in emissions from 'rural areas' could be offset somewhat by growth in MH, Lutterworth and S/T/B. The substantial housing provision at MH could help reduce carbon emissions.	Neutral effect predicted overall. Substantial housing provision at MH could help reduce carbon emissions. Delivery of an SDA at Scraptoft ought to promote sustainable growth, especially with measures to improve and encourage bus travel, but it is likely that car trips into Leicester would continue.	Neutral effect predicted overall. Substantial housing provision at MH could help reduce carbon emissions. Delivery of an SDA at Kibworth ought to promote sustainable growth but it is likely that car trips would continue to be dominant mode of travel. The addition of a further 20ha of employment land to the SDA could result in some reduction in out-commuting.	Minor positive effect predicted. Positive effects at certain settlements outweigh negative effects predicted for others. Delivery of SDA in Lutterworth ought to promote sustainable growth, and good links to jobs (for example at Magna Park) but it is likely that car trips would continue to be the dominant mode of travel.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2.5 =	2.5 =	1
Average Ranking: Environmental	3.40	2.00	2.60	2.00

SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraptoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Suitability of location to meet Harborough's Housing needs	Housing is distributed in proportion to existing household location (with some redirection towards urban areas) so will be best matched to demographic growth.	Housing is concentrated in the Leicester Urban Area and so could serve the needs of the City. But a large part of Harborough's needs are derived from the City, so will also meet those needs.	Housing is centrally located within the District and so could serve the needs of Market Harborough and the rural areas, but substantial development already over-committed in Kibworth and Great Glen.	Housing is concentrated in Lutterworth and will meet a large amount of the need derived from employment growth, as well as demographic growth in the district's second largest town.
<i>Ranking</i>	2=	2=	4	2=
Proximity to existing employment	Market Harborough (1770 dwellings) has a good range of employment in accessible locations. Scraptoft/ Thurnby/ Bushby (330) has access to employment areas within the PUA. Lutterworth (260) has employment in the town and access to Magna Park. Limited employment in Fleckney (540) & rural areas.	No specific employment areas in the immediate vicinity. However, there is access to a wide range of employment opportunities within Leicester City and the wider PUA.	Limited existing employment provision within Kibworth. Traffic study shows increased out-commuting. Revised masterplan proposes an additional 25ha of employment.	Substantial employment provision both within Lutterworth and at Magna Park, all of which are in relatively close proximity.
<i>Ranking</i>	2 =	2 =	4	2 =
Provision of new employment	Various sites. Fails to deliver the employment requirements in the HEDNA.	Various sites but none in SDA. Fails to deliver the employment requirements in the HEDNA.	Various sites and 25ha in SDA on 2 areas adjacent to A6 to north (2 ha) and south of the site (20 ha).	Various sites and 23ha within SDA on sites adjoining M1 and to SE of J20.
<i>Ranking</i>	3.5 =	3.5 =	1.5=	1.5=
Proximity to retail and impact on centres	Market Harborough and Lutterworth are both town centres in the retail hierarchy with a wide range of retail provision, including a choice of supermarkets. Limited provision in Fleckney.	Local supermarket (Co- op) in Scraptoft to meet day to day needs. Large supermarket at least 2 miles away from SDA in Hamilton.	Local supermarket in Kibworth Beauchamp village centre (at least 1 mile away from SDA) along with a range of smaller shops and facilities in village centre. Closest large supermarket approx 5 miles (Oadby). Kibworth centre to benefit somewhat from increased expenditure but most of this likely to go to MH and Leicester.	Lutterworth has a good town centre with a range of shops and facilities. 2 large supermarkets in town centre, which are a minimum of 0.5 miles away from nearest part of SDA. Lutterworth centre to benefit from increased expenditure and environmental improvement.
<i>Ranking</i>	2.5=	2.5=	4	1
Provision of retail	Provision: new sites in MH and Lutterworth town centres.	Provision: new sites in MH and Lutterworth town centres, plus local centre in SDA .	New sites in MH and Lutterworth town centres + 2.8ha local centre in SDA to include a small supermarket.	New sites in MH and Lutterworth town centres + 1.2 ha local centre in SDA.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2=	2=	2=

Proximity to / Provision of education	Adequate primary and secondary provision in MH, Lutterworth and Scraptoft/Thurnby/ Bushby. New primary school to be provided at MH SDA will add to capacity in MH. Potential capacity issues identified in some smaller village schools.	Scraptoft does not have a primary school and children go to Fernvale Primary School in Thurnby. New primary provision is proposed in the SDA. Secondary schools in Oadby (6 miles but in catchment) and Hamilton Community College (adjacent to SDA site but in City): both schools seek contributions.	Capacity issues identified at both primary and secondary levels. Primary needs would be met through new provision at SDA. SDA promoters propose extensions to Kibworth Academy.	Secondary school capacity in Lutterworth, providing existing capacity is maintained prior to delivery of the SDA. Two new primary schools will be provided to meet needs of SDA.
<i>Ranking</i>	3	2	4	1
Proximity to/ Provision of other community facilities	Proximity: A good range of community facilities are available in MH and Lutterworth. Both have leisure centres with swimming pools, libraries, GP surgeries. Scraptoft/ Thurnby/ Bushby have fewer local facilities – no library or leisure centre. Thurnby and Bushby have community venues, but Scraptoft is seeking an improved multi-use community hall.	Scraptoft does not have a GP surgery, permanent library or community leisure facility. It has only a small village hall but planning permission for a new multi-use community hall is in place. Its location means that facilities in the PUA can be accessed.	There are 2 GPs, a community library and a village hall. There is no dedicated leisure centre but the secondary school allows evening community use of its sport hall and artificial grass pitch. Community centre provision is proposed in the SDA and commercial leisure facilities.	Lutterworth has a good range of community facilities (including a leisure centre with swimming pool, library, community hospital, 2 GPs and town hall). These are all in or close to the town centre. Their accessibility to SDA residents will depend on appropriate and safe links to SDA from Lutterworth.
<i>Ranking</i>	1.5 =	4	3	1.5 =
SA Assessment of effects on housing and economy	Significant and major positive effect overall. Benefits for the majority of settlements through provision of housing choice, affordable housing and increased spending in village/town centres. Effects would be spread fairly evenly across the district.	Moderate positive effect overall. Mostly positive effects across the District by supporting modest housing growth. Delivery of an SDA would see major positive effect in S/T/B. Low levels of growth in some Rural Centres see negative or neutral effects (Ullesthorpe, Great Glen, Kibworth).	Major significant positive effect overall. Provision of greater housing choice, affordable housing and increased spending would have beneficial effects on housing and the economy at the majority of settlements. Major positive effect in Kibworth and surrounding settlements (e.g. Fleckney) through delivery of SDA.	Major significant positive effect overall. Beneficial effects on housing and the economy at majority of settlements. Major positive effect on Lutterworth and surrounding villages through delivery of SDA. Most favourable re: matching housing growth to areas of jobs growth (and more so should expansion at Magna Park be part of the preferred strategy). Low levels of growth in Kibworth and Great Glen see neutral effects.
<i>Ranking</i>	2 =	4	2 =	2 =
SA Assessment of effects on health and well being	Major positive effect overall. Overall housing provision and contributions to social/ community infrastructure would deliver positive outcomes. Particular benefits for Fleckney, MH and S/T/B.	Moderate positive effect overall due to improved health and well-being in many places resulting from access to housing and potential improvements to community infrastructure and open space. Moderate positive effects at MH, Fleckney and S/T/ B.	Major positive effect overall. Neutral or positive effects on health in most Selected Rural Villages and Rural Centres. Major positive effects predicted for Fleckney and Kibworth (due to infrastructure upgrades, jobs and housing at SDA). Also positive effects at Lutterworth, Market Harborough and S/T/B.	Major positive effect overall. Option performs best at the Selected Rural Villages level whilst also having similar positive effects for the Rural Centres, Key Centres and MH. Major positive effect in Lutterworth (due to infrastructure upgrades, jobs and housing provision at SDA).
<i>Ranking</i>	2 =	4	2 =	2 =
Open space and Green	Various existing shortfalls exist. Developers will be asked to make	The minimum provision for Scraptoft North SDA calculated on 1200	The minimum provision of Green Infrastructure for Kibworth SDA	The minimum provision of Green Infrastructure for Lutterworth SDA

Infrastructure provision	appropriate S106 contributions.	dwellings is 38.16 ha of Green Infrastructure. The Scraftoft SDA proposal includes 35.2ha of Green Infrastructure including Public Open Space, SUDS and attenuation basins and woodlands. This amounts to an under-provision of Green Infrastructure. Loss of Local Nature Reserve and most of Green Wedge and replacement of golf course in Houghton.	calculated for 1665 dwellings is 51.16ha. The proposal for Kibworth SDA includes 62.1 ha of Green Infrastructure including Public Open Space, on-site attenuation and screen planting. This is 20% over-provision.	calculated for 2750 dwellings is 87.41ha. The proposal for Lutterworth SDA includes 104 ha of Green Infrastructure including structural landscaping, allotments and formal sports provision and cemetery land. This is 20% over-provision.
<i>Ranking</i>	3	4	1.5=	1.5=
Provision of land to meet Gypsy and Traveller needs	No SDA proposed with no additional site options. Any additional sites across the district would be available to all options.	Site not proposed and may be difficult to identify a suitable opportunity.	Site proposed (2 options) in conjunction with SDA.	Site not proposed but could potentially be delivered as an extension to existing public site nearby (Bonehams Lane).
<i>Ranking</i>	3.5 =	3.5 =	1	2
Air quality impacts	Dispersed development leads to increased emissions.	Lowest level of emissions increase due to lower journey times. Likely to increase emissions in Leicester.	Highest predicted increase in car emissions due to higher average journey times. Bypass likely to improve air quality on existing A6 in potential Air Quality Management Area. Likely to increase emissions in Leicester.	Higher emissions to Lutterworth SDA and Market Harborough only, and higher levels of emissions outside of the District. Spine Road will offer some improvement to air quality in existing town centre Air Quality Management Area upon completion.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	1	2.5 =	2.5 =
Average Ranking: Socio-Economic	2.75	2.88	2.63	1.75

NPPF SELECTED PRINCIPLES	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
<p>A creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives.</p>	<p>All developments would be required to offer opportunities to enhance and improve the lives of their residents. However, there would be fewer opportunities to plan for improved places at a community scale in a comprehensive and well-planned way. Mainly incremental additions to the built-up area, with particularly unwelcome urban extensions to Market Harborough and Thurnby/ Scraftoft.</p>	<p>The SDA would create an attractive environment for new residents and some improvements for existing residents through provision of a local primary school, communal open space between existing and new communities, a local centre and some local traffic management. Much of the existing green wedge would be lost, but the most important section between Scraftoft and Leicester retained and made more publicly accessible, while the golf course, which is to be relocated elsewhere, and the LNR, which is to be de-classified, are not publicly accessible open space. There would be an impact on the local landscape although this could be minimized through maintaining mature vegetation. While consolidating recent ad hoc expansion to Scraftoft, it will form a sizeable 'bolt on' to the village.</p>	<p>SDA would include development of the proposed by-pass and could remove through-traffic from the A6, offering opportunities for reduction in congestion and improvements in local car borne journey times and public realm improvements. The potential 'downgrading' of the A6 through Kibworth and associated traffic management measures would provide opportunities to improve pedestrian and cycle routes between the SDA and existing development/ village centres. There is the opportunity to create an integrated well-planned expanded village/ small town by-passed by through traffic and with open space to limit impacts on existing residents and the conservation area. Impact on the local landscape would need to be minimised. Local people are concerned that the scale and character of the village would be overwhelmed, but the promoters have undertaken to work closely with them to create an well-designed extension to the town that will support and enhance its facilities and attractiveness.</p>	<p>The SDA offers the potential to create a well-planned new community without direct impact on existing residents, although there would be increases in local traffic. New residents will help the retention and enhancement of existing local retail and community facilities for the benefit of all. in the long-term provision of the new spine road could ease town centre through-traffic on the A426, when compared with the 2031 situation without the SDA and new road, offering opportunities for reduction in congestion and improvements in journey times, air quality, public realm and local shopping experience. However, there would be short term increases in traffic in the town centre and on Gilmorton Road and continuing impacts on Gilmorton residents. The creation of an attractive place for new residents is made more difficult by the constraints affecting the SDA, in particular 140 houses will be in an isolated location bounded by the M1, a motorway junction and the main spine road into the site, while another 850 house neighbourhood will be cut in half by a high voltage power cable and its 'buffer'. GI will need careful design to ensure it unites rather than divides the community.</p>
<p><i>Ranking</i></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Drive and support Sustainable economic development to meet housing, business and development needs, and respond to wider opportunities for growth.</p>	<p>Does not meet HEDNA employment requirement and does not meet the requirement for housing in Market Harborough and Scraftoft/ Thurnby/ Burnby.</p>	<p>All Options meet objectively assessed housing and business needs. Supports the growth of Leicester city where pressures and opportunities are greatest. However, does not meet HEDNA employment requirement.</p>	<p>All Options meet objectively assessed housing and business needs. Kibworth SDA provides opportunities for substantial additional employment land with a further 20ha recently identified within the SDA. It does not relate well to identified location for growth in SW Leics & A5 corridor.</p>	<p>All Options meet objectively assessed housing and business needs. Lutterworth SDA provides opportunities for substantial additional employment land. This SDA represents an opportunity for growth, with the potential for further growth beyond the Plan period. Well located for identified growth areas in SW Leics & A5 corridor.</p>
<p><i>Ranking</i></p>	<p>4</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1</p>

Taking account of flood risk and climate change	This Option would provide significant development (1770 more dwellings) in Market Harborough, which the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates has a high risk of surface water flooding with the risk increasing with more development. It also relies on significant development in Scraftoft, Thurnby & Bushby (330 more), which increases the risk of flooding downstream in Leicester City. Market Harborough is in Welland valley where only small and medium scale of wind turbines allowed.	Larger developments, such as this SDA, offer the greatest opportunity to exploit renewable resources, although the potential for on-site renewable energy generation would require further analysis. In High Leicestershire and so outside the Opportunity Area for wind turbines. Development of the Scraftoft North SDA is low flood risk. Need to ensure that on site drainage is managed so as not to increase flooding downstream in Leicester.	Larger developments, such as this SDA, offer the greatest opportunity to exploit renewable resources, although the potential for on-site renewable energy generation would require further analysis. SDA is in High Leicestershire and so outside the Opportunity Area for large or medium sized wind turbines. SDA is low flood risk. Surface water treatment will need careful management.	Larger developments, such as this SDA, offer the greatest opportunity to exploit renewable resources, although the potential for on-site renewable energy generation would require further analysis. Within the Lutterworth Lowlands Opportunity Area for wind turbines, but no renewable energy proposed in SDA. Part of the SDA is at high risk of flooding. Mitigation measures will be needed.
<i>Ranking</i>	4	2=	2=	2=
Conserving the Natural environment and Reducing pollution/ allocating land of lesser environmental value	By focusing development on the most sustainable urban areas, this Option offers the opportunity to reduce dependency on the private car (particularly Market Harborough) and therefore reducing pollution. Some of land release on medium-low sensitivity.	Scraftoft North SDA would impact on the Green Wedge, defined in Scraftoft NDP. However, layout shows could ensure maintenance of some separation and improved access to green infrastructure. Local landscape identified as medium-low sensitivity. Wider District impacts would be reduced as housing numbers would be reduced. Good access to bus services could help reduce car-borne traffic and so pollution.	Local landscape would be impacted, majority of which is of medium-high sensitivity. Impacts in the wider District would be reduced as housing numbers would be reduced. Would increase commuting and so pollution on surrounding roads. However, the inclusion of an additional 20ha of employment land within the SDA could help to reduce the scale of out-commuting. The provision of an A6 bypass and proposals to 'downgrade' the A6 would lead to a reduction in pollution on the existing A6 through Kibworth.	SDA offers potential for some environmental improvements through the provision of accessible green infrastructure. Could impact negatively on condition of Misterton Marshes SSSI, but mitigation is proposed. Some loss of best & most versatile farm land. Potential improvements to air quality in Lutterworth through provision of the Spine Road. Local landscape is mostly medium sensitivity, with rest medium-low. Impacts in the wider District would be reduced (lower housing numbers).
<i>Ranking</i>	1.5 =	1.5 =	3.5 =	3.5 =
Promoting mixed use developments	This Option has limited opportunities for mixed use development, being mainly housing only sites.	Scraftoft North SDA would include elements of mixed use development (primary school and GI) but no additional employment.	Kibworth SDA scheme would be a mixed-use development (primary school, bypass, green infrastructure, employment and local retail provision). Additional 20ha of employment land recently included within SDA.	Lutterworth East SDA would be a mixed-use development (primary school, relief road, green infrastructure, local retail provision, employment).
<i>Ranking</i>	4	3	1.5 =	1.5 =
Conserving heritage assets	The impacts on heritage assets are likely to be more significant because of the potential impact on Conservation Areas and listed buildings in villages.	Scraftoft North SDA would have limited impact on Scraftoft Conservation Area. Few impacts likely on listed buildings (only Nether Hall). It does have the benefit of reducing housing requirements in other settlements, particularly the more sensitive rural settlements.	Potential for SDA to impact significantly on the Kibworth Harcourt Conservation Area and its setting. Some of SDA land is within CA. Presence of ridge and furrow close to settlement contributes to setting. Several listed buildings in the vicinity would be impacted without substantial mitigation.	The Lutterworth SDA proposal is distant from the Lutterworth Conservation Area, so less likely to impact on the CA. Impact on listed buildings in Misterton would need mitigation. SDA reduces housing requirements in other settlements, particularly the more sensitive rural

			However, fewer impacts on heritage assets in other settlements.	settlements.
<i>Ranking</i>	3.5 =	1.5 =	3.5 =	1.5 =
Making fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling	This Option is likely to provide the greatest opportunity to access services locally by walking, cycling or public transport since it focuses developments on urban areas with the greatest range of established services, employment opportunities and public transport.	SDAs close proximity to existing development and services would present opportunities for the development of for reasonable walking/ cycling links and distances. However, it is likely that there would continue to be a reliance on car-based trips generally to employment and higher order services in Leicester.	Potential walking/cycling distances to existing services and facilities from new houses within the SDA could be an issue. However, the by-pass would remove traffic from the village which is currently a barrier to movement allowing 'downgrading' of A6. This would enable the introduction of proposals to discourage through-traffic and improve pedestrian and cycling links between SDA and the existing settlement. The reliance on car-based trips to employment opportunities and higher order services elsewhere, particularly in Leicester and Market Harborough, is likely to continue. However, the inclusion of an additional 20ha of employment land within the SDA could help to reduce such trips.	Potential walking/cycling distances to existing services and facilities from new houses within the SDA could be an issue. However, given the scale of the development, safe walking/cycling access to proposed new services and facilities could be achieved through sensitive master planning, while movements to Lutterworth would be improved by upgrading crossing(s) over the M1. Reliance on car-based trips to employment and some higher order services elsewhere is likely to continue given its location in relation to the strategic road network, but employment and most services are available locally.
<i>Ranking</i>	2	1	3.5 =	3.5 =
Average Ranking: NPPF Principles	3.29	2.00	2.43	2.29

APPENDIX C: Assessment of Selected Options against Local Plan objectives (April 2017)

The following table assesses whether the 4 Options meet the 14 draft Local Plan objectives.

Where the option meets the objective this is indicated by a '✓' and, where necessary, some supporting text. An entry of 'neutral' indicates that the option is unlikely to have any impact on the objective. Where the Option is unlikely to meet the objective this is indicated by an 'X' and a brief explanation is included.

Local Plan Objective (summary)	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraptoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
1 Housing: Meet the housing requirements of the District in full by providing a range of market and affordable housing types, tenures and sizes in appropriate and sustainable locations to meet local needs, recognising the specific accommodation needs of the young and elderly populations	X Fails to meet the requirement for housing land because of a significant shortfall in the requirement for Market Harborough (c 400 dwellings) and Scraproft/ Thurnby/ Bushby (c 100)	✓	✓	✓
2 Employment: Promote sustainable economic growth, by facilitating the sustainable growth of businesses, fostering new local enterprise and helping to create more jobs that meet local employment needs, and reduce need for out-commuting to help increase sustainability and self containment of communities	X Various potential employment allocations identified but option would not deliver level of currently developable employment land required by HEDNA.	X No employment land within SDA and therefore option would not deliver level of currently developable employment land required by HEDNA.	✓	✓
3 Location of development: Locate new development in sustainable locations that respect the environmental capacity of the local area and encourage the appropriate and efficient re-use of previously developed land and buildings	✓	✓	X Large scale of development for Rural Centre which is likely to increase commuting	✓
4 Infrastructure: Support local communities and maintain a high	✓	✓	✓	✓

Local Plan Objective (summary)	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
quality of life by ensuring that new development delivers the necessary range of infrastructure				
5 Protection of local services: Protect, enhance and, where appropriate, secure the provision of additional accessible community services and local facilities	✓	✓	✓	✓
6 Natural environment: Protect and enhance the quality, diversity, character, local distinctiveness, biodiversity and geodiversity of the natural environment, ensuring that open countryside is protected	X Loss of greenfield land. SA notes moderate negative effects on natural environment across the district.	X Loss of greenfield land, most of Green Wedge and Local Nature Reserve, but potential for a positive effect. SA notes moderate negative effects on natural environment across the district. .	X Loss of greenfield land and potential impacts on relatively sensitive landscape. SA notes moderate negative effects on natural environment across the district.	X Loss of greenfield land and potential impact on SSSI. SA notes moderate negative effects on natural environment across the district and major negative effects at Lutterworth, albeit with potential for positive effects.
7 Historic environment: Protect and enhance the character, distinctiveness and historic significance of settlements and their wider landscape and townscape settings	X Potential impacts across several settlements with Conservation Areas (CAs) and listed buildings. SA notes major negative effect overall.	X SA notes moderate negative effect overall and for Scraftoft.	X Potential for impacts on Kibworth Harcourt CA / listed buildings and their setting. SA notes moderate negative effect overall and major negative effect in Kibworth.	X SA notes moderate negative effects overall and in Lutterworth.
8 Town/village centres: Support and enhance the vitality and viability of market town and larger village centres through encouraging retail, leisure and commercial development in appropriate locations and at appropriate scales.	Neutral effect	Neutral effect	✓	✓

Local Plan Objective (summary)	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
9 Design: Ensure that new development is of high quality and sustainable design and promotes sustainable behaviours including waste reduction and non-motorised travel patterns	Neutral effect Other than through general design policy and DM process.	Neutral effect Other than through general design policy and master-planning process at a later stage.	Neutral effect Other than through general design policy and master-planning process at a later stage.	Neutral effect Other than through general design policy and master-planning process at a later stage.
10 Transport: Provide greater opportunities to reduce car use, thereby reducing the impacts of road traffic on local communities, the environment and air quality by locating development where there is good access to jobs, services and facilities, and by supporting improvements in public transport, walking and cycling networks and facilities	✓ Most of development in Market Harborough.	✓ Close to existing services/facilities and employment opportunities within Leicester urban area. Master planning process would need to ensure good cycling and walking linkages.	✓ A6 bypass to remove through traffic and allow downgrading of A6 through village and improvements to walking and cycling networks. However, likely to result in increased commuting out of village.	✓ Spine road through SDA would remove 24-34% through traffic in peak with positive impacts on air quality in Lutterworth town centre. SDA would be located close to employment opportunities and good range of services/ facilities.
11 Flood risk: Locate new development in areas which will not put life or property at risk of flooding and require the use of appropriate sustainable drainage systems in new developments	✗ Potential flood risk issues in Market Harborough, especially close to River Jordan.	✓ Potential impacts downstream in Leicester City would need to be taken into account.	✓	✓ Potential flood risk issues but likely to be mitigatable. The EA would require a detailed modelling study prior to any development
12 Environmental impact: Minimise the environmental impact of development and its vulnerability to the impacts of climate change by reducing pollution and waste and promoting use of low carbon technologies	✓	✓	✓	✓
13 Tourism and culture: Promote the sustainable growth of tourism, cultural activities and access to the countryside for benefit of both residents and visitors	Neutral effect	Neutral effect	Neutral effect	Neutral effect

Local Plan Objective (summary)	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variant): Scraftoft North	Option 5: Kibworth North East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
14: Neighbourhood Planning: Encourage and support communities to make decisions at the local level through the preparation of neighbourhood plans	Neutral effect Most development in Market Harborough which is unparished and not proposing a Neighbourhood Plan.	Neutral effect Likely that SDA, being strategic in nature, would be handled through the master planning process, with local community input.	Neutral effect Likely that SDA, being strategic in nature, would be handled through the master planning process, with local community input.	Neutral effect Likely that SDA, being strategic in nature, would be handled through the master planning process, with local community input.
Number of objectives met	5	7	8	9
Number of objectives not met	5	3	3	2

APPENDIX D: Pros and Cons of Choices following Reassessment of Selected Options (April 2017)

Choice	Pros	Cons
<p>1. Continue with its current strategic approach (east of Lutterworth SDA plus Scraftoft North as a reserve site to meet any potential unmet needs arising from other parts of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates housing to meet unmet needs close to Leicester City • Well related to employment growth areas (SW Leics and M1 / A5 corridor) • Benefits for Lutterworth town centre • No further change to draft Local Plan (unless HDC's contribution to any unmet need is excessive), so timetable maintained • Avoids need for early review of Local Plan • Greenfield land not released until need established • Significant contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period • Substantial employment land provision included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No longer exactly reflects Options Assessment ranking • Potential self-fulfilling prophecy re: level of unmet need to be accommodated • Significant delivery risks with East of Lutterworth SDA, including need for a CPO
<p>2. Reverse the roles of the SDAs so that Scraftoft North would meet Harborough's needs and East of Lutterworth would be a reserve site to meet unmet needs from elsewhere.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects Options Assessment ranking • Allows more time for risks associated with East of Lutterworth to be addressed • Changes to the draft Local Plan are minimised, but some delays to timetable • Avoids need for early review of Local Plan, with its resource implications • Greenfield land not released until need established • Significant contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period • Substantial employment land provision in the long term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential over-concentration of development in one location (Leicester PUA) leading to deliverability concerns and failure to meet needs elsewhere in the District, especially those in Lutterworth • Housing to meet Leicester's unmet needs is located at a distance from the City • Not well related to employment growth areas (SW Leics and M1 / A5 corridor) • Benefits for Lutterworth town centre only achieved in the longer term, if at all • Difficult to meet employment land requirements in the short term without use of unsustainable sites • Significant delivery risks with East of Lutterworth SDA, including need for a CPO
<p>3. Replace east of Lutterworth with Scraftoft North and carry out an early review of the plan in order to meet any potential unmet needs arising from other parts of the Leicester and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects Options Assessment ranking • Does not pre-empt the level of unmet need • Changes to the draft Local Plan are minimised, but some delays to timetable • Avoids significant delivery risks associated with east of Lutterworth SDA • Potential to contribute to meeting housing need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time and resource implications of an early review • No land available to meet any unmet needs from Leicester City or other local authorities • Potential for extension to east not assessed (in terms of sustainability and transport) so there would be some delay to Local Plan timetable • Difficult to meet employment land requirements over

<p><i>Leicestershire HMA, if required.</i></p>	<p>beyond the current Local Plan period through eastern extension to the Scraftoft North SDA</p>	<p>plan period without use of unsustainable sites</p>
<p><i>4. Replace East of Lutterworth with Kibworth North and East and retain Scraftoft North as a reserve site to meet any potential unmet needs arising from other parts of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates housing to meet unmet needs close to Leicester City • Benefits for Kibworth resulting from A6 bypass • Avoids need for early review of Local Plan (unless HDC's contribution to any unmet need is excessive) • Avoids delivery risks associated with progressing East of Lutterworth SDA • Contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period • Substantial employment land provision included • Meets 8 Local Plan objectives, fails on 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not reflect Options Assessment ranking • Potential self fulfilling prophecy re: level of unmet need to be accommodated • Changes needed to draft Local Plan • More commuting, longer journey times and strategic transport impacts around south east Leicester • Not well related to employment growth areas (SW Leics and M1 / A5 corridor) • Kibworth does not have the same range of community facilities and infrastructure as Lutterworth or Leicester PUA
<p><i>5. Retain the East of Lutterworth SDA but also release Scraftoft North to meet Harborough's needs as well as any potential unmet needs arising from other parts of the Leicester and Leicestershire HMA from adjoining authorities.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflects Options Assessment ranking • Maximises the extent to which Local Plan Objectives are met, meeting 9 and failing on 2 • Changes to the draft Local Plan are minimised, but some delays to timetable • Locates housing to meet unmet needs close to Leicester City • Well related to employment growth areas (SW Leics and M1 / A5 corridor) • Benefits for Lutterworth town centre • Avoids need for early review of Local Plan (unless HDC's contribution to any unmet need is excessive) • Release of Scraftoft North, with relatively few delivery challenges, allows more time to address the risks associated with East of Lutterworth SDA • No additional allocations (for about 110 homes) needed in Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby • Significant contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period • Substantial employment land provision included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant delivery risks with Lutterworth SDA remain, including need for a CPO • Potential self-fulfilling prophecy re: level of unmet need to be accommodated • Involves the release of greenfield before need is established; Scraftoft no longer conditional on the demonstration of unmet need from elsewhere.
<p><i>6. Allocating all three SDAs, with Scraftoft as a reserve site</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spreads the risks of delivery over a wider number of sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not reflect Options Assessment ranking • Over-reliance on large scale development, leading to

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locates housing to meet unmet needs close to Leicester City • Benefits for Kibworth resulting from A6 bypass • Benefits for Lutterworth town centre • Avoids need for early review of Local Plan (unless HDC's contribution to any unmet need is excessive) • Contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period • Substantial employment land provision included • Significant contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period • Significant contribution to meeting housing need beyond the current Local Plan period 	<p>problems in meeting 5 year supply on adoption of the plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously rejected on these grounds prior to Options Consultation • Potential self-fulfilling prophecy re: level of unmet need to be accommodated • Large amount of greenfield land committed, reducing incentive to maximise use of brownfield land • Major changes needed to draft Local Plan, possibly including an additional Options Consultation, with significant delays to the timetable • Significant delivery risks with Lutterworth SDA remain, including need for a CPO • Would unnecessarily pre-empt Strategic Growth Plan in which other options may emerge
--	---	---

