



A New Local Plan for Harbourough

Options Consultation Report

April 2016

**Options Consultation
September – October 2015**

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. How we consulted	4
3. Breakdown of representations	5
4. Summary of the key issues raised in representations:	8
A. Vision and Objectives	8
B. Sustainable Settlements	22
C. Housing	27
Housing and Employment Options	27
Option 1: Rural	27
Option 2: Core Strategy distribution	31
Option 3: Urban	35
Option 4: Scraptoft / Thurnby SDA	39
Option 5: Kibworth SDA	42
Option 6: Lutterworth SDA	46
Option 7: Scraptoft / Thurnby SDA and Kibworth SDA	50
Option 8: Scraptoft / Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA	54
Option 9: Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA	58
Replacement to limits to development policy	62
D. Housing in the Countryside	66
E. Affordable Housing	69
F. Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Provision	71
G. Employment	74
H. Green Infrastructure	83
I. Town Centres and Retail	87
J. Infrastructure Planning	92
K. Settlement Sections	94
5. Next Steps	98

1. Introduction

1.1 In 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF requires local planning authorities like Harborough District Council to support 'sustainable development' and to plan positively for it by preparing new local plans. Although the Core Strategy was only adopted in 2011, it is already considered to be out of date because it does not deliver enough housing to meet the District's future needs. So, it needs to be updated and will be replaced with the new Local Plan for Harborough. The Council made the decision to prepare a Local Plan, based on an updated Core Strategy, at its meeting on 3rd December 2012.

1.2 Consultation on the scope of the new Local Plan was undertaken in March and April 2013. The results of this consultation were taken into account in agreeing the final scope of the plan and are presented in two reports ['New Local Plan scoping consultation responses'](#) and ['New Local Plan scoping consultation – officer recommendations'](#).

1.3 Following completion of the scoping stage and evidence collection, a further stage of public consultation was undertaken. The Local Plan Options Consultation ran for 6 weeks between 18 September and 30 October 2015.

1.4 The Options Consultation Paper set out a number of topics to be considered during the preparation of the Local Plan. Comments were invited on each of the following topics:

- Vision and Objectives
- Sustainable Settlements
- Housing
- Housing in the Countryside
- Affordable Housing
- Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Provision
- Employment
- Green Infrastructure
- Town Centres and Retail
- Infrastructure Planning
- Settlement Sections

1.5 A number of these topics also included alternative options or alternative policy approaches. Again, views were invited on the alternative options presented, together with an invitation for respondents to suggest any further options.

1.6 A total of 3969 consultation responses were made from 584 respondents. Section 4 of this report presents a breakdown of the number of responses to each topic, as well as the number supporting and objecting to each alternative option.

Section 4 also provides a high level summary of the key issues raised in responses to each topic. The report will be used, together with other technical evidence, to inform the selection of the preferred options to take forward into the draft Local Plan. This is expected to be consulted upon in late 2016.

2 How we Consulted

2.1 The Options consultation ran for 6 weeks from 18 September 2015 to 30 October 2015. The consultation was hosted via the online consultation portal at the following address: www.harborough.gov.uk/strategic-planning-consultations.

2.2 Assistance and advice for customers was provided by members of the Strategic Planning Team via e-mail, over the telephone and at the 4 Local Plan Options consultations surgeries, held at the following locations and dates from 12 noon until 7pm:

Wednesday 30th September - Council Chamber, The Symington Building (Adam and Eve Street, Market Harborough, LE16 7AG)

Thursday 1st October - Kibworth Cricket Club (Fleckney Road, Kibworth, LE8 0HG)

Wednesday 7th October – Wycliffe Rooms (George Street, Lutterworth, LE17 4ED)

Wednesday 14th October – Scraftoft Village Hall, (Scraftoft Rise, Scraftoft, LE7 9TF)

3 Breakdown of representations

Number of representations and submission method

3.1 A total of 3969 representations were made from 584 respondents, 66% of which were made via the consultation portal. The table below illustrates the proportions of submission methods used by respondents:

Table 1: Local Plan Options consultation representations by submission method

Submission method	Number of representations	% of representations
Online consultation portal	2639	66%
Email	625	16%
Letter	705	18%
TOTAL	3969	100%

3.2 All representations may be viewed online via the consultation portal at the link below. The Local Plan Options consultation is now available in the 'Draft / Closed Consultations' section. Representations may be viewed by clicking on the blue magnifying glass icon next to the relevant paragraph or question.

www.harborough.gov.uk/strategic-planning-consultations

Consultation surgeries

3.3 A total of 177 customers attended the 4 consultation surgeries. The majority of attendees were able to speak with a member of the team, often at some length and to receive further explanation of the Options. A significant number of customers expressed their gratitude at the additional explanation and assistance provided. Table 2 below shows the number of attendees at each surgery.

Table 2: Local Plan Options consultation surgeries – numbers of attendees

Local Plan Options surgery	Count of attendees
Market Harborough	25
Kibworth	40
Lutterworth	87
Scraptoft	25

Number of representations by consultation question

3.4 The Table below provides an overview of the number of respondents and representations to each question within the Local Plan Options document. A number of respondents have made more than one representation on specific questions, or parts of questions. This split between the number of respondents and the number of representations is set out in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Local Plan Options consultation – Numbers of respondents and representations by question

Question	Number of respondents	Number of representations
Q1. Do you have any comments on the draft Vision?	63	67
Q2. Do you have any comments on the draft Objectives?	67	76
Q3. Which Housing and Employment Option(s) do you favour?		
Option 1: Rural	248	274
Option 2: Core Strategy Distribution	218	236
Option 3: Urban	220	238
Option 4: Scraftoft / Thurnby SDA	254	271
Option 5: Kibworth SDA	305	328
Option 6: Lutterworth SDA	248	270
Option 7: Scraftoft / Thurnby SDA and Kibworth SDA	355	371
Option 8: Scraftoft / Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA	279	295
Option 9: Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA	331	351
Q4. Do you have any comments on the proposed criteria-based policy to replace Limits to Development?	72	77
Q5. Which is your preferred Option for Development in the Countryside?		
Option C1: Strictly controlling development in the countryside	31	34
Option C2: Limited infill and Development management led	21	21
Option C3: Meeting locally identified need (with Option c1 above)	16	16
Option C3: Meeting locally identified need (with Option C2 above)	17	17
Q6. Would you like to submit any potential sites to accommodate gypsies and travellers, or travelling showpeople?	8	8
Q7. Do you have any comments on the list of	8	8

Question	Number of respondents	Number of representations
existing employment sites proposed to be retained and protected through policy?		
Q8. We'd like to know which Strategic Distribution Option(s) you favour.		
Strategic Distribution Option A	85	89
Strategic Distribution Option B	79	84
Strategic Distribution Option C	80	82
Q9. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed policy approach for Bruntingthorpe proving Ground?	15	16
Q10. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed policy approach for Leicester Airport?	14	14
Q11. Which is your preferred option to prevent the coalescence of settlements?		
Option G1: Defining Specific Areas of Separation	36	37
Option G2: Using criteria to prevent coalescence across the District, not just in specific Areas of Separation	26	26
Q12. Do you have any comments on the list of proposed Local Green Space?	31	32
Q13. Do you have any comments on the potential retail sites?	13	13
Q14. Do you have any comments on the suggested Town Centre or Primary Shopping Area Boundary for Market Harborough?	7	7

4. Summary of the key issues raised in representations

A. Vision and Objectives

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper set out a draft vision for the District to 2031. This explains how the District will change and develop during the Local Plan period and has been prepared to reflect the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, which emphasises the need for Local Plans to reflect a collective, positive vision for the future of the area, the Council's corporate priorities and local issues and concerns.

The draft vision is supported by a number of draft objectives which were also presented in the Options Consultation. These set out the priorities for the sustainable development of the District. Comments were invited on both the draft vision and objectives and the questions asked were as follows:

- Q1. Do you have any comments on the Draft Vision?
- Q2. Do you have any comments on the Draft Objectives, or any additional objectives to suggest?

Number of respondents and representations

A total of 141 representations were made on this section as set out in the table below.

Table 4: Number of respondents and representations to Vision and Objectives

Breakdown of Representations to Vision and Objectives					
Paragraph	Respondents	Representations			
		Support	Object	Comment	Total
Draft Vision	63	25	12	30	67
Draft Objectives	67	21	11	44	76
TOTAL		46	23	74	143

Draft Vision Summary: Overall there was a good level of satisfaction with the draft vision. Only 12 objecting representations were received regarding the vision and the majority of these were dissatisfied with only particular elements. Whilst 25 respondents expressed overall agreement in principle, there were various suggestions as to how the vision could be improved. Given the importance of the Vision to the assessment of the options and the development of the new Local Plan, Table 5 sets out the main issues raised and the Council’s response to these issues.

Table 5: Summary of Responses to the Draft Vision (Respondent ID in brackets where appropriate)

Specific Issues raised	Response	Suggested Action
End date for Local Plan, and therefore the Vision, should be 2036 given that the NPPF recommends 15 years and SHMA evidence is available to 2036. It would provide greater certainty and reduce the need for an early review. (5526, 5516, 5224, 4740)	15 years is a recommendation not a requirement in the NPPF. It is considered that 2031 is the most appropriate timescale for the Local Plan reflecting the urgency to get at plan in place to start delivering future housing need, the need to ensure compliance with the Government’s aim to speed up plan making and the fact that much of the evidence base relates to that timescale. By the time of adoption, the timescale only just fall short of 15 years. It is anticipated that the Local Plan will set out longer term options in order to add the required flexibility.	No change.
Primacy of Market Harborough as an historic centre is not reflected. Market Harborough and Lutterworth are very different. (4305)	Agreed. The district’s two market towns, although both historic, are significantly different and this should be reflected in the vision.	Amend vision at paragraph 4 to distinguish between the two settlements.
The sentence on housing provision in our view needs to incorporate the word range to read as: 'the whole range of local needs...'. There is a need for housing variety to widen	Meeting the whole range of housing need is implicit in the current wording.	No change.

Specific Issues raised	Response	Suggested Action
housing choices. (4305)		
Does not adequately reflect that Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby adjoin the urban area and the long established spatial strategy for the HMA. Amend to better reflect the sustainable location of the PUA and the vital role that it will play in the delivery of housing for the Housing Market Area (HMA) authorities. (4740)	Edge of Leicester villages describes the location of Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby adequately. Their role in delivering housing is not dictated by previous spatial strategy for the HMA and will depend on an up to date assessment of their sustainability and capacity to accommodate development.	No change.
Role of Sustainable Rural Villages (SRVs) should be specifically referenced. Proportionate development in sustainable villages will be appropriate to meet the diverse needs of the District. (5521, 4454, 5433, 5160, 5160, 4740).	Agreed. The vision should make reference to the role of SRVs.	Amend to include sentence on SRVs at paragraph 4.
In looking to meet strategic growth requirements over the emerging Plan period, it is considered appropriate to disperse development across the District to ensure that the needs of individual settlements are met whilst retaining their rural identity. A greater degree of flexibility within the draft Vision would be achieved by replacing 'here 'possible through sustainable urban extensions' with 'where necessary through sustainable urban extensions' in relation to the focus for development. (5401)	Reference to sustainable urban extensions has been removed. The vision already acknowledges that development needs to take place across the District to support rural areas. Reference to role of SRVs added.	No change.
No reference to Magna Park despite options for expansion. (5519)	Agreed. The vision should make reference to strategic distribution, although not specifically to Magna Park, since there may be other options emerging.	Amend to insert new paragraph (after existing paragraph 5) referencing the role of strategic distribution.
LP fails to adequately address the issue of Previously Developed Land in the countryside and its reuse to meet local	Explicit reference to encouraging the reuse of previously developed land is included in objective	No change.

Specific Issues raised	Response	Suggested Action
and district needs. (5290)	3. It is not felt necessary to include it in the vision.	
The emphasis on providing for local needs risks not catering appropriately for all facets of market and affordable housing, particularly in rural areas. Greater emphasis should be placed on the need to provide new housing both on a strategic and local level. The provision of new housing should be given greater emphasis to reflect NPPF. '...A significant amount of new housing will have been provided reflecting strategic requirements and local needs and, in terms of type, size and tenure, greater equality of access to suitable accommodation will have been promoted. Older people...' (4944, 3755,	Local need is used to mean 'objectively assessed need', as well as a local mix. Objectively assessed housing need for the HMA and for each L& L local authority area was set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014), and will be updated through the 2016 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). It is for the plan to translate this need into a requirement for the District. For clarity a distinction between such a strategic requirement and local needs could be made in paragraph 4. No change is then required to (original) paragraph 6, which just refers to the type, not quantity of housing.	Amend paragraph 4 (original 3 rd sentence) to read 'Residential development will have been delivered to meet strategic housing requirements and local needs and the necessary infrastructure and community facilities / services to support growth will have been delivered on time.'
Wording pre-emptive as it is not appropriate to provide a Vision until preferred option is decided. (4714)	The Vision will guide the development of the strategy and will be used in the assessment of options.	No change.
Specific reference to a reduction in pollution, and specifically improvements to air quality within the District, should be added. (5312)	Paragraph 2 already refers to 'the overall diversity and quality of Harborough's countryside, natural environment and built heritage will have improved'. Air quality is part of the 'natural environment'. Reference to Lutterworth being less impacted by traffic is now included. However, reference to maximising opportunities for improving air and water quality will be added.	Amend to include 'opportunities to improve air and water quality will have been maximised' at paragraph 2.
Paragraph on community facilities should include sports facilities providing the right facilities in the right place by protection, enhancement or new provision. (4436)	Agree that sports facilities should be added to list of facilities in 7 th paragraph. The further detail set out in the comment will be taken into account in policy formulation.	Amend paragraph 7 to include 'sports'.

Specific Issues raised	Response	Suggested Action
Emphasise urban development as opposed to rural development. Concerned about the phrase "with vibrant towns and large villages". (3728)	Development to promote vibrant places in which to live is important to supporting local communities.	No change.
Need cross checking mechanisms to ensure Vision is being achieved. (4196, 3938)	A monitoring framework will form part of the draft Local Plan.	No change.
Reference to the wealth of heritage assets within the district should be included. Change 'built heritage' to 'historic environment'. Helpful to make reference to heritage at risk being tackled here. (4627, 5078)	Agreed. Reference will be changed to 'historic environment' as it recognises the significance features of historic landscapes as well as built features. Reference to heritage at risk will be covered in policy.	Amend. Replace 'built heritage' with 'historic environment' at paragraph 2.
Need more emphasis and greater clarity on reduction of carbon emissions, beyond low carbon design, and intention to reduce pollution (air/light/noise). Emphasis should not just be on private vehicles (4737, 4988, 4328)	Agreed. Make reference to low carbon technologies at paragraph 3 long with minimising the impacts of noise and light pollution. Reference to public transport is made in paragraph 3 so the emphasis is not just on private vehicles.	Amend. Paragraph 3 to read as 'Low carbon design and technologies.....' Reference to the impacts of noise and light pollution being minimised is also included.
Should be clear reference to protecting biodiversity. (4737, 4328)	The overall improvement of the diversity and quality of Harborough's natural environment is mentioned at paragraph 2. This encompasses biodiversity.	No change.
There should be an emphasis on real involvement of the people HDC serve in planning and decision making. (4737, 4328)	The Council is committed to involving people in planning and decision making. The ways in which this will be achieved are set out in the 'Statement of Community Involvement'.	No change

Specific Issues raised	Response	Suggested Action
<p>Concern at the emphasis being placed on 'edge of Leicester settlements'; 'sustainable urban extensions'; and, the placing of the PUA at the top of Harborough's Settlement Hierarchy. The restricted road network, lack of adequate public transport, services and facilities mean it is not sustainable (2685, 4103, 2441)</p>	<p>Comments noted and will be considered in the analysis of responses to the settlement hierarchy. Reference to sustainable urban extensions has been removed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Reference to promotion of in-town rather than out of town shopping should be made. (4676)</p>	<p>Supporting and enhancing the vitality and viability of town and village centres is set out in the objectives and reference to the promotion of in-town rather than out of town shopping will be set out in policy. Reference to 'vibrant towns and large villages' is considered appropriate detail for the vision.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Reference to ensuring development does not have a negative visual effect on Harborough's rural areas. (4988)</p>	<p>Reference in paragraph 1 to the District's distinct identity as a predominantly rural area of villages and market towns and in paragraph 2 to the overall improvement and diversity of Harborough's countryside is considered adequate. Paragraph 6 emphasises good design in development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Draft Objectives Summary: Although there were more comments on the draft objectives than on the vision, the number of objections was similar with many suggesting how a particular objective could be improved. Overall there was a high level of approval expressed of the draft objectives. Given the importance of the objectives, along with the vision, to the assessment of the options and the development of the new Local Plan, Table 6 sets out the main issues raised through consultation, the Council's response to these and the proposed amendments to the objectives. The objectives have also been amended to ensure that the Local Plan is able to respond positively to changing circumstances.

Table 6: Summary of responses to Draft Objectives (Respondent ID in brackets where appropriate)

Draft Objective 1: Housing		
Specific issues raised:	Response	Suggested action
'Appropriate' should not be included as surely the aim is to meet all the various housing needs full stop. (4305)	Not all need can be met where it arises therefore the word appropriate is needed.	No change.
Object to objective 1), 3), 4) and 5) as there is a need for the objectives not to be strictly applied to expect development to mutually achieve all 4 objectives. (4714)	It is accepted that not all development will meet all parts of all the objectives but that development will contribute to delivery of relevant objectives.	No change.
Strengthen to specifically state that local housing needs will be met in full. (5428)	This is implicit in the current wording which reads 'provide a range of market and affordable housing types, tenures and sizes in appropriate locations which meets local housing needs.	No change.
Define 'Affordable' and add 'which will be reserved for local people'. (5164)	The definition of affordable housing will be set out in the relevant policy section of the Local Plan and will reflect national guidance. Affordable housing will contribute to meeting identified local housing need. This includes,	No change.

	but is not restricted to, local people.	
Meeting strategic housing requirement to cater for wider needs of society should also be acknowledged. The need to meet both strategic requirements and local housing needs should be referenced. Suggested wording '...Meet the strategic housing requirement by providing a range of market and affordable housing types, tenures and...' (3755, 4944, 4900)	Local need is used to mean 'objectively assessed need', as well as a local mix. Objectively assessed housing need for the HMA and for each L& L local authority area was set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014), and will be updated through the 2016 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). It is for the plan to translate this need into a requirement for the District. The suggested change would clarify this. .	Amend to read 'Meet the strategic housing requirement by providing a range of market and affordable housing types, tenures and sizes in appropriate locations to meet local needs....
Draft Objective 2: Employment		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
No scenario presented which aims to reduce level of out-commuting, despite Objective 2. Would require substantial increase in workplace jobs including jobs that appeal to resident workforce. (168)	Comment noted. This will be considered further in policy development.	No change.
Needs to make reference to communication by internet provision improvements. Only then will district be attractive to businesses. (4099)	The need for new development to contribute to telecommunications, including high speed broadband connectivity is set out in Objective 4.	No change.
The word 'existing' should be removed. (5268, 4254, 5370, 5348, 4996, 2682, 4328, 4737)	Agree that the word existing is unnecessary.	Amend to read: 'sustainable growth of businesses'
Should add a drive to attain more employment self-containment. (5428)	This is already covered in 'contribute to reducing the need for out-commuting'.	No change.
Should also focus on in commuting which does not contribute to the amenity of the district and impacts massively on the overall	Objective is aiming to reduce out commuting and therefore aiming for a better balance	No change

sustainability of the district. (4459)	between in and out commuting.	
Draft Objective 3: Location of development		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
Development must be located to minimise the use of cars; this means good public transport links must exist. (2441)	The word 'sustainable' will take into account access to public transport as well as other factors. It is not necessary to list all the factors which contribute to sustainability in the objective.	No change.
The prioritisation of brownfield land is contrary to NPPF paras 17 and 111, which only encourage, and not prioritise it. (3759, 4935). Few PDL opportunities remain. (4740)	Agreed.	Amend wording from 'prioritising' to 'encouraging'.
Draft Objective 4: Infrastructure		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
This objective is about delivery. There does not appear to be an objective which protects and enhances existing, or provides for, new sports facilities and playing fields. (4436)	Covered by objective 5 which seeks to 'Protect, enhance and, where appropriate, secure the provision of additional accessible community services and local facilities...'	No change.
Reference to the need to ensure there is sufficient foul sewerage network capacity would be helpful. (4571)	Agree. Reference to foul sewerage network capacity to be added.	Amend to refer to infrastructure for water supply and treatment'.
Objective suggests an over-reliance on new developments to deliver all infrastructure required within the District, which is unrealistic and will not address any current under-provision in infrastructure provision. The objective also fails to recognise the responsibility of other bodies involved in the infrastructure delivery. It is also potentially not consistent with national policy. No reference to CIL. (4935)	Wording of the objective to be amended to add clarity.	Wording to be amended to refer to new development being supported by the necessary infrastructure.

Draft Objective 5: Protection of local services		
No specific issues raised		
Draft Objective 6: Natural environment		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
Needs to be caveated at this stage with a clear understanding and intention for prospective policies for protecting the natural environment to be fully informed by a necessary up to date review of evidence in relation to Green Wedge and landscape designations. (4714)	No change proposed as all policy development will reflect the most up to date evidence available at the time.	No change.
Recognition and identification of minerals safeguarding areas to prevent unnecessary sterilisation. Important to support minerals (4720)	Agreed. It is important to acknowledge the importance of the District's natural resources.	Amend to include reference to prevention of unnecessary loss of natural resources.
See response to Objective 12 also.		
Draft Objective 7: Historic environment		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
Undermined by continuing to freely grant permissions for development which result in village streets covered in vehicles. (1704)	Comment noted.	No change.
No reference to wider cultural heritage and historic environment. Notable omission being the lack of recognition of Harborough's rich and well preserved rural heritage and historic landscape, including substantial and well preserved areas of ridge and furrow. (5137)	Reference to heritage assets in the countryside added.	Amend to refer to heritage assets in the countryside.
Historic England suggests Objective 7 should read:	Agreed. Objective amended to reflect main	Amend as suggested.

7. Historic Environment: Protect and enhance the character and significance of the District's historic settlements recognising the important contribution that heritage assets make to the distinctiveness of the District's towns, villages, and countryside and the need to secure a high quality public realm. (4627)	point of comment.	
Should add 'for future generations'. (4360)	Not considered necessary to qualify the objective in this way.	No change.
Ignores the fact that there are heritage assets in the countryside (outside of towns and villages) that should be reused practically and beneficially as new housing as advocated in paragraph 55 of the Framework. (4944)	Objective amended to recognise heritage assets in the countryside.	Objective to be amended to reflect comment.
Needs to include reference to maintaining the individual character and separation of settlements. (4737, 4328)	Protecting and enhancing the character of settlements is set out in the objective. It is not considered necessary to refer specifically to maintaining separation of settlement as this is part of their character.	No change.
Draft Objective 8: Town/village centres		
No specific issues raised		
Draft Objective 9: Design		
See Objective 12 response		
Draft Objective 10: Transport		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
Allowing development in small villages while failing to provide adequate bus services defeats this aim. (1704)	Comment noted.	No change.
Use of public transport should be encouraged, not just encouraging people to walk to destinations. (4099)	Comment noted.	No change.

Growing reliance on homeworking and home delivery of goods and services, via the internet, and sustainability of settlements closer to urban areas should be recognised. (4714)	Already covered in other objectives.	No change.
Draft Objective 11: Flood risk		
No specific issues raised		
Draft Objective 12: Environmental impact		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
Loss of agricultural land to development (2685)	Objective 3 encourages the use of previously developed land. NPPF specifies that planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. Objective 6 now refers to preventing the loss or sterilisation of natural resources.	Amend Objective 6.
Reducing pollution and waste would be better expanded and separated from the other elements of this objective which relate to climate change. Reducing pollution is particularly relevant to Harborough District given the Council has declared an Air Quality Management Area in Lutterworth Town Centre. It is relevant therefore for 'reducing pollution' to not only be recognised in its own right, but also expanded to add reference to the improvement of air quality within Lutterworth Town Centre as an objective of the New Local Plan. (5312)	Pollution and waste to be removed from this objective. Reducing waste is now within objective 9. Air quality is already covered in Objective 10 and therefore should be removed from this objective.	Amend objective 9 to include reference to waste.
Reducing noise pollution should be included. (4988)	This forms part of residential amenity considerations as set out Objective 9.	No change.
Should be explicit that negative impact on environmental issues; particularly carbon emissions, will be given significant weight in planning decisions. (4737, 4328)	It would be inappropriate to refer to the weight to be given to this issue in planning decisions.	No change.

Draft Objective 13: Tourism and culture		
No specific issues raised		
Draft Objective 14: Neighbourhood planning		
Specific issues raised	Response	Suggested action
The Local Plan plays a key role in ensuring that sufficient development is proposed to meet the objectively assessed needs of the district. Neighbourhood Plans should not be used as a mechanism to restrict development in sustainable locations. (4740)	The use of NPs as a mechanism to restrict development is not referred to in the objective. It clearly states that a clear strategic policy framework will be set out for their preparation.	No change.
Necessity for a neighbourhood planning objective is questioned. Its existence should not compromise communities where a neighbourhood plan is not appropriate. (4676, 3747)	It is recognised that neighbourhood planning will not be an appropriate way forward for all communities. Communities not preparing a neighbourhood plan will not be disadvantaged.	No change.
Neighbourhood Planning objective should be higher up the list of objectives. Should the objective include something about the Neighbourhood Plans providing local policies which are used to help determine planning applications? (3789)	The objectives are not in priority order. It is considered unnecessary to include further detail within the objective. The body of the Local Plan will provide additional detail in due course.	No change.
Suggested New Objectives/Themes	Response	Suggested action
There is the need to provide for mixed sustainable communities to help enable community capacity to be created so that communities are able to support themselves and vulnerable individuals and families within them. This concept is embraced within the Leicestershire Communities Strategy 2014. (5137)	It is considered that, taken together, the 14 objectives set out above will help provide for mixed sustainable communities.	No change
How will achievement of the objectives be measured? (3938, 4196)	A monitoring framework will be drawn up as part of the draft Local Plan.	No change.
The presumption in favour of development should be included.	Given that the presumption in favour of	No change.

(5428)	sustainable development is at the heart of national planning policy guidance it is not considered necessary to repeat it in the objectives. It will however be explained and form part of the Local Plan.	
--------	---	--

B Sustainable Settlements

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper set out a draft settlement hierarchy for the District for comment. Ensuring that development is directed to the appropriate locations is an important way to achieve sustainable development across the District. Through assessing the level of services and facilities accessible to residents, a draft settlement hierarchy was established which identified an appropriate approach to future development for settlements within each tier. This was set out in Section 4 of the Options Paper. Although there was no specific question, the various tiers of the settlement hierarchy allowed comments to be submitted.

Number of respondents and representations

A total of 88 representations were made on this section as set out in the table below. In addition there were 113 responses from residents of Great Easton supporting their continued designation as a Selected Rural Village. Table 7 shows the breakdown of representations in relation to the Sustainable Settlements section.

Table 7: Number of respondents and representations to Sustainable Settlements

Breakdown of Representations to Sustainable Settlements					
Paragraph	Respondents	Representations			
		Support	Object	Comment	Total
Harborough's Settlement Hierarchy	27	8	9	12	29
Principal Urban Area	6	4	2	0	6
Sub Regional Centre	5	3	2	2	7
Key Centres	7	5	1	1	7
Rural Centres	13	3	3	8	14

Selected Rural Villages	16	4	6	6	16
Sub-Selected Rural Villages	7	3	2	2	7
Other Settlements	6	0	4	3	7
	TOTAL	30	29	34	93

Summary: Overall there was a reasonable level of support for the draft settlement hierarchy, although some of this support was qualified. Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages attracted the most responses with the latter attracting the highest number of objections. Table 8 below sets out an overall summary of the responses received on each tier of the settlement hierarchy.

Table 8: Summary of responses to Draft Settlement Hierarchy

Principal Urban Area
<p>Summary of responses: Overall there was agreement that the PUA is the most sustainable location for development and with its position at the top of the settlement hierarchy, particularly from the development industry. Local responses, however, questioned the sustainability of Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby, particularly in respect of access to services and facilities, despite its proximity to Leicester.</p> <p>Specific issues raised:</p> <p>Some respondents felt that Great Glen should be reclassified as a settlement within the PUA as it has a more comprehensive service provision than Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby. It has excellent transport and pedestrian links to the Leicester PUA which is less than a mile away. It benefits considerably from its proximity to the services and facilities within Oadby.</p> <p>Several respondents including Thurnby and Bushby PC consider that Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby should not be identified at the top of the settlement hierarchy. The proximity to the City of Leicester is by no means the only measure of sustainability which should be taken into account. The Council should not allow the absorption of key village settlements into the City of Leicester.</p>

Sub-Regional Centre
<p>Summary of responses: Whilst it was recognised that Market Harborough fulfils the role of a Sub-Regional Centre, there was concern over the integration of new development around the town and the need for investment to manage traffic flow more effectively; the strategy for the town needs to take these issues into account.</p> <p>Specific issues raised:</p> <p>One respondent pointed out that as currently set out, the approach to development for the Sub-Regional Centre is the same as that set out for Key Centres. If Market Harborough is more sustainable than Lutterworth or Broughton Astley, this should be reflected in approach to development.</p>
Key Centres
<p>Summary of responses: There was general support for the 2 identified Key Centres, mainly from developers. The lack of sustainable transport provision and the resulting reliance on private car use in these settlements was raised. The need to ensure that the type and level of development respects the settlement's heritage and character was also raised.</p> <p>Specific issues raised</p> <p>One developer felt that in relation to Broughton Astley, the settlement hierarchy has not been used to inform the distribution options.</p> <p>Another respondent raised that Lutterworth should be considered for Sub-Regional Centre status.</p>
Rural Centres
<p>Summary of responses: There was criticism that identifying Rural Centres in terms of access to key services is over simplistic insofar as it does not take into account their capacity or long term viability. This, along with the need for development to be of an appropriate level and type that respects the historic heritage and character, was an issue raised by several local respondents. The identification of the Rural Centres was generally supported by developers/agents.</p> <p>Specific issues raised</p> <p>Some agents/developers felt that Great Bowden should be identified as a Rural Centre given its level of key services and sustainable location close to Market Harborough. Several respondents, including Kibworth Harcourt PC, felt that identification based on at least 4 out of 6 key services is over-simplistic and does not take into account the capacity of these services.</p>

Selected Rural Villages

Summary of responses: Local concern was expressed that the methodology for the identification of SRVs is unsophisticated and that services / facilities already at capacity should not be used to justify further development in Selected Rural Villages. The fact that public transport services are not taken into account also raised concerns. There was strong support for Great Easton remaining a Selected Rural Village.

Specific issues raised

Claybrooke Magna PC along with 2 other respondents considered Claybrooke Magna's identification as a Selected Rural Village is unacceptable as it only has 1 key service within the village.

Several respondents felt that identification based on at least 2 out of 6 key services is not sophisticated and does not take into account the capacity of these services. There should be recognition across the settlement hierarchy that the categorisation may be imprecise.

Sub-Selected Rural Villages

Summary of responses: Of the few comments made most expressed the view that these settlements could accommodate some limited new development and that this approach would reflect the national Planning Policy Framework in respect of rural development and supporting sustainable rural communities.

Specific issues raised

One respondent pointed out that Drayton no longer has a village hall and therefore should not be a sub-selected rural village.

One landowner felt that Stoughton should be identified as a Selected Rural Village given its close proximity to the main urban area and the opportunities for infill development.

A couple of respondents felt that the services on which the designation is made are not equally valuable to the local community (i.e. cannot equate a village hall to a local food store)

Several respondents considered that the current approach to development in rural settlements does not reflect the NPPF aim of supporting rural development and rural communities. Identification should not be based on number of key services alone. No account is taken of NPPF (para 55) which recognises that development in one village could support services in a nearby village. There needs to be a broader analysis of how local communities function.

Other Settlements

Summary of responses: Of the few comments made, most expressed the view that these settlements could accommodate some very limited new development. Such an approach would be more reflective of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of rural development and supporting sustainable rural communities.

The point was made that the implication from the hierarchy that development in small settlements or in the countryside would be unacceptable in policy terms is not supported by national guidance. The role of rural PDL in delivering housing in rural areas is not recognised.

C Housing and Employment Options

Option 1: Rural

Summary of the Option:

Under this option a total of 60% of the District's future housing need would be met in the urban settlements (Thurnby, Bushby and Scraftoft, Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Broughton Astley) and 40% met in the rural settlements (Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages).

The bulk of general employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha), with at least 4ha in Lutterworth and approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 9 sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 1 (Rural), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 9: Summary of responses to Option 1 (Rural)

Option 1: Rural - Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 248 Total representations: 274</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 180• Supporting: 83• Commenting: 11 <p>Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sixth highest number of respondents;• Fifth highest number of representations;• Fifth highest number of objecting representations; and

- Fourth highest number of supporting representations.

Key issues raised in objections:

44 objecting comments came from Scraftoft, Thurnby Bushby, with another 28 from residents of the Kibworths. Another 26 originated from Houghton on the Hill and 12 from Medbourne. Residents of 17 other settlements objected to this option.

Many respondents, including the Highway Authority, felt that this approach would place too much development in rural villages and would risk creating unsustainable patterns of development. The Highway Authority is concerned that by not locating development in the most sustainable locations, reliance of the use of the private car would increase, particularly in light of recent cuts to public transport. Significant rural based growth will be heavily car dependent and people being isolated from work and social needs.

The capacity of local services, facilities and the rural road network to cope with growth under this option was a major concern, with many expressing that both schools and doctors' surgeries are already full and unable to cope with increased demand. The numbers of dwellings involved would not deliver meaningful infrastructure to overcome capacity issues.

PUA residents were concerned over the impact of additional development, over and above that already built and committed, on traffic, services and separation between the settlements. Nearby Houghton on the Hill residents were concerned over the high number suggested for the village under this option and how new development would lead to further traffic and parking issues (Main Street) and the effect on the character of their village. The assimilation of new residents into the community was highlighted.

Issues relating to infrastructure capacity were particularly prevalent in responses from the Kibworths with concerns over local traffic and access onto the A6 strongly expressed along with the lack of capacity of GP surgeries and schools. The high growth figure for Fleckney caused concern not only within Fleckney but also in the Kibworths due to impact on the local road network and the likelihood of exacerbating current highway issues.

Of the 15 Parish Councils that responded to this option, all but 1 objected with many questioning the ability of the settlement to accommodate the indicated level of housing growth in terms of impact on local infrastructure and loss of rural character.

There were several responses concerned over the impact development would have on the character of individual settlements and of the district as a whole. Some raised the issue that such a pattern of development was inconsistent with the Vision set out in the options paper and felt that rural settlements should be protected.

Lutterworth Town Council indicated that the piecemeal approach to development under this option would not deliver the correct level of

infrastructure for the town.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

The majority of comments supporting this option came from residents of the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby area (51). This approach found support among those promoting rural land for development.

Almost half of those expressing support for this approach felt that was the most equitable approach to the location of development to 2031, with no one area subjected to excessive development. By spreading development across the district some respondents felt that it could avoid placing undue strain on certain areas and revitalise some rural. Others cited potential benefits of this approach for rural areas such as the delivery of affordable housing in rural villages, support for local services and facilities, and encouraging the growth of the rural economy as promoted by the NPPF. This option also found support amongst those who considered an over reliance on strategic development areas to be a risky approach to the delivery of development. There was a feeling that this approach could aid housing deliverability in the short term. Some suggested that this is a balanced distribution which reflects the rural nature of the district and is best able to support and sustain all communities.

Key issues raised in comments:

Thurnby and Bushby PC commented that by spreading development across the district the benefits on infrastructure across the district would be proportionately low.

Anglian Water has indicated that this more dispersed distribution option is likely to have a greater impact on its infrastructure than the other options. However, it wishes to comment further when specific housing sites have been identified by the Council.

The County Council has indicated that there may be difficulty in extending the schools in the following locations:

- Houghton on the Hill
- Husbands Bosworth
- Claybrooke Magna
- Dunton Bassett
- Gilmorton

- Great Bowden
- Tugby

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Developers/agents suggest that a higher figure for the Kibworths is warranted, given its position in the settlement hierarchy and good range of services/facilities; a particular focus on rural areas is not the most sustainable and that this is identified as the worst in terms of resource use in the SA; and that the figures are not evidence led and do not reflect the development actually required.

Option 2: Core Strategy Distribution

Summary of the Option:

Under this option the distribution of future housing need would broadly continue as identified in the existing adopted Core Strategy, with approximately 70% of future new housing planned for the urban settlements and 30% planned for the rural settlements.

The bulk of general employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha), with at least 4ha in Lutterworth and approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 10 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 2 (Core Strategy Distribution), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 10: Summary of responses to Option 2 (Core Strategy Distribution)

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 218 Total representations: 236</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 160• Supporting: 57• Commenting: 19 <p>Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lowest number of respondents;• Lowest number of representations;• Seventh highest number of objecting representations; and• Seventh highest number of supporting representations.
<p>Key issues raised in objections:</p> <p>The highest number of representations objecting to this option came from residents of Scruptoft/Thurnby/Bushby (58) followed by those from</p>

Houghton on the Hill (27). The Kibworths accounted for a further 14 representations whilst Market Harborough, Great Bowden, Foxton and Medbourne all had 5. There were objections from a handful other settlements.

12 Parish Councils objected to this option expressing concern over impact on local services, road infrastructure and village character. Market Harborough Civic Society and Lubenham PC felt that the numbers for Market Harborough were unacceptably high (taking into account commitments) and that the option does not allow for growth already in the pipeline to be absorbed. Other comments related to a lack of detail regarding how already stretched services would be improved or how traffic congestion would be eased.

Residents from Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby objected to the numbers for the parishes raising issues relating to traffic congestion, high number of outstanding commitments, disproportionate new development over recent years, lack of service/facility capacity and improvement along with the potential loss of village identity.

The Kibworths' residents objected to the option on the grounds that local schools and GPs are at capacity, traffic congestion in the village, poor access onto the A6 and worsening air quality. Kibworth Harcourt lacks food store or meeting place despite recent growth. Congestion, access to A6 poor and air quality all worsening. Concern was also expressed regarding the high numbers proposed for Fleckney and its impact not only on the village but also on surrounding rural roads and the Kibworths.

Regarding the rural villages, it was felt that the numbers proposed were too high, given that villages lack the services, road infrastructure and public transport to absorb additional housing. Loss of rural character was raised along with the lack of employment opportunities. It was suggested that the approach does not reflect the draft vision. Houghton on the Hill and Great Bowden respondents were concerned over the impacts on traffic/parking and local services and facilities.

Whilst the above comments related to numbers being too high, some respondents, mainly developers/site promoters felt that the housing figures under option 2 were too low. More specifically it was suggested that the Kibworths should have a higher level of development given its good range of services and facilities; there is scope for more development to be accommodated in the Leicester PUA and Market Harborough as the most sustainable locations in the district; and the option fails to have regard to the availability of specific deliverable and developable sites and therefore is contrary to the NPPF. Lutterworth Town Council objected to the option on the basis that that the town will not receive appropriate level of infrastructure support with a piecemeal approach to development.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

Of those residents supporting this option, 21 representations came from Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby and 18 representations came from the Kibworths. Another 5 came from the Cotesbach area.

Kibworth Harcourt PC supported this approach emphasising the role of the neighbourhood plan in providing appropriate policies for the villages (taking into account infrastructure capacity). Cotesbach PC felt that the approach has worked well to date and allows a fair distribution which meets the plan's draft vision/objectives.

Supporting comments suggested that it is fair and sensible to locate development in most sustainable locations whilst keeping rural settlements alive. The option spreads development across the District, whilst minimising its impact on infrastructure. Some suggested that this distribution has worked well up to now. The need to allow for housing choice in rural areas to help address lack of affordability and to provide affordable housing in rural areas was also highlighted in support of the option.

Key issues raised in comments:

Anglian Water has indicated that the potential Market Harborough development sites likely to require improvements to foul sewerage network, and possibly additional sewage treatment enhancements.

The County Council has indicated that further infill development at Market Harborough could be problematic and that there may be difficulty in extending the schools in the following locations:

- Houghton on the Hill
- Husbands Bosworth
- Claybrooke Magna
- Dunton Bassett
- Gilmorton
- Great Bowden
- Tugby

The County Highway Authority points to the need to have the outcomes of the Market Harborough transport study (currently underway) to assess the ability of the town to accommodate further strategic housing growth. The scale of infrastructure needed might not be fundable by developers alone. It also highlights increased risks of putting further housing numbers on the eastern edge of the PUA in combination with

growth to the north-east of the PUA due to the impact on strategic traffic issues including Leicester City roads.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Developer/agent comments include:

- whilst responding well to market demand, this approach relies on the delivery of the MH SDA which has large, expensive infrastructure requirements which may delay effective delivery; and
- the approach will help support and underpin the retail and other services in Market Harborough and add to overall resilience and sustainability of the town.

Option 3: Urban

Summary of the Option:

Under this option a total of 80% of the District's future housing need would be met in the urban settlements and 20% met in the rural settlements.

The bulk of general employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha), with at least 4ha in Lutterworth and approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 11 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 3 (Urban), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 11: Summary of responses to Option 3 (Urban)

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 220 Total representations: 238</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 125• Supporting: 96• Commenting: 17 <p>Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next to highest number of respondents;• Next to highest number of representations;• Third highest number of objecting representations; and• Next to highest number of supporting representations.
<p>Key issues raised in objections:</p> <p>The highest number of objections to option 3 came from the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby area (60) with a further 12 representations</p>

originating from nearby Houghton on the Hill (12). Other settlements with 5 or more objecting representations were Cotesbach, the Kibworths and Market Harborough.

Lutterworth Town Council, Market Harborough Civic Society (MHCS) and 5 parish councils objected to the option. MHCS and Lubenham PC feel that the option sees too much development going to Market Harborough. Lutterworth Town Council, Cotesbach PC and Swinford PC all raise issues around piecemeal development not delivering the correct level of infrastructure support (namely a relief road) whilst at the same time exacerbating current traffic problems.

Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby residents are concerned regarding the impact of further development on traffic congestion, the high number of outstanding commitments, the disproportionate new development over recent years, lack of service/facility capacity and improvement. They are also concerned that development outside of the District is impacting on the villages. The risk of loss of village identity and threat to village separation area were highlighted. The need to improve traffic flow substantially is raised. The area has been neglected in terms of funding for services and facilities. They emphasise that the villages are not an urban centre.

Taking into account current commitments concern was expressed that this approach, with its piecemeal developments, would overwhelm the Market Harborough and its services. There was concern that there is no indication of any infrastructure benefits to alleviate the situation. Increased traffic congestion, worsening air quality and loss of 'market town' feel were also raised as potential issues. It was also felt that development on this scale would impact on A6 through Kibworth, exacerbating access issues already being experienced. The ability of one housing market (Market Harborough) to deliver this scale of housing to 2031 (bearing in mind current commitments) is questioned as is the number of suitable sites in the town to deliver this scale of housing growth.

There were also a number of comments relating to provision in settlements being too low or piecemeal. Some, including a number of landowners/promoters, felt that the approach would not sustain villages, leading to house price rises, social stagnation and potential loss of services. There was some criticism that the distribution does not reflect the role of rural centres or take into account housing land availability in rural areas which could contribute to housing growth and affordable housing.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

Supporting comments came in mainly from residents of the Kibworths (25) Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby (24) and Houghton on the Hill (16).

Most comments in support of option 3 felt that directing development to urban areas is the most sustainable approach as these areas have the infrastructure, public transport and employment opportunities. The approach allows rural areas to keep their character and eases pressure on rural roads, services and facilities. It was felt that the more modest development level for Fleckney would impact less on services, facilities and the local road network.

8 Parish Councils supported this option as being sustainable and impacting less on rural character, rural roads and community cohesion.

Key issues raised in comments:

Anglian Water has indicated that the potential Market Harborough development sites likely to require improvements to foul sewerage network, and possibly additional sewage treatment enhancements.

The County Highway Authority point to the need to have the outcomes of the MH transport study (currently underway) to assess the ability of the town to accommodate further strategic housing growth. The scale of infrastructure needed might not be fundable by developers alone. It also highlights the increased risks of putting further housing numbers on the eastern edge of the PUA in combination with growth to the north-east of the PUA (impact on strategic traffic issues including Leicester City roads).

The County Council has indicated that further infill development at Market Harborough could be problematic and that there may be difficulty in extending the schools in the following locations:

- Houghton on the Hill
- Husbands Bosworth
- Claybrooke Magna
- Dunton Bassett
- Gilmorton
- Great Bowden
- Tugby

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Some respondents questioned the ability of Market Harborough to accommodate level of growth identified and suggest that other places should take some of the town's growth.

Given the potential level of investment, the need for a vision and master plan for the town is raised. Also expressed is the view that growth will consolidate the town's position as the primary centre for the district.

Option 4: Scraftoft/Thurnby Strategic Development Area (SDA)

Summary of the Option:

A proposal has been received which would provide a significant extension to the East of Scraftoft and Thurnby within Harborough District. The proposal is for at least 1000 dwellings with community facilities and a link road between Scraftoft village and the A47. Considerable further assessment of transport impact, landscape and viability is needed to test whether it is appropriate for allocation. Delivery of this strategic development area would reduce the requirement for all other settlements in the District.

The bulk of general employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha), with at least 4ha in Lutterworth and approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. The potential SDA at Scraftoft does not include proposals to deliver employment land at present, but this will be considered further. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 12 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 4 (Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 12: Summary of responses to Option 4 (Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA)

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 254 Total representations: 271</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 227• Supporting: 32• Commenting: 12 <p>Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fifth highest number of respondents;• Sixth highest number of representations;• Third highest number of objecting comments;

- Next to lowest number of supporting comments.

Key issues raised in objections:

Of the representations objecting to option 4, the majority came from residents of Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby (142) with another 24 coming from Houghton objecting to the figure for their village and the impact of the scale of development proposed for the PUA.

13 parish councils objected to this option. Whilst some were concerned directly with the impact of the potential SDA, others felt that the numbers for their settlement are too high. Lutterworth PC objected as the town would not receive the correct level of infrastructure support through piecemeal development. Market Harborough Civic Society expressed concern over the level of development for the town.

Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby residents, along with both Parish Councils, are concerned regarding the impact of further development on traffic congestion, the high number of outstanding commitments, the disproportionate new development over recent years, lack of service/facility capacity and improvement. They are also concerned that development outside of the District is impacting on the villages. The risk of loss of village identity and threat to village separation area issues are highlighted. The need to improve traffic flow substantially is raised. The view is expressed that the area has been neglected in terms of funding for services and facilities. Some respondents emphasise that the villages are not an urban centre despite their location on the edge of Leicester and that there are poor transport links with Leicester.

There are specific concerns relating to the potential Scraptoft/Thurnby SDA link road. Many felt that it would be unable to resolve A47 congestion issues; it would not ease congestion in Scraptoft village; it would become a rat-run between the A46 and A47 therefore increase traffic at Scraptoft; and it would impact on the local landscape. It was felt that development on the scale proposed would merely deliver more cars onto already congested roads, without any benefits to the local communities and rendering local roads more unsafe. Stoughton Parish Council felt that such large scale development at the PUA would increase traffic movements between A47 and A6 and impact on their village.

Respondents from Houghton on the Hill, including the Parish Council, are particularly concerned regarding the impacts of scale of development (both within the village and at the PUA) on traffic issues, access to potential sites, the assimilation of new residents into the community and the erosion of separation with Thurnby and Bushby.

Whilst the majority of objecting comments focus on the scale of development being too high for settlements, some from developers/promoters feel that provision at Kibworth and Broughton Astley does not reflect the settlement's role in the settlement hierarchy and does not support the draft vision. Others consider the distribution does not allow sufficient flexibility; does not reflect the available supply of housing land; relies on the delivery of one site which could take time to come on stream.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

The majority (21) of representations in support of this option came from the Kibworths. Kibworth Harcourt PC also supported this option. Many of these respondents feel that development adjacent to Leicester City with its range of services, facilities, employment opportunities and connectivity offered a sustainable approach with less environmental impact than development in rural areas. It was felt that this option's approach to development in the Kibworths is reasonable, recognising its infrastructure limitations. However there are still concerns over the potential increase in traffic on the A6 impacting on the Kibworths.

Key issues raised in comments:

The County Highway Authority commented that any proposals for strategic growth in the Scraftoft/Thurnby area could be limited unless and until a strategy can be put into place to address cumulative traffic issues in the north east of the PUA. The link road might address some local issues but could encourage rat-running of more strategic traffic trying to avoid congestion on the main road network in the north east of the PUA. The viability of this scale of infrastructure would also need to be carefully assessed.

The County Education Authority expressed support for the principle of an SDA from an education perspective as the proposal is large enough to provide a new school. LCC Economic Growth highlighted the need to ensure sites are truly deliverable and financially viable, particularly if the supporting infrastructure required is extensive.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Other comments suggest that rural development could complement the single SDA approach (providing short term development opportunities) and question the sustainability credentials of the SDA site, despite its position in the settlement hierarchy.

Option 5: Kibworth Strategic Development Area (SDA)

Summary of the Option:

Two alternative proposals near the Kibworths have been received and this option is derived from these. Both proposals offer new road infrastructure, community and employment facilities and around 1,200 houses. One proposal involves development to the north and east of Kibworth Harcourt and a potential relief road for the existing A6. Another involves development to the north and west of the Kibworths and linking road infrastructure between the A6 and Fleckney Road. Considerable further assessment of transport impact, landscape and viability is needed in terms of both proposals to test whether either is appropriate for allocation.

This option would include just one of these two potential alternative strategic development areas at the Kibworths.

Delivery of either potential strategic development area would reduce the requirement for all other settlements in the District.

Approximately 5ha of employment land would be delivered as part of the potential Kibworth SDA. A further 10ha (approx.) of employment land would be delivered in Market Harborough along with at least 4ha in Lutterworth and approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 13 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 5 (Kibworth SDA), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 13: Summary of responses to Option 5 (Kibworth SDA)

Options Consultation Responses
Number of respondents: 305 Total representations: 328 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 239• Supporting: 77• Commenting: 12

Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:

- Third highest number of respondents;
- Third highest number of representations;
- Next to highest number of objecting representations; and
- Fifth highest number of supporting representations.

Key issues raised in objections:

The majority of representations objecting to this option came from residents of the Kibworths (148). Kibworth Harcourt and Kibworth Beauchamp Parish Councils also objected to the option due to the potential impacts on the Kibworths, along with Fleckney PC and Burton Overy PC. Lutterworth Town Council object to the option as piecemeal development would not deliver the infrastructure needed (i.e. eastern relief road) for the town. 8 other parish councils objected to the option. Market Harborough Civic Society and Lubenham PC were concerned over the number of homes identified for Market Harborough.

Objections from the Kibworths (including the Parish Councils) raised concerns in relation to the capacity of services and facilities (particularly schools and GP surgeries). The capacity of the primary school was raised by the school's Governors and Head as they consider that the continuous growth of village puts unreasonable strain on school and that the quality and quantity of education will suffer. Access to school was raised as major concern. The scale of recent housing development has already put schools and GP surgeries under severe pressure. Traffic around the villages and difficulties in accessing the A6, especially at peak periods, is highlighted by many respondents: a situation that will be further exacerbated by the development of the MH SDA. Further traffic will give rise to additional pollution and noise to the detriment of villagers. Objections relating to the loss of village identity were common, with residents fearing a change from historic village to town and associated loss of rural character, attractive countryside, wildlife habitat and heritage value. There was dismay at the radical change this option would represent from Core Strategy policy for the villages, with many feeling that the settlement needs time to adjust to KB/1. A small minority recognised that the village could take more housing but emphasised that only steady housing increase would help maintain the strong sense of community. There was a feeling that the neighbourhood plan process could provide the opportunity to provide a comprehensive review of the Kibworths' capacity for further development.

There was some scepticism as to whether the proposed bypass would be affordable and whether it would solve A6 congestion issues. There was a feeling that it could just create other pinch points in the local road system. The impact on highway capacity within the City also needs to be considered as this may affect delivery. Some of the surrounding villages also raised concerns over how the scale of development would impact on local rural roads.

In other objections, developer/promoters were concerned that the approach places undue reliance on one area, which may take a long time to deliver, rising a lack of flexibility; and it ignores housing land availability evidence in other, potentially more sustainable settlements including the PUA and Market Harborough.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

The majority of support for this option came from residents of the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby area (62) due to its relatively modest potential housing numbers for these settlements. Other support came mainly from site promoters/developers.

Key issues raised in comments:

Anglian Water Services Ltd commented that development of either SDA is expected to require improvements to foul sewerage network and sewage treatment enhancements.

Leicestershire County Highway Authority has commented that evidence shows that A6 London Road south of the Ring Road is likely to require further attention and investment to 2031. The area is already under significant traffic pressures and proposals for strategic growth on or around south eastern edge of PUA will exacerbate these problems. As a result it suggests that options for strategic growth in places such as the Kibworths could be limited unless and until a strategy for addressing issues on the south side of the PUA can be put in place. Further transport modelling will be needed to assess the impacts on the PUA (applies to both SDAs). Substantial on and off site transport infrastructure would be needed to mitigate impacts so there would need to be certainty that developments remained financially viable.

Leicestershire County Council Education supports the principle from an education perspective of providing a primary school. However, it acknowledges that there may be an issue at secondary level. LCC Economic Growth stresses the importance of the county's rural economy and importance of providing market and affordable housing to meet identified local need whilst minimising risk of unsustainable patterns of development. Ensuring that sites are financially viability is emphasised, particularly where extensive supporting infrastructure is required.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green

wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Other comments suggest that the development of smaller sites around the Kibworths should not be ruled out as they could be more sustainable/deliverable than an SDA and that development on the scale of an SDA does not reflect the settlements' position in the settlement hierarchy, would not lead to a change in the Kibworths' role or lead to a substantial increase in the level or quality of services for villagers.

Option 6: Lutterworth Strategic Development Area (SDA)

Summary of the Option:

This option has been derived from a proposal that has been received which would provide approximately 1,950 dwellings, local facilities and employment land to the East of Lutterworth by 2031. This would involve provision of a road link between the A4304 (to the east of Lutterworth) and A426 (Leicester Road to the north of Lutterworth) which would provide relief for Lutterworth town centre. In addition, approximately 550 dwellings would be delivered at this location after 2031. There is also scope for provision of a motorway service facility adjoining M1 Junction 20 and land for strategic distribution. Considerable further assessment of transport impact, landscape and viability is needed to test whether it is appropriate for allocation. Delivery of this strategic development area would reduce the requirement for all other settlements in the District.

The proposal for a Lutterworth SDA would deliver approximately 10ha of employment land. Approximately 10ha of employment land would also be delivered in Market Harborough along with approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 14 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 6 (Lutterworth SDA), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 14: Summary of responses to Option 6 (Lutterworth SDA)

Options Consultation Responses
Number of respondents: 248 Total representations: 270 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 79• Supporting: 179• Commenting: 12

Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:

- Sixth highest number of respondents;
- Seventh highest number of representations;
- Lowest number of objections; and
- Highest number of supporting representations.

Key issues raised in objections:

Approximately 30 representations objecting to the option originated from Lutterworth and the surrounding villages. There were fewer than 10 representations from Lutterworth residents. Cotesbach Parish Council was among the 6 parish councils objecting to the option. It feels that a commitment to preparing a strategic growth plan for Lutterworth is needed as such a plan is critical to the success of the SDA. The potential revenue from the resultant housing, employment land and potential Magna Park rates should be invested into such a plan and the cash used for the town itself. Misterton with Walcote PC is strongly opposed to the allocation of land for the motorway service facilities.

Local objections to the option relate to the limited capacity of existing services and facilities; additional traffic, parking and congestion in the town particularly on the A426; an exacerbation of pollution in the town; lack of capacity of the existing retail area; and increased out commuting due to low unemployment rate in the area. Many commented on specific elements of the SDA such as its isolated location to the east of the M1, limited opportunities for connectivity to Lutterworth, its location downwind of traffic fumes/pollution and its reliance on car usage. Given the relief road's critical role in the success of the SDA, there needs to be solid evidence in relation to its benefits for traffic in the area and for the town in particular. There is a fear that the relief road would not be built for a long time and that Lutterworth, a vehicle oriented town, would become even more congested. The addition of a service station is questioned by respondents and could negate the benefits of a relief road. Its development would extend development too far into open countryside. There is also concern over the possible impacts of potential cumulative developments on the M1 J21 roundabout (Lutterworth SDA/further Magna Park development/service station).

Other opposing comments, mainly from the development industry, include the view that this option focusses too much development in one area; this could impact on the economic and social development of the whole district over the plan period. There is undue reliance on one area that will take too long to deliver. It is claimed that the option is not flexible enough and does not take account of the available housing land supply. Other comments raise issues with the lack of housing target for Broughton Astley and Kibworth and low housing targets for PUA and Market Harborough. Such targets do not reflect the role of these settlements within the hierarchy.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

Over half of the representations in support of this option came from Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby and Houghton on the Hill area (108). 37 representations in support came from residents of the Kibworths. Fewer than 10 representations supporting the option came from Lutterworth and the surrounding villages.

Lutterworth Town Council has expressed support for this option contingent on the provision of an eastern bypass and new bridge to the north of the town. It feels that this will allow the separation area to be safeguarded and will bring with it increased vitality of service provision and facilities which would not be the case if development was piecemeal.

10 parish councils and Market Harborough Civic Society supported this option with many of them referring to Lutterworth's sustainability in terms of access to the strategic road network and employment opportunities.

Leicestershire County Council, as landowner, strongly supports the delivery of an SDA at Lutterworth as it would make a significant contribution to housing numbers and has the potential to deliver economic and environmental benefits to the town. LCC Education supports the principle from an education perspective as scope for growth at Lutterworth and Fleckney. LCC Economic Growth supports the Lutterworth SDA as the location is a focus for economic growth in the Strategic Economic Plan. However, ensuring that sites are financially viable is emphasised, particularly where extensive supporting infrastructure is required.

Key issues raised in comments:

Natural England has serious concerns over the potential SDA given its proximity to Misterton Marshes SSSI. They consider that it is highly likely that such development would have significant hydrological and other impacts on the SSSI which could damage or destroy the features for which it is designated.

Alongside its strong opposition to the service station, Misterton with Walcote Parish Council is concerned that housing will be built but not deliver of the eastern bypass and the impact this would have on access into Lutterworth.

LCC Highway Authority comments that Lutterworth's performance in transport sustainability terms is better (re: total vehicle time and total delay) relative to MH, the District and also many other parts of the HMA. However, Strategic Transport Assessment evidence suggests there are off-site impacts (capacity issues on A426 Rugby Road and impacts on M1 J20). Further LLITM modelling work is needed to aid the understanding of potential impacts. There are also concerns over:

- relatively poor walking/cycling links to facilities in Lutterworth and cost of providing improved access;

- public transport through the site;
- potential cost of road with new bridge over M1; and
- cost of mitigating off-site impacts.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Other comments call into question the viability of the SDA (in particular whether 2,500 homes could fund a link road that includes a bridge over the M1 whilst still providing planning contributions) and promote the role of rural development in complementing a single SDA strategy (by providing shorter term development opportunities thus contributing to the 5 year housing land supply).

Option 7: Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA and Kibworth SDA

Summary of the Option:

This option would involve two of the proposals for strategic development areas in the District: approximately 1,200 dwellings at the Kibworths; and approximately 1,000 dwellings to the East of Scraftoft / Thurnby. Other settlements would receive limited housing growth.

Approximately 5ha of employment land would be delivered with one of the potential Kibworth SDAs. Approximately 10ha of employment land would also be delivered in Market Harborough, at least 4ha in Lutterworth and approximately 3ha in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 15 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 7 (Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA and Kibworth SDA), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 15: Summary of responses to Option 7 (Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA and Kibworth SDA)

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 355 Total representations: 371</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 335• Supporting: 25• Commenting: 11 <p>Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highest number of respondents;• Highest number of representations;• Highest number of objecting comments; and• Lowest number of supporting comments.

Key issues raised in objections:

Residents from the Kibworths' area raised 129 objections to an SDA for the village. Common concerns raised included the lack of infrastructure capacity (particularly schools and GP surgeries), difficult and dangerous access to the A6, traffic congestion within the village itself, increasing noise and pollution levels and lack of shopping facilities/parking in the centre. There was also a feeling that development of an SDA would have an adverse impact on the settlement changing it from an historic village to an unattractive town. Loss of open countryside, wildlife habitat and biodiversity was also raised. Many pointed out the high level of housing development which has taken place over the past few years and the need for the settlement to be allowed time to adjust to this growth. Losing the sense of community was a real concern expressed by many villagers. The viability and the effectiveness of the proposed bypass were questioned by some respondents. Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt Parish Councils objected to the option, echoing local concerns and the lack of infrastructure capacity assessment and assessment of local need. Nearby Fleckney PC and Burton Overy PC also objected fearing the SDA would change the character and nature of the Kibworths and impact on the countryside.

There were 160 representations from residents of the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby and Houghton on the Hill area opposing an SDA to the east of Scraftoft/Thurnby. Many comments focused on traffic related issues with traffic congestion and speed highlighted with the A47 of particular concern. There was general agreement that the potential link road would not provide benefits to the road network and would create the opportunity for new rat runs through the villages. The lack of capacity of local services and facilities (particularly schools and GP surgeries) was highlighted. Several respondents felt that although the settlements have had a lot of new development in recent years, no improvements to local infrastructure provision have taken place. High levels of current commitments and building in adjacent areas (Keyham Lane, Hamilton and Barkby) also need to be taken into account. Loss of separation, reduced access to the countryside, worsening air pollution and continuing erosion to the character of the villages were also emphasised in comments. There was a general feeling that, although on the edge of the City, the settlements are not a sustainable location for an SDA due to the restricted road network and lack of public transport. Scraftoft and Thurnby & Bushby Parish Councils objected to the option as did nearby Houghton on the Hill PC. Stoughton PC expressed opposition fearing the impact on the local road network between A47 and A6.

A further 7 parish councils opposed this option. In addition Lutterworth Town Council was concerned that under this option the town will not receive the correct level of infrastructure support as development would be delivered in piecemeal fashion.

Some developers/promoters felt that the approach is not flexible enough to deal with market variations and relies on a few areas which will take too long to deliver. Others felt that numbers for villages were too low to support services and allow for rural growth and that the approach does not take into account the evidence in relation to available supply of land.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as

far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

Market Harborough Civic Society considered the option set out a more realistic figure for Market Harborough.

Billesdon PC supported the approach of concentrating development in urban areas. Whilst a number of those in support felt that the option set out a more realistic level of development for rural villages.

Key issues raised in comments:

Anglian Water Services Ltd stated that the development of either SDA at Kibworth is expected to require improvements to the foul sewerage network and sewage treatment works.

Leicestershire County Highway Authority has commented on the option as follows:

- Scraftoft /Thurnby SDA: Any proposals for strategic growth here could be limited unless and until a strategy can be put into place to address cumulative traffic issues in the north east of the PUA. The link road might address some local issues but could encourage rat-running of more strategic traffic trying to avoid congestion on the main road network in the north east of the PUA. The viability of this scale of infrastructure would also need to be carefully assessed.
- The Kibworths SDA: Evidence shows that A6 London Road south of the Ring Road is likely to require further attention and investment to 2031. It is already under significant traffic pressures and proposals for strategic growth on or around south eastern edge of PUA will exacerbate these problems. As a result the options for strategic growth in places such as the Kibworths could be limited unless and until a strategy for addressing issues on the south side of the PUA can be put in place. Further LLITM modelling is needed to assess the impacts on the PUA (applies to both SDAs). Substantial on an off site transport infrastructure would be needed to mitigate impacts so there would need to be certainty that developments remained financially viable.
- The relative paucity of strategic transport infrastructure on the south side of the PUA, especially in terms of orbital highway capacity, could mean that it would be extremely difficult to mitigate any overlapping impacts arising from the 2 potential growth areas set out in this option.

Leicestershire County Council Education has commented on the option as follows:

- Kibworth SDA: support the principle from an education perspective of providing a school, maybe an issue at secondary level.
- Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA: support the principle from an education perspective as the proposal is large enough to provide a new school.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Option 8: Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA

Summary of the Option:

This option would involve two of the proposals for strategic development areas in the District: approximately 1,950 dwellings to the East of Lutterworth; and approximately 1,000 dwellings to the East of Scraftoft / Thurnby. Other settlements would receive limited housing growth.

The proposal for a Lutterworth SDA would deliver approximately 10ha of employment land. Approximately 10ha of employment land would also be delivered in Market Harborough and approximately 3ha of employment land in Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 16 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 8 (Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 16: Summary of responses to Option 8 (Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA and Lutterworth SDA)

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 279 Total representations: 295</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 204• Supporting: 77• Commenting: 14 <p>Of the 9 options presented, this option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fourth highest number of respondents;• Fourth highest number of representations;• Fourth highest number of objections; and• Fifth highest number of supporting comments.

Key issues raised in objections:

There were 21 representations from residents of the Lutterworth area objecting to an SDA to the east of the M1. Concerns over additional traffic, parking and congestion around the town and the exacerbation of the existing pollution issues were raised. The A426 and congestion at the Whittle roundabout was a particular focus. Also mentioned were the potential impacts of new development on school capacity, GP surgeries and other town infrastructure including the town centre. Loss of town character was a worry as was the lack of information relating to planned investment in improvements in infrastructure (e.g. pedestrianisation of the town centre) and the lack of an integrated strategic growth plan for the Lutterworth area (Cotesbach PC). It was pointed out that the area already has a high rate of employment meaning that people buying homes will be travelling out of Lutterworth to work. The potential isolation of the SDA to the east of the motorway was raised along with the limited options for sustainable travel methods in the area. Misterton with Walcote PC strongly objects to potential motorway services facilities.

There were 145 objecting comments from residents of the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby to an SDA in their area. The concerns raised echoed those expressed in responses to options 4 and 7. Many focused on traffic related issues with traffic congestion and speed highlighted with the A47 of particular concern. There was general agreement that the potential link road would not provide benefits to the road network and would create the opportunity for new rat runs through the villages. The lack of capacity of local services and facilities (particularly schools and GP surgeries) was highlighted. Several respondents felt that although the settlements have had a lot of new development in recent years, no improvements to local infrastructure provision have taken place. High levels of current commitments and building in adjacent areas (Keyham Lane, Hamilton and Barkby) also need to be taken into account. Loss of separation, reduced access to the countryside, worsening air pollution and continuing erosion to the character of the villages were also emphasised in comments. There was a general feeling that, although on the edge of the City, the settlements are not a sustainable location for an SDA due to the restricted road network and lack of public transport. Scraftoft and Thurnby & Bushby Parish Councils objected to the option. Stoughton PC expressed opposition fearing the impact on the local road network between A47 and A6.

16 objections were received from residents of Houghton on the Hill with concerns over how development on the scale proposed in the option (at proposed SDA and Houghton on the Hill) would impact on the A47 and the increasing threat of coalescence with Thurnby and Bushby expressed.

In addition to the parish councils mentioned above a further 2 opposed this option.

Other objections, mainly from developers/promoters, included the assertion that the approach is not flexible enough to deal with market variations and relies on a few areas which will take too long to deliver. It was felt that not enough in villages to support services and allow for rural growth and that the approach does not take into account the evidence in relation to available supply of land. There was also concern that

the option makes no provision for development in Kibworth. This is considered unsound given its size, its role in settlement hierarchy and its services and facilities. Similarly no provision is made for Broughton Astley despite its size, service provision and position in the settlement hierarchy.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

Lutterworth Town Council's support for this option is contingent on the provision of an eastern bypass and a new bridge to the north of the town. The Town Council considers this approach enables the safeguarding of the separation area and will provide increased vitality, better services and facilities than development on a piecemeal basis. In addition 9 parish councils and Market Harborough Civic Society express support for this option.

There was support for the option from the landowner/promotor interests of the 2 potential SDA.

Other comments supporting option 8 originated from across a number of settlements most of which are supporting the lower numbers in their settlement or agreeing that this option locates development in the most sustainable locations. The highest number (18) of supporting comments came from the Kibworths. Fewer than 10 supporting representations came from the Lutterworth area.

Key issues raised in comments:

Natural England is concerned about the Lutterworth SDA given its proximity to the Misterton Marshes SSSI. It is likely that large scale residential development in the area would have significant hydrological and other impacts on the SSSI which could damage or destroy the interest features for which it is notified.

Leicestershire County Highway Authority has commented on the option as follows:

- Scraftoft /Thurnby SDA: any proposals for strategic growth here could be limited unless and until a strategy can be put into place to address cumulative traffic issues in the north east of the PUA. The link road might address some local issues but could encourage rat-running of more strategic traffic trying to avoid congestion on the main road network in the north east of the PUA. The viability of this scale of infrastructure would also need to be carefully assessed.
- The Lutterworth SDA: Lutterworth's performance in transport sustainability terms, relative to Market Harborough, the District and also may

other parts of the Housing Market Area (Leicester and Leicestershire), is better regarding total vehicle time and total delay. However, Strategic Transport Assessment evidence suggests off-site impacts (capacity issues on A426 Rugby Road and impacts on M1 J20). Further LLITM modelling work is needed to aid the understanding of potential impacts. There are also concerns over:

- relatively poor walking/cycling links to facilities in Lutterworth and cost of providing improved access;
 - public transport through the site;
 - potential cost of road with new bridge over M1; and
 - cost of mitigating off-site impacts.
- Overall in comparison to with some other options there would appear to be much less risk of traffic impacts from these two areas of growth over-lapping and causing significant strategic problems.

Leicestershire County Council Education have commented on the option as follows:

- Lutterworth SDA: support the principle from an education perspective as scope for growth at Lutterworth and Fleckney.
- Scraftoft/Thurnby SDA: support the principle from an education perspective as the proposal is large enough to provide a new school.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

2 parish councils have made comments on this option. Misterton with Walcote PC supports sufficient housing to trigger the construction of the eastern bypass but is concerned that if Lutterworth is allocated extra housing without bypass that it may be impossible to travel in and out of Lutterworth. Houghton on the Hill PC accepts that the option sees fewer homes in the village but it is concerned that a lot of new homes will be located in an area (Scraftoft/Thurnby) that has already seen or will see considerable development.

Option 9: Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA

Summary of the Option:

This option would involve the implementation of two of the proposals for strategic development areas in the District: approximately 1,950 dwellings to the East of Lutterworth; and approximately 1,200 dwellings at the Kibworths. Other settlements would receive limited housing growth.

Approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered at Lutterworth in conjunction with delivery of the potential Lutterworth SDA. Approximately 5ha of employment land would be delivered at Kibworth in conjunction with one of the potential Kibworth SDAs. A further approximately 10ha of employment land would also be delivered in Market Harborough and approximately 3ha of employment land in Fleckney to balance its potential housing growth. There would also be additional provision for strategic distribution close to Magna Park, the scale of which is yet to be determined.

Table 17 below sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Option 9 (Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA), highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 17: Summary of responses to Option 9 (Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA)

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents: 331 Total representations: 351</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 179• Supporting: 156• Commenting: 16 <p>This option attracted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Second highest number of respondents;• Second highest number of representations;

- Sixth highest number of objecting comments; and
- Next to highest number of supporting comments.

Key issues raised in objections:

The majority of comments (128) objecting to option 9 came from residents of the Kibworths opposing an SDA in the village. Common concerns raised included the lack of infrastructure capacity (particularly schools and GP surgeries), difficult and dangerous access to the A6, traffic congestion within the village itself, increasing noise and pollution levels and lack of shopping facilities/parking in the centre. There was also a feeling that development of an SDA would have an adverse impact on the settlement changing it from an historic village to an unattractive town. Loss of open countryside, agricultural land, wildlife habitat and biodiversity was also raised. Many pointed out the high level of housing development which has taken place over the past few years and the need for the settlement to be allowed time to adjust to this growth. Losing the sense of community was a real concern expressed by many villagers. The viability and the effectiveness of the proposed bypass were questioned by some respondents. Kibworth Beauchamp and Kibworth Harcourt Parish Councils objected to the option, echoing local concerns and the lack of infrastructure capacity assessment and assessment of local need. Nearby Fleckney PC and Burton Overy PC also objected fearing the SDA would change the character and nature of the Kibworths and impact on the countryside.

17 objecting comments were submitted by residents of Lutterworth and surrounding villages in respect of the Lutterworth SDA. Concerns over additional traffic, parking and congestion around the town and the exacerbation of the existing pollution issues were raised. The A426 and congestion at the Whittle roundabout was a particular focus. Also mentioned were the potential impacts of new development on school capacity, GP surgeries and other town infrastructure including the town centre. Loss of town character was a worry as was the lack of information relating to planned investment in improvements in infrastructure (e.g. pedestrianisation of the town centre) and the lack of an integrated strategic growth plan for the Lutterworth area. It was pointed out that the area already has a high rate of employment meaning that people buying homes will be travelling out of Lutterworth to work. The potential isolation of the SDA to the east of the motorway was raised along with the limited options for sustainable travel methods in the area. Misterton with Walcote PC strongly objects to potential motorway services facilities.

Comments from developers/promoters included the assertion that the approach is not flexible enough. Some felt that it is unrealistic and contrary to objectives of sustainable development to focus the vast majority of housing growth in 1 or 2 settlements or within the urban areas only. The approach does not take into account the evidence in relation to available supply of land across the district (including rural areas) and the contribution it could make to affordable housing and investment. Others felt that the option fails to take into account that there is significant scope for future development to be accommodated at the PUA and Market Harborough as the most sustainable locations for development. This is acknowledged in the settlement hierarchy but not reflected in the option. Another commented that the approach is inappropriate as it does

not ensure that each settlement receives a sufficient influx of market and affordable dwellings whilst retaining the character of the larger market towns and rural settlements.

Some respondents felt that the distribution of housing should follow decisions regarding the location of employment provision so as to avoid, as far as is possible, extensive commuting. Others felt that an option of no further development around Magna Park should be considered.

Key issues raised in support:

Lutterworth Town Council, 10 parish councils and Market Harborough Civic Society support this option. Lutterworth Town Council supports the option contingent on the provision of an eastern bypass and new bridge to the north of the town. It considers this approach enables the safeguarding of the area of separation whilst providing increased vitality, and better services and facilities that through a piecemeal approach. Ullesthorpe PC suggested that the Lutterworth SDA could be enlarged to accommodate strategic distribution needs. Whilst supporting the option, Market Harborough Civic Society expressed the view that a Kibworth SDA should only go ahead if necessary due to lack of services and infrastructure.

Developers/promoters of the potential SDAs submitted supporting comments.

Other comments supporting option 9 originated from across a number of settlements most of which were supporting lower numbers in their settlement. The highest number (86) came from the Scraftoft, Thurnby and Bushby which sees no development under this option. The option was also supported by Houghton on the Hill (21 reps) due to its relatively low target for the village.

There were 4 supporting reps from Lutterworth supporting a more comprehensive/strategic approach to development to deliver community benefits rather than a piecemeal approach to development.

Key issues raised in comments:

Natural England has concerns about the Lutterworth SDA given its proximity to the Misterton Marshes SSSI. It is likely that large scale residential development in the area would have significant hydrological and other impacts on the SSSI which could damage or destroy the interest features for which it is notified.

Anglian Water Services Ltd has commented that the development of either SDA at Kibworth is expected to require improvements to the foul sewerage network and sewage treatment works.

Leicestershire County Highway Authority has commented on the option as follows:

- Lutterworth SDA: Lutterworth's performance in transport sustainability terms, relative to Market Harborough, the District and also may other parts of the Housing Market Area, is better regarding total vehicle time and total delay. However, Strategic Transport Assessment evidence suggests off-site impacts (capacity issues on A426 Rugby Road and impacts on M1 J20). Further LLITM modelling work is needed to aid the understanding of potential impacts. It is also concerned over:
 - relatively poor walking/cycling links to facilities in Lutterworth and cost of providing improved access;
 - public transport through the site;
 - potential cost of road with new bridge over M1; and
 - cost of mitigating off-site impacts.
- The Kibworths SDA: Evidence shows that A6 London Road south of the Ring Road is likely to require further attention and investment to 2031. It is already under significant traffic pressures and proposals for strategic growth on or around south eastern edge of PUA will exacerbate these problems. As a result the options for strategic growth in places such as the Kibworths could be limited unless and until a strategy for addressing issues on the south side of the PUA can be put in place. Further LLITM modelling is needed to assess the impacts on the PUA (applies to both SDAs). Substantial on an off site transport infrastructure would be needed to mitigate impacts so there would need to be certainty that developments remained financially viable.
- In comparison to with some other options there would appear to be much less risk of traffic impacts from these two areas of growth overlapping and causing significant strategic problems.

Leicestershire County Council Education has commented as follows:

- Lutterworth SDA: support the principle from an education perspective as scope for growth at Lutterworth and Fleckney.
- Kibworth SDA: support the principle from an education perspective of providing a school, maybe an issue at secondary level.

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council commented that development options in the proximity of the Borough or which would place extra traffic on the A6 will require very careful consideration in the context of the relationship with growth already planned in the Borough to 2026 and development options beyond 2026; additional congestion on the A6 in the Borough and in Leicester City; additional congestion on routes around the A6 (in particular east-west routes, Fosse Park/J21/M1/M69); and impact on countryside and green wedge adjoining Leicester PUA.

Misterton with Walcote PC supports sufficient housing to trigger construction of the eastern bypass but is concerned that, if Lutterworth is allocated extra housing without a bypass, it may be impossible to travel in and out of Lutterworth.

One developer makes the point that development in Kibworth through an SDA does not allow for smaller scale development on the edge of Kibworth which could be more sustainable and deliverable.

Replacement to Limits to Development

As set out in the previous Scoping Consultation (2013), the new Local Plan will replace Limits to Development with a new criteria-based policy to determine planning applications for new housing within and on the edge of settlements. This will replace Limits to Development which were drawn up during the 1990's and adopted in the previous Local Plan (adopted in 2001) and which are now out of date. The criteria-based policy will provide greater flexibility, be more responsive to local circumstances and provide a more positive approach to managing development in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework. A number of the criteria are broad in order to ensure that they can be applied to the full range of types of proposals, sites and settlements across the entire District. Additional supporting text will be provided in the pre-submission new Local Plan to give some guidance to the interpretation and implementation of the criteria.

The proposed draft policy was set out in the Options Paper and Question 4 asked for comments on the draft policy. Table 18 sets out a summary of the consultation feedback.

Table 18: Summary of responses to proposed criteria based policy to replace Limits to Development

Question 4: Do you have any comments on the proposed criteria based policy to replace Limits to Development?
Summary of Consultation Responses
Number of respondents to question 4: 72 Total representations: 77 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 18• Supporting: 24• Commenting: 35
In addition there were 9 representations (1 supporting, 4 objecting and 4 commenting) on the 'Development Management' paragraph introducing the Settlement Development policy. These responses are included in the overall analysis of responses below.

Key issues raised in objections:

The majority of objections to the Settlement Development policy approach came from members of the public. Most of the 15 objections from residents expressed the view that the criteria based policy would not be applied consistently and would be open to interpretation. In their view Limits to Development, which are used by other Councils, provide much welcomed consistency and certainty. Some raised specific issues such as how local support would be gauged under criterion 2, the need to include reference to Neighbourhood Plans in the policy and reference to maximum walking distances to community facilities. Similar objections were raised by 4 Parish Councils.

Market Harborough Civic Society felt that the criteria are too limited to cover the situations that will arise in Market Harborough and other large settlement and would result in too much uncertainty. It expressed the view that either the boundaries need to be defined in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan for MH needs to be prepared. Overlooking, access, parking design and open space were thought to be omissions.

There were objecting comments from the development industry in relation to specific criterion. One felt that the policy should refer to the overall 5 year housing land supply position in order to ensure that overall need is being met, not just targets for individual settlements. Criteria in relation to the form and scale of development were considered to be subjective and difficult to judge and in need of more objectivity. Also pointed out was the fact that it is not always possible to retain natural boundaries; retaining and enhancing the qualities of the landscape is unduly restrictive; and criterion 11 and 12 go beyond what the NPPF requirement in relation to Conservation Areas and heritage assets. Criterion 14 (conformity with all other relevant policies within the Plan) was considered to be unnecessary as the Plan must be read as a whole when considering applications.

Key issues raised in support:

The majority (12) of supporting comments originated from developers/agents. They generally feel this policy would offer a more flexible and sophisticated approach than limits to development which can become out of date. However, many felt that identifying more allocations (down to SRV level) alongside the policy would offer greater certainty and meet requirements. Some felt that terms such as 'scale' needed greater clarity. Another made the point that limits to development have the potential to be confusing as Neighbourhood Plans could propose different limits to the Local Plan; neither is it sensible to delegate to Neighbourhood Plans as this could cause a policy vacuum if Neighbourhood Plans fail to come forward. The proposed approach was felt to be more responsive.

There was some support amongst members of the public with 7 supporting representations. One suggested a criterion relating to maintaining and enhancing rights of way. Another felt that criterion 8 should read 'maintain separation' rather than 'prevents coalescence'.

Natural England supported the policy particularly criteria 6, 7, 9, 11 and 12.

No Parish Councils expressed support for this approach.

Key issues raised in comments:

Many of those making comments expressed qualified support for the policy but felt that either additional or amended criteria were needed. Leicester City Transport Strategy Team considered that reference to the inclusion of safe access for cyclists and cycle ways to access services and facilities was needed and that reference to transport should be higher in the list. Sport England wanted to see protecting and securing replacement sport facilities in the criteria. Another respondent felt that impact air pollution should be mentioned.

Criteria 2 was criticised by some developers as being contrary to the NPPF in so far as it is not positively prepared. It was felt that reference to the requirement should reflect that it is a minimum, not a ceiling, and that the need to demonstrate community support goes beyond the requirements of the NPPF. Suggested alternative word was suggested as follows: *'Helps to meet the identified housing target for the settlement. Where development would result in the number of completions plus outstanding permissions exceeding the identified target, regard will be given to whether any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'*. It was pointed out that reference to community support was unnecessary as valid local objections are already taken into account as material consideration in determining planning applications.

Another developer suggested that adherence to criterion 4 (respects the shape and form of the existing settlement) could preclude development that is acceptable.

Other developers supported the approach providing the Local Plan contains clear allocations. Development meeting all the criteria was felt to be challenging. As regards the level of conformity with the spatial strategy, it was considered that this would be dependent on the Council's ability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. If the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, it may be acceptable for development to be delivered earlier or where there is conflict with other policies in the Local Plan (which seek to restrict the supply of development land).

Defining limits to development for the PUA, Market Harborough, Key and Rural Centres was supported by one agent who suggested that this would allow well planned considered schemes to come forward in larger settlement whilst allowing small development to come forward to meet local needs in accordance with para. 55 of the NPPF. In relation to housing targets, one developer questioned whether it is the intention that any shortfall should be made up within the same settlement, arguing that there could be more sustainable sites elsewhere in the District to make up the shortfall.

Leicestershire County Council (Assets) supported the approach in principle but only alongside allocations. Others supported this argument in so far as the Local Plan needs to offer certainty on its housing supply by providing more allocations even down to Rural Centre and Selected

Rural Village level.

The Highway Authority expressed support providing there are policies elsewhere in the plan to cover more general highway safety matters. If not then criterion 13 would need to be amended to cover the safeguarding of the safe and satisfactory operation of the wider highway network.

Other respondents comment that the approach is too vague and consistent implementation cannot be guaranteed; by replacing certainty with vagueness, the policy approach loses the element of certainty which is fundamental to planning.

4 Parish Councils commented raising concerns over the precise wording of criteria (should say 'maintain separation' and 'maintain the individual character') and the need to refer to conformity with Neighbourhood Plans.

Historic England welcomed reference to heritage assets in the criteria.

D Housing in the Countryside

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper set out 3 Options for an approach to housing in the countryside (development below Selected Rural Villages in the settlement hierarchy). The total development arising from each of these options will be identified as 'windfall' development to be provided over and above the housing numbers set out in each of the 9 Options. The 3 Options for housing in the countryside are:

Option C1 – Strictly controlling development in the countryside

Under Countryside Option C1 housing development in settlements below Selected Rural Villages would be strictly controlled, including settlements with existing limits to development. Option C1 will ensure development is focused to more sustainable settlements, with access to a range of services and facilities, whilst protecting the integrity of the landscape character and settlement pattern of rural villages and the countryside. Option C1 will enable the provision of new services and facilities in rural settlements to improve sustainability. The NPPF states that planning should manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and Option C1 would support this approach.

Option C2 – Limited infill and Development Management led

Option C2 would allow for limited infill development and conversion of existing buildings to residential use in Sub-Selected Rural Villages. Proposals would be required to meet the relevant criteria set out in the proposed Settlement Development policy to replace Limits to Development. This approach would allow limited infill development in the relevant settlements listed above in addition to appropriate development in the countryside set out in Option C1 above. Such a policy would seek to provide additional support for existing services and facilities and would encourage further provision.

Option C3 – Meeting identified needs

Option C3 would allow for the provision of housing in all smaller settlements below Selected Rural Village level where it helps to meet needs which have been identified locally through community involvement. These needs may be identified through either a neighbourhood plan or through a Rural Housing Needs Survey. This approach could occur in conjunction with either Option C1 or Option C2 above. A neighbourhood plan led approach would enable communities to plan for their area, including providing

additional housing development. This additional housing development would be identified to meet local needs, support the long term sustainability of the settlement and may be either infill development or development outside the existing built form, or a combination of both, providing it is adequately justified and consistent with the broad policies of the new Local Plan and the NPPF.

Number of respondents and representations

A total of 106 representations were made on this section as set out in Table 19 below.

Table 19: Number of respondents and representations to Housing in the Countryside Options

Paragraph	Respondents	Representations			
		Support	Object	Comment	Total
Option C1	31	25	7	2	34
Option C2	21	8	7	6	21
Option C3 (with C1)	16	7	7	2	16
Option C3 (with C2)	17	9	7	1	17
TOTAL	85	49	28	11	88

Summary:

Overall there was a high level of support for Option C1 for limiting development in the Countryside. This support for Option C1 was generated from residents and Parish Councils, with developers and agents (and 2 Parish Councils) objecting to Option C1. The level of responses for Options C2 and C3 was very similar, with an almost identical level of representations for supporting and objecting to each Option. Table 20 summarises the representations received against each Option.

Table 20: Summary of Responses to Housing in the Countryside Options

Option C1 – Strictly controlling development in the Countryside
<p>Summary of responses: Overall there was a high level of support for Option C1. This support was solely made up of resident and Parish Council representations, supporting a control of countryside development. Those supporting Option C1 raised the issues of protecting village identity, protecting development boundaries, and protecting green spaces, whilst those objecting to Option C1 proposed that the Option is too prohibitive to development, and may not be compatible with national planning policy.</p> <p>Specific issues raised:</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council commented that bus services are decreasing, and additional growth to countryside settlements will not represent sustainable development.</p> <p>Some agents/developers felt that Option C1 is overly restrictive to development, and not compliant with NPPF para. 28, 54 and 55.</p> <p>Another landowner felt that additional provision should be made for previously development land in the countryside, to allow for residential development / conversion.</p>
Option C2 – Limited infill and Development Management led
<p>Summary of responses: Support for allowing rural settlements to grow, both with infill development and adjacent to boundaries. Policy to support additional service provision is supported and need should be locally evidenced.</p> <p>Specific issues raised</p> <p>One respondent pointed out that Drayton should be removed from the list of sub-SRVs, the village hall has closed.</p>
Option C3 – Meeting locally identified needs
<p>Summary of responses: There was a general split between support and objections to both options within C3 (with C1 or with C2). Support for C3 with C1 was on the basis of limiting development, and allowing neighbourhood plans to propose locally identified need, with support for C3 with C2 allowing for development on a larger scale. Issues were raised regarding settlements that do not wish to undertake a neighbourhood plan, with cost and monitoring/management of neighbourhood plans seen as restrictive, and instead decisions should be made by HDC.</p> <p>Specific issues raised</p> <p>None</p>

E Affordable Housing

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper sets out an approach to affordable housing in the District, with affordable housing delivery a significant pressure.

The proposed approach states that viability assessment work is ongoing to establish a realistic level of affordable housing requirement across all proposed housing sites. This will help to meet affordable housing need whilst ensuring schemes remain viable and deliverable in line with the National Planning Practice Guidance.

The Council will encourage the provision of low cost market housing, together with affordable rent and intermediate housing provision, whilst also supporting the need to provide older persons and retirement housing provision. In addition, neighbourhood plans, based on an identified need, may set targets in excess of those identified in the new Local Plan through local housing needs surveys and may also set parameters for the type and tenure of affordable housing provision to meet local needs.

Number of respondents and representations

A total of 22 representations were made on this section as set out in Table 21.

Table 21: Number of respondents and representations Affordable Housing

Paragraph	Respondents	Representations			
		Support	Object	Comment	Total
Proposed approach	23	6	8	12	26

Summary:

Only comments were invited on the proposed approach to affordable housing provision, as opposed to any support/objection; however representations of support/objections were still made, and equally split. Representations both supported the provision of

the current 40%/30% split across the District, whilst querying the deliverability of 40% affordable housing on both small sites and in SDAs. Several representations were made regarding the Council's lettings process, with support for local identified affordable housing need only, and support was also received for delivery of low cost market housing and starter homes. The following Table 22 summarises the representations received.

Table 22: Summary of responses to affordable housing proposed approach

Affordable housing proposed approach
<p>Summary of responses: A preference was made throughout a range of responses for low cost market housing provision, and for starter home provision. Affordable housing to meet local need was also supported, with additional provision for extra care housing and bungalows. Objections raised to the proposed approach included the need for a clearer and more up to date assessment of viability, and the need to set a higher minimum threshold for sites, of 10 or more dwellings only.</p> <p>Specific issues raised:</p> <p>Local residents and Parish Council felt that affordable housing should meet locally identified need only, with a lettings system in place to allow for provision for residents with local connections.</p> <p>Agents/developers considered that any increase in affordable housing provision, together with maintaining a low threshold of site size, will result in small rural sites becoming unviable.</p> <p>Additional provision should be made for extra care and affordable bungalow provision.</p>

F Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Provision

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper sets out the total district requirements for the provision of Gypsies and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. These are based on the 2013 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The Council currently demonstrates a 0.5yr supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites, and a 3.18yr supply of Travelling Showpeople sites, with net requirements of 70 Gypsy and Traveller pitches to 2031, and 25 Travelling Showpeople plots to 2031.

The new Local Plan will set out a minimum target for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots, as identified in the GTAA. This is recognised as the objectively assessed need for provision within the District. In addition, the provision of transit sites will also be supported.

Previous Calls for Sites for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites have not resulted in any being put forward. However, the Council has received planning applications for additional sites and extensions to existing sites. The new Local Plan will seek to allocate sites and also set out an enabling policy for the development of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites.

The Council is currently undertaking both an updated GTAA together with other Leicestershire planning authorities, and undertaking a Site Identification Study for the District. The results of both studies are expected in summer 2016, with the results forming the basis of both target provision, and any potential site allocations.

Number of respondents and representations

A total of 35 representations were made on this section, split into 4 separate sections, as set out in Table 23.

Table 23: Summary of responses to Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Provision

Paragraph	Respondents	Representations			
		Support	Object	Comment	Total
How many pitches do we	14	0	9	6	15

need to provide?					
How many plots do we need to provide?	4	1	3	0	4
How will future need be met?	9	0	1	8	9
Do you wish to submit any potential sites?	8	0	0	8	8
Total	35	1	13	22	35

Summary:

No support was received for additional provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches, with only 1 representation of support for provision of additional Travelling Showpeople plots. The majority of representations were made in relation to provision of pitches/plots in the Lutterworth/Ullesthorpe area of the District, with representations wishing to see the existing sites either capped or reduced in size, and instead provision sought elsewhere in the District. Other proposals included increasing existing sites to meet future needs where these are already established, and that further updated evidence is required. In addition, Leics County Council proposes a target of 20% social rent provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites. Table 24 summarises the representations received against each of the paragraphs.

Table 24: Summary of Responses to Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision

Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision
Summary of responses: A preference for no further provision was clear through all comments along with a cap on the existing sites in Lutterworth / Ullesthorpe.

Specific issues raised:

Need to use up to date evidence, and increase social provision, aiming for 20% target.

Need to have restrictions to any temporary permissions to ensure inappropriate sites are not made permanent.

Current provision is concentrated around Lutterworth and Ullesthorpe.

G Employment

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper sets out why the new Local Plan needs to provide additional land for employment uses. Planning positively for the sustainable development of homes and the development needs of business is one of the core planning principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Supporting businesses to enable them to grow and increase skills and training is a Council Priority.

The Council must plan for new jobs and employment land to meet the needs of the District and to support the wider sub-regional economy. In Section 9, the Options Paper sets out the scale of employment land required to 2031 based the most up to date evidence available. It also sets out how the need for new jobs and employment land will be delivered over the plan period. Table 25 sets out a summary of the issues raised in response to establishing how much employment land is needed and how this need will be met.

Table 25: Summary of responses to establishing and meeting employment need paragraphs

Why do we need to provide land for more jobs? How much land do we need to provide? How will provision for new jobs and employment land be met?
Number of respondents: 17 Total representations: 27 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 4• Supporting: 1• Commenting: 22
Key issues raised in objections: <p>There was an objection to providing for more jobs based on the fact that the District has low employment and providing more jobs will encourage in commuting bringing traffic and pollution. Another felt that rather than providing land for large international companies it is preferable to support and provide for SMEs.</p>

Another respondent considered that the new evidence on the apparent need for more distribution space is so out of line with previous evidence that its validity is questioned and that, if more space is required, it should be spread across the district, not concentrated.

Key issues raised in support:

One respondent emphasised the need for employment land and questioned why housing is allowed on land previously in employment use.

Key issues raised in comments:

Developers highlighted that there is no option aimed at reducing the level of out-commuting despite draft objective 2; no mention of the 4 Local Enterprise Partnerships which have logistics as a priority in their Strategic Economic Plans; and that the Employment Land Study is out of date and should be updated to ensure jobs target is appropriate. The Employment Land Study was also criticised as it does not present a policy-led scenario to reduce levels of out-commuting and under-estimates the logistics sector forecast needs.

Whilst one respondent felt that reliance on jobs in distribution is a mistake as it requires large areas of land but provides low skilled jobs, another saw that such development offers some economic benefits. The importance of reliable need evidence was referred to.

Leicestershire County Council expressed support for additional employment growth in Lutterworth as it is situated in the SW Leicestershire Priority Growth Area as defined in the Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Economic Plan 2014-20. It also felt that the suggested oversupply of B1a/b shouldn't prevent new B1 developments coming forward where they represent sustainable development.

One developer felt that there should be more detail on the Council's Open for Business prospectus, and reference to the role of Magna Park. It was also felt that there was an underlying, and unjustified, assumption that strategic distribution is unlikely to be 'sustainable'.

Another respondent referred to the need to improve road communications and that modern business requires good broadband links which much of the District currently lacks. The need for improved transportation of goods traffic with a rail terminal at Magna Park was considered an essential element of providing more jobs.

Lubenham PC felt that farm buildings should be utilised for employment before allocating more land; that the take up of under utilised office space should be encouraged to alleviate the need to travel; and that allocated employment sites should have sufficient parking or public/private bus services to alleviate parking problems.

Again the need to avoid using employment sites for housing was raised. There needs to be a good mix of both housing and employment in all areas.

Retaining and protecting existing employment sites

The new Local Plan will set out a strategy to affirm the District's 'Open for Business' prospectus. It will seek to provide a choice of attractive and viable employment sites, particularly industrial sites, across the District. An important element of this is retaining and protecting the most important existing employment areas for ongoing employment use where they are 'fit for purpose', and relinquishing them where not. The list of existing employment sites proposed to be retained and protected through policy is set out at Appendix F of the Options Paper. Peaker Park and other more recently completed employment sites will be assessed and considered for inclusion. Question 7 of the consultation invited comments on the list of sites to be retained and protected and Table 26 summarises the responses.

Table 26: Summary of responses to existing employment sites proposed to be retained and protected through policy

Q7. Do you have any comments on the list of existing employment sites proposed to be retained and protected through policy (set out at Appendix F of Options Consultation Paper)?

Number of respondents: 8

Total representations: 8

- **Objecting: 1**
- **Supporting: 4**
- **Commenting: 3**

Key issues raised in objections:

None

Key issues raised in support:

The County Council expressed support for the retention of existing employment allocations, in particular Airfield Farm Business Park (MH), subject to individual sites remaining economically viable / meeting needs without creating conflict with adjoining uses. There was also developer support.

Support for the protection and expansion of Magna Park (Phases 1 & 2) and Churchill Way (Fleckney) was also expressed by developer/agent interests.

Key issues raised in comments:

Cotesbach PC called for clarity in relation to a proposed employment site at Shawell.

One agent felt that Arkwright Hill Farm Industrial Estate (Cosby), an existing employment site of 7.76 ha, should be included in Appendix F due to the under-supply of B1,B2 and B8 floor-space.

In view of an oversupply of office space it was suggested that the balance of the allocation at Compass Point Business Park (MH) should be reviewed and a further phase of land released for housing.

There was concern about extensive development of Magna Park without developing the road system, especially the A5.

Where will new land for employment be provided?

The Options paper at Appendix H set out how new employment land is proposed to be distributed across the District under the 9 options. Table 27 summarises the comments received in relation to the proposed distribution options.

Table 27: Summary of responses to proposed distribution of employment land

<p>Where will new land for employment be provided? Continuing Current Distribution of Development (Options 1 – 3) Options involving delivery of 1 or 2 Strategic Development Areas (Options 4 – 9)</p>
<p>Number of respondents: 9 Total representations: 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objecting: 2 • Supporting: 1 • Commenting: 6
<p>Key issues raised in objections:</p> <p>One respondent questioned the need and/or the demand for additional employment land at Kibworth.</p> <p>A site-specific policy for the site with planning permission for a crematorium at Great Glen is sought by the landowner.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in support:</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in comments:</p> <p>Anglian Water has indicated that 10ha of employment land at Market Harborough and 5ha at Kibworth may require additional sewerage treatment enhancements and potentially improvements to the foul sewerage network (subject to site location).</p> <p>Historic England emphasised that the impacts of potential employment development on heritage assets should be assessed.</p> <p>Leicestershire County Council stated that, in principle, it has no objection to further employment provision in Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Fleckney particularly where it is likely to bring about a better balance between jobs and housing. Potential general employment site allocations need to be reflected in transport modelling work. It also supported the general principle of mixed use development (through SDAs), given the potential to reduce the number of car borne trips generated by the development on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>Whilst the strength of the evidence for employment land requirements was questioned, others felt that housing should follow employment to avoid extensive commuting and improve sustainability.</p>

Potential general employment site allocations

All general employment (non strategic distribution) land needs to 2031 are expected to be provided for through the allocation of sites in either the new Local Plan or in neighbourhood plans. This is to assist in bringing the sites forward and to safeguard them for employment use. Work on assessing the sustainability of sites is still ongoing; however, it is likely that most of the potential general employment sites submitted to the Council (apart from in relation to strategic distribution) will need to be allocated to meet the employment land requirements.

A pool of potential employment sites is set out in the Options Paper at Appendix G and comments were invited on the sites. A summary of the responses received is set out in Table 28.

Table 28: Summary of responses to potential employment site allocations.

Potential general employment site allocations
Number of respondents: 7 Total representations: 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 1• Supporting: 2• Commenting: 5
Key issues raised in objections: Concern was raised about the potential impact of further industrial and manufacturing jobs on the local road network. There was one objection to development of site E/001LT/11 (Land south of Lutterworth Road/Coventry Road, Lutterworth), such development would set a precedent which would be exploited by major commercial / logistics developers in the future.
Key issues raised in support: Both supporting comments came from landowners promoting their respective sites (land south of Lutterworth Road / Coventry Road,

Lutterworth E/001LT/11 and land adjacent to M1/south of Lutterworth Road, Lutterworth E/005LT/11.

Key issues raised in comments:

The Highway Authority has indicated that; 'Land at Airfield Farm' should be served from the road infrastructure for the existing Airfield Farm Business Park; access to site 'land adjacent to M1/South of Lutterworth Road' could be challenging given existing junctions. The traffic impacts of the Lutterworth sites (E005LT/11 and E/001LT/11) could overlap with any other 'general employment allocations' at Lutterworth and any Lutterworth SDA options.

One respondent questioned the strength of the employment land need evidence. Another felt that the argument for another 10ha of employment land at Market Harborough is not presented and that future employment development should achieve much higher aesthetic standards.

Site Specific Employment Areas

The New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper set out the proposed approach to Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground and Leicester Airport (Stoughton) in order to positively manage their development within the plan period to 2031. The following section summarises the responses received.

Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground

It is proposed that the new Local Plan will contain a new site allocation policy to manage positively future development at Bruntingthorpe, while protecting local communities from adverse noise and traffic generation. There are no development or policy options at this stage but as part of the ongoing preparation of the new Local Plan for the District, officers of the Council will continue to work with the site owners and representatives of the local community to develop an appropriate local planning policy for inclusion in the Plan. Question 9 of the Options consultation invited comments on the proposed approach and Table 29 summarises the responses received.

Table 29: Summary of responses to Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground proposed approach

Question 9: Do you have any comments regarding the proposed policy approach for Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground
Number of respondents: 15 Total representations: 16 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: N/A• Supporting: 2• Commenting: 14
Key issues raised: <p>There were various comments, mostly referring to the impact of the Proving Ground on local communities. The need to maintain the safe and effective use of the highway network was raised particularly by the Highway Authority. One comment referred to the site as a nuisance and suggested it be allocated for housing. Another said it should be developed for manufacturing rather than storage. In general the point was made that the Local Plan must help manage future development and ensure present activities are controlled. Some respondents said the area is underused brownfield land with potential for mixed development, so long as the traffic infrastructure is improved. There was general support for such a policy in the Local Plan.</p>

Leicester Airport, Stoughton

It is proposed that the new Local Plan will contain a new site allocation policy to manage positively future development at Leicester Airport and protect local communities from adverse noise, light pollution and traffic generation. There are no development or policy options at this stage but as part of the ongoing preparation of the Local Plan for the District, officers of the Council will work with the site owner and representatives of the local community to develop an appropriate local planning policy for inclusion in the Plan. Question 10 of the Options consultation invited comments on the proposed approach and Table 30 summarises the responses received.

Table 30: Summary of responses to Leicester Airport proposed approach

Question 10: Do you have any comments regarding the proposed policy approach for Leicester Airfield
<p>Number of respondents: 14 Total representations: 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 1• Supporting: 6• Commenting: 7
<p>Key issues raised:</p> <p>There were mixed responses to the principal of a policy which supports additional development at the Airfield. Leicester Airport supports the proposal for a site specific policy which enables additional limited business development. Other representors note that the level of development will be restricted by the access which is from rural roads. Stoughton Parish Council is opposed to further development owing to traffic risk, and note the noise issue from the Go Kart circuit. Leicestershire CC as Highway Authority would wish to see any site allocation policy address the issue of increased use of the Airport and the mitigation measures needed to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the local road network.</p>

H Green Infrastructure

This section set out the options in relation to the preventing the coalescence of settlements (Question 11) and invited comments on the list of proposed Local Green Space designations (Question 12).

Preventing the coalescence of settlements: Summary of options:

2 suggested policy options were put forward to prevent settlement coalescence while at the same time allowing for sustainable development which does not unduly impact on the separation of settlements. The options presented were as follows:

- **Option G1: Defining Areas of Separation.** Areas of Separation would be defined in areas where the potential risk of settlements merging together is at its greatest. Within these defined areas planning proposals would be assessed on whether they would result in an unacceptable reduction in the physical and visual separation of settlements. Applicants putting forward proposals in these defined areas would need to show they have considered the effect on coalescence and are applying mitigation. The policy would allow for development which does not impact unduly on the separation between settlements; and
- **Option G2: Using a criteria to prevent coalescence across the District, not just specific Areas of Separation.** A specific criterion will be included in the Settlement Development policy which ensures that development on a particular site does not lead to settlements merging or does not undermine the physical and visual separation of settlements. This would be one of a number of criteria aimed at protecting the character of individual settlements. Specific Areas of Separation would not be defined in the new Local Plan under this policy option.

Table 31 sets out a summary of the consultation responses received to Options G1 and G2, highlighting the key issues raised in objection and support of the option.

Table 31: Summary of responses to prevention the coalescence of settlements options

Question 11: Which is your preferred option to prevent the coalescence of settlements? Options G1 and G2	
Options Subtitle:	Defining Areas of Separation
Description:	Option G1: Defining specific Areas of Separation Option G2: Using a criteria to prevent coalescence across the District, not just specific Areas of Separation
Options G1 and G2	
<p>Number of respondents to option G1: 36 Total representations: 37</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objecting: 2 • Supporting: 32 • Commenting: 3 <p>Number of respondents to option G2: 26 Total representations: 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objecting: 12 • Supporting: 14 • Commenting: 0 <p>In addition there were a further 21 representations commenting on aspects of the prevention of coalescence section of the Options Consultation Paper.</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in objections:</p> <p>Only 2 objecting comments were received to option G1 (defining Areas of Separation). One considered the approach to be contrary to the NPPF and therefore unjustified. The other considered that such a policy would leave the door open to development.</p> <p>Option G2 (criteria to prevent coalescence) received a much higher level of objection the G1. There was a feeling that the G2 approach would be very subjective and open to exploitation from developers. Some expressed the view that such an approach would be too generic.</p>	

Key issues raised in support:

Option G1 received a relatively high level of support compared to option G2 (32 supporting representations compared with 14). The continued identification of specific Areas of Separation, with an accompanying policy allowing for development which does not impact unduly on the separation between settlements, was considered by some developers/agents to be more flexible and sophisticated than the G2 approach. Some local respondents felt that this approach is logical and more easily understood. It was felt that a broader, undefined policy would dilute this protection. Thurnby and Bushby PC supported keeping Areas of Separation and expressed concern over the erosion of the existing S/T/B Area of Separation.

In supporting this option (G2), many respondents expressed the need for new or extended Areas of Separation. These included:

- A new area between Kibworth Beauchamp and Smeeton Westerby (Kibworth Harcourt PC);
- An extension of the existing area between Lutterworth and Bitteswell;
- A new area between Magna Park and Ullesthorpe;
- A new area between Cotesbach and Magna Park (Cotesbach PC); and
- Enhanced separation between villages and Magna Park (Claybrooke Parva PC).

Comments in support of option G2 included the view that it allows for development proposals to be considered on their own merits, on a case-by-case basis. The view was expressed that this approach is best unless a robust way of defining Areas of Separation can be found.

A couple of respondents supported an approach incorporating both approaches.

Key issues raised in comments:

The point was raised that the policy approach needs to reflect that it is not only maintaining separation between settlement but also industrial/commercial sites.

Sport England commented that separation area could provide opportunities for sport.

Overall there was recognition that the rural character around villages needs to be protected.

Local Green Space: Summary of Approach

Included in the New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper at Appendix J was a list of proposed Local Green Spaces which the Council intends to designate through the Local Plan. The rationale for their designation was also provided as a background document. A summary of the responses to Question 12 (Do you have any comments on the list of proposed Local Green Space (Appendix J)?) is set out in Table 32 below.

Table 32: Summary of responses to proposed Local Green Space designations

Options Consultation Responses
<p>Number of respondents 31 Total representations: 32</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 9• Supporting: 8• Commenting: 15
<p>The key issues raised in objections were either the designation of a site that was felt to be incorrect, or the lack of designation of sites that the respondent felt should have been included.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in support:</p> <p>All supporting respondents agreed with the general principle, including Natural England. Supporters also highlighted additional sites.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in comments:</p> <p>In the comments the issue of lack of designation of identified site (5 reps), or corrections to details of sites (2 reps) was raised.</p> <p>Three sites were objected to as not suitable and an appeal hearing was referenced.</p> <p>The issue of public access to private land was highlighted (2 reps).</p> <p>Alternative types of site for designation were suggested (1 rep).</p>

I Town Centres and Retail

Summary of approach

The suggested approach to Town Centres and Retailing as set out in the New Local Plan Options Consultation Paper is to focus most new shopping development at Market Harborough, while continuing to support limited growth in other towns and village centres. New Local Plan policy relating to town centres will be based on a clear understanding of the new retail floorspace needs, the allocation of sites to meet those needs, the definition of an appropriate town centre and primary shopping area for Market Harborough, the definition of shopping and business areas for the other centres to ensure new development is located in the most appropriate locations and the setting of locally specific thresholds for the requirement of impact assessments.

Included in the New Local Plan Options Consultation were 2 specific questions relating to town centres and retail and these are dealt with in turn below (Tables 33 and 34). Table 35 sets out comments made to the overall approach to town centres and retailing.

Where should retail and town centre needs be met? (Question 13: Do you have any comments on the potential retail sites?)

The NPPF makes it clear that the Council should understand the scale of new retail floorspace needed over the plan period and allocate a suitable range of sites to meet this need. Vacant shop units may be able to contribute to this need but only to a limited extent, as the Harborough Retail Study 2013 showed that vacancy rates were lower than the national average. Therefore the new Local Plan will need to allocate land for town centre uses and retail needs to 2031. A number of potential retail sites have been identified through the Retail Study 2013 and through local knowledge. These are mainly in Market Harborough. A recent Call for Sites for development failed to attract any retail or other town centre use submissions. The potential sites are identified in Appendix K of the Options Consultation Paper. The deliverability and viability of the sites has not yet been assessed. Where these involve development of existing surface level car parks it is expected that in any redevelopment there will be replacement car parking provision either on site or elsewhere in the town centre. Table 33 below summarises the responses to Question 13.

Table 33: Summary of responses to potential retail sites

Question 13: Do you have any comments on the potential retail sites?
<p>Number of respondents 13 Total representations: 13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 3• Supporting: 1• Commenting: 9• <p>Also incorporates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 objections on 'How much retail floorspace is needed to 2031' and 2 comments on 'Where should retail and town centre needs be met?'•
<p>Key issues raised in objections:</p> <p>Several respondents felt that not enough retail sites/floorspace is identified for Lutterworth. Potential retail sites and floorspace requirements need to reflect where new housing is to be located. Therefore there should be more for Lutterworth.</p> <p>Market Harborough Civic Society felt that any change to Commons and Springfield Street car parks would spoil town centre and add to traffic congestion. Multi level shopping/car parking would not be appropriate and would be at odds with Conservation Area.</p> <p>Another respondent felt that by allowing large out of town shopping facilities damages independent retailers in town centre.</p> <p>One respondent felt that the supermarkets are concentrated at one end of town leading to congestion. Development of retail site at Clarence St would exacerbate this.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in support: None identified.</p>

Key issues raised in comments:

Leics. County Council (Archaeology) highlighted that the sites are within historic core of Market Harborough and Lutterworth. Therefore development would have to have regard to impact on historic environment and archaeological remains.

Several respondents were concerned over the potential loss of parking in Market Harborough and the need to include car parking/traffic management in any new development. Retention and provision of car parking and accommodating retail needs within/close to town centres is the key to maintaining vitality.

Adequate parking in Lutterworth was also raised as an issue given that many travel into the town from villages by car due to poor public transport.

Inadequate provision for Lutterworth, given potential levels of development, was raised again. It was felt that site selection should wait for decisions on the scale and location of new homes and jobs. Changing markets would suggest caution.

Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundaries (Question 14: Do you have any comments on the suggested Town Centre or Primary Shopping Area boundary for Market Harborough)

The definition of town centre and principal shopping area boundaries helps in ensuring that retail and other town centre uses are located in the most appropriate locations. The Council is keen to strengthen the 'town centre first' principle to the location of retail and town centre uses, meaning that wherever possible new development should be located in or as close to the town centre as possible.

In order to ensure that retail development and other town centre uses are directed to the most appropriate areas of Market Harborough, the intention is to define both a town centre and a primary shopping area for the town in the new Local Plan. The primary shopping area will serve as the preferred location for retail development and the town centre boundary will be the preferred location for other main town centre uses such as leisure and offices. Question 14 invited comments on these proposed designations

boundaries which will help in the application of the sequential test (the aim of which is to identify whether there are preferable sites in primary shopping areas or town centres for the development proposed). Table 34 below sets out a summary of the responses received to Question 14.

Table 34: Summary of responses to the proposed Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries for Market Harborough

Question 14: Do you have any comments on the suggested town centre or primary shopping area boundaries?
<p>Number of respondents: 7 Total representations: 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objecting: 3 • Supporting: 1 • Commenting: 3
<p>Key issues raised in objections:</p> <p>A commitment to improved Lutterworth town centre planning needed if SDA is approved.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in support:</p> <p>The MH Civic Society supported the proposed MH town centre shopping boundary.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in comments:</p> <p>Leics. County Council (Archaeology) highlighted that any development within historic core of MH and Lutterworth should have to have regard to impact on historic environment and archaeological remains.</p> <p>Historic England emphasised that policies for town centres can assist in delivering a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment and felt that the Council should consider detailed issues such as shop fronts and use of upper floors.</p>

Table 35: Summary of responses to new Local Plan approach to town centres and retailing

Proposed new Local Plan policy approach to town centres and retailing
<p>Number of respondents: 5 Total representations: 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 0• Supporting: 3• Commenting: 2
<p>Key issues raised in support:</p> <p>One respondent expressed support providing but felt that the Council should consider eliminating car parking charges and provide new and improved car parks along with a relief road to encircle the town. Another felt that the congested High Street is already threatening attractiveness of MH. Focus should be on improving shopping experience (independent shops). An even lower threshold for out of town development (retail impact assessments) would be better.</p> <p>County Highway Authority generally supported the principles of the suggested approach.</p>
<p>Key issues raised in comments</p> <p>Lubenham PC felt that rural communities outside MH may wish to accommodate retail facilities for food and community shops and that any policy should incorporate this.</p>

J Infrastructure Planning

Section 12 of the New Local Plan Options Consultation acknowledged that infrastructure planning is an essential part of the Local Plan process. The new Local Plan will contain an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to identify future infrastructure needs for the District and detail where possible the costs, means of funding and timetable of infrastructure provision. This IDP is currently being prepared and will help to ensure that any infrastructure needs arising from new development are met. This might be either through providing new infrastructure (such as new schools) or by increasing the capacity of existing infrastructure (such as by providing an extra classroom at an existing school). The emerging IDP will form an important element of the new Local Plan at both pre-submission and submission stages of the preparation of the plan. Comments on the IDP will be invited at the pre-submission consultation stage. In its final form, the IDP will ensure that infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion, whilst ensuring that its requirements will not prejudice the viability of the planned development.

The Options Consultation Paper highlighted the process for involving service and utility providers in the development of the New Local Plan. Comments were invited on the approach to infrastructure planning. A breakdown of comments received is set out in Table 36.

Table 36: Summary of responses to the Infrastructure Planning section

Infrastructure Planning (no Options were consulted upon)
Number of respondents: 14 Total representations: 14 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objecting: 0• Supporting: 5• Commenting: 9
Key issues raised in support: Supporting responses welcomed the proposal to include a policy on infrastructure planning. Suggestions for types of infrastructure to be

covered by such a policy were: education, healthcare, police, highways, broadband with fibre optics and green infrastructure (suggested by Natural England).

One response mentioned the timing of infrastructure provision, suggesting it should come before new development starts, not upon completion.

Key issues raised in comments:

The following suggestions were made for further infrastructure-related policies:

- a policy on telecommunications development (Mobile Operators Association)
- a site specific policy on the crematorium site at Great Glen (Co-operative Group)
- a specific policy, which requires applicants to:
 - demonstrate that there is capacity or capacity can be made within the foul sewerage network to accommodate the proposed development and;
 - use of SuDs is required unless it can be demonstrated by applicant that this is not feasible (Anglian Water Services)

Sport England reminded us that NPPF para 73 requires LAs to undertake an assessment of sport and recreation needs.

Two respondents (including Cotesbach PC) reiterated the need for any potential SDA at Lutterworth East to be well-integrated with Lutterworth and the need for better retail, leisure, recreational amenities, public space, roads and air quality improvements.

A developer commented on viability, making the point that infrastructure and affordable housing requirements must be assessed to ensure that requirements do not threaten the economic viability of development.

K Settlement Sections

Section 13 of the New local Plan Options Consultation Paper provides an explanation of the implications of the 9 alternative growth Options on individual settlements. The amount of housing proposed for the settlement under each of 9 options is compared. Then the potential benefits and issues that may result from the Options at the settlement level are outlined.

The main issues arising from responses to this section are summarised in Table 37.

Table 37: Summary responses to Settlement Sections

<p>Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby 2 representations (2 objecting)</p>
<p>Development should be spread across the District with each settlement taking its share. This will destroy what identify is left. Road network incapable of taking pressure of another 1000 households and local infrastructure does not have the capacity to cope. It will reduce access to countryside.</p>
<p>Market Harborough 7 representations (3 objecting, 1 supporting, 3 commenting)</p>
<p>No more development to west of Farndon Fields as roads are inadequate and housing sites on edge of MH should be decided in conjunction with relevant PCs and through NPs where relevant. No more employment development at Airfield Farm until current highways issues addressed. Close to a school and a weight restricted road (Lubenham PC)</p>
<p>Lutterworth 1 representation (1 commenting)</p>
<p>Should seek to encourage limited highly technical companies to provide good employment attracting more graduates and highly qualified engineers. This area does not need to become the low paid, low skilled capital of the region.</p>
<p>Broughton Astley 1 representation (1 objecting)</p>
<p>Developer objection to no further housing numbers being provided in the New Local Plan for Broughton Astley. It is considered that land could be identified for safeguarding for future development in the New Local Plan post 2031. By safeguarding land for future development, the New Local Plan would be planning positively in accordance with the NPPF.</p>

Billesdon 5 representations (2 supporting, 1 objecting, 2 commenting)
Ongoing changes to service functions need to be taken into account (e.g. Billesdon has lost its garage and is likely to lose its post office and fire station in near future). Services in village cannot cope with more development than set out in neighbourhood Plan. Developer view that village has been overlooked re: housing numbers in options. Whilst figure of 59 in Option 1 is welcomed other option numbers should be increased to sustain permitted development and existing facilities.
Fleckney 2 representations (1 supporting, 1 commenting)
Developer support for upper end of growth of village supported along with allocation of land at Arnesby Road.
Great Glen 1 representation (1 commenting)
Developer of view that Great Glen could accommodate Option 1 (166 dwgs) figure given its service provision and land availability. It would expand services, invest in local infrastructure and increase supply of both market and affordable homes.
Houghton on the Hill 3 representations (1 objecting, 2 commenting)
Developer of the view that the lack of completions and commitments in Houghton on the Hill over the past five years is particularly concerning when you consider its relatively high house prices and lack of affordable housing. The village also has a sufficient level of services to accommodate further housing growth and should therefore be making notable contribution to the Council's five year housing land supply shortfall. Too many houses proposed. It will damage village community character. Only small developments should be allowed. Development must be in line with developing NP.
Husbands Bosworth 1 representation (1 commenting)

Leics. County Council state that the level of housing could be affected by the primary school's capacity and the fact that it is constrained in terms of expansion. The Local Plan should reflect the potential for the County Council's site at Welford Road to be developed in part for a new school, with the remainder of the site and the existing school site to be developed for housing.

The Kibworths

4 representations (1 supporting, 1 objecting, 2 commenting)

Objection due to lack of infrastructure capacity.

Developer acknowledges positive summary for the Kibworths at 218 and supports additional growth. However, ruling out additional housing in options 3, 4, 6 and 8 is considered contrary to aims of vision and settlement hierarchy. Option 1 figure should be considered a minimum level.

Ullesthorpe

7 representations (1 supporting, 2 objecting, 4 commenting)

The level of housing proposed even under Option 1 (54 dwellings) would not be harmful to the settlement and has the potential to improve existing services and facilities and support and enhance local shops and services (LCC).

Stricter control is needed given current commitments and pressure of services. Impact on landscape/conservation area would be permanently negative. House building should be more fairly and evenly distributed, including 'affordable housing'. Planning should encourage all villages to build a percentage to be decided, encouraging them to remain or become more vibrant and living villages.

Selected Rural Villages

19 representations (6 supporting, 5 objecting, 8 commenting)

Professional and comprehensive housing needs survey for rural areas is needed.

Developer view that Stoughton should be an SRV as opportunities for infill/extensions.

If objective 7 to be met development in SRVs should be strictly controlled, meeting only local housing needs.

Developer view that Great Bowden should be Rural Centre and more housing allocated to it. 171 home seekers have put GB as one of their areas of preference. Local view that it is critical that GB stays as an SRV and not subsumed into MH.

No account taken of provision of services nearby – improved public transport links could improve access to these.

Support for Great Easton as an SRV (plus standard responses from 113 respondents).

Developer commented that the range of growth options for each of the Selected Rural Villages is welcomed and contributes to ensuring that LP "should make clear what is intended to happen in the area over the life of the plan, where and when this will occur and how it will be delivered".

Development seems developer driven preferences (large houses) and does little to address housing shortage.

Claybrooke Magna does not meet criteria for SRV.

5 Next Steps

This report will be used, together with other technical evidence, to inform the selection of options to take forward into the draft Local Plan. It is anticipated that this draft Local Plan will be available for consultation in late 2016.

Please note that at this stage, the Options Consultation Report does not include a summary of the strategic distribution (large warehousing) options. This will follow, together with the results of the recent consultation on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal of strategic distribution options.