## REPORT TO THE LOCAL PLAN EXECUTIVE ADVISORY PANEL MEETING OF 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016

# Meeting:Local Plan Executive Advisory PanelDate:19th September 2016Subject:Assessment of Selected Spatial Options

### ERRATA ADDENDUM

Since the publication of the above report, some mathematical errors have been identified in the Table 2. This has resulted in some of the written analysis needing to be amended, but does not result in any changes to the overall conclusions of the assessment or to the recommendations. The amended words are in *italics*.

	Option 2: Core Strategy	Option 4 (variation): Scraptoft N	Option 5: Kibworth North & East	Option 6: East of Lutterworth
Category of	Average	Average	Average	Average
factors	ranking	ranking	ranking	ranking
Transport	2.50	2.83	2.50	2.17
Deliverability	2.64	2.43	<del>2.43</del> 2.36	<del>2.50</del> -2.57
Environmental	<del>3.70</del> -3.60	1.80	2.20	<del>2.30</del> -2.40
Socio-	<del>2.89</del> 2.40	<del>2.61</del> 3.20	<del>2.48</del> 2.60	<del>2.02</del> 1.80
Economic				
Planning	2.86	2.00	2.79	2.36
Principles				
Total	<del>14.59</del> -14.00	<del>11.74</del> 12.26	<del>12.36</del> 12.44	<del>11.31</del> 11.58

#### Option 2: CoreStrategy

- 4.11 In terms of **deliverability** Option 2 is marginally better worse than the others.....
- 4.14 In terms of **socio-economic** matters, the option is worse than the others Option 6 but marginally better than Option 5 and significantly better than Option 4....

Option 4: Scraptoft North

- 4.17 The option is on a par with *marginally worse than* Option 5 (Kibworth) and <del>marginally</del> better than Option 6 (Lutterworth) in terms of **deliverability**....
- 4.21 In **socio-economic** terms Option 4 is better worse than Options 2, but slightly worse than and Option 5 (Kibworth) and significantly worse than Option 6 (Lutterworth)....

Option 5: Kibworth North and East

- 4.24 This option is on a par with Option 4 in performings marginally best in relation to **deliverability**.....
- 4.28 With regard to **socio-economic** factors, the option performs <del>second only to</del> worse *than* Option 6 (Lutterworth), *marginally worse than* Option 2 and <del>slightly</del> *significantly* better than Option 4 (Scraptoft North).

#### Meeting Harborough's Needs

4.39 The analysis in Appendix A and as summarised in paragraphs 4.10 – 4.36 above indicates that Options 4 and 6 offer the best way forward, while Options 5 is *slightly and Option* 2 and 5 are *is* significantly worse. Option 6 performs best, but is only slightly better than Options 4 and 5.