

## **Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031**

### **Examination**

#### **Hearings commencing 2 October 2018 10.00am v3**

#### **Inspector's Note accompanying the Hearings Agenda**

This is the agenda for the full set of Hearings. It may be subject to adjustment.

I have considered the submitted evidence and the plan representations and would like to thank those who have submitted statements in response to my Matters and Issues.

The Hearings will generally focus on a narrower range of subjects than those covered by the Matters and Issues, and will only cover issues about which I require further information. I have not included items in the hearings where I already have enough information.

The Council have indicated that there are a number of policies that they wish to modify in response to my earlier questions. These will be subject to written exchange and generally do not need to be discussed at the Hearings.

Jonathan Bore  
INSPECTOR

01 October 2018

## **Harborough Local Plan Examination**

**Hearings commencing 2 October 2018 10.00am**

### **AGENDA**

#### **Tuesday 2 October**

#### **Opening and appearances**

##### **1. The objectively assessed need for housing.** (Matter 1)

1.1 Are the OAN calculations soundly based?

1.2 Is the affordability uplift of 15% appropriate?

1.3 Does the OAN figure take sufficient account of affordable housing need in Harborough District? What level of affordable housing can realistically be achieved on housing sites?

#### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Define for Bloor Homes  
GVA for Jelson  
Home Builders Federation  
Savills for Taylor Wimpey

##### **2. The housing requirement**

2.1 When is the figure for Leicester's unmet housing need likely to be quantified and apportioned?

2.2 Is it possible to make a soundly based allowance for unmet need based on what is known now?

2.3 Is there enough headroom above OAN in the available supply to accommodate both an element of unmet need and an allowance to ensure that the plan is robust against any slippage from the SDAs?

2.4 Can the 25dpa relating to Magna Park be considered a partial allowance for unmet need?

2.5 Should reserve sites be identified?

2.6 What triggers might be inserted in the plan to bring about a review to deal with unmet need when it is quantified? How might such a policy be worded?

### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Bidwells for Davidsons Developments  
Bruton Knowles for the Trustees of the Bowden Settlement  
Define for Bloor Homes  
Gladman  
GVA for Jelson  
Home Builders Federation  
Leicester City Council  
Pegasus for William Davis  
PlanitX for Scraftoft & Thurnby & Bushby Parish Councils  
Savills for Taylor Wimpey  
Turley for Catesby Estates  
WYG for Homes England

## **3. Five year housing land supply**

3.1 What would be the 5 year land supply position on adoption, taking into account the plan's housing requirement (557dpa), commitments and local plan allocations? What is the appropriate buffer?

3.2 What are the risks to the maintenance of a 5 year supply of housing?

3.3 Are the assumptions about delivery start dates and rates from the SDAs reasonable? This includes not only infrastructure but the number of potential outlets and market capacity.

3.4 Is the plan resilient and flexible enough to maintain 5 years' supply going forward?

### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Andrew Hiorns for Parker Strategic Land  
Bidwells for Davidsons Developments  
Define for Bloor Homes  
Gladman  
GVA for Jelson

Home Builders Federation  
Marrons for Landowner Consortium East Lutterworth

### **Wednesday 3 October**

#### **4. Homes to meet the needs of all the community**

(Affordable housing need is dealt with in 1.3 above.)

4.1 Does the plan do enough to encourage purpose-built specialist housing in the right locations?

4.2 Is the plan sound in requiring housing to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards?

4.3 Does the plan take the right approach towards custom and self-build homes?

4.4 Given that GD2 Settlement Development allows for development contiguous with built up areas, how can H3 Rural Exception Sites be effective, since it also requires sites to be physically or visually connected with a settlement?

#### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Define for Bloor Homes  
Home Builders Federation  
WYG for Homes England

#### **5. Business and employment**

5.1 Is the provision of a minimum of 59ha for new business development (excluding strategic storage and distribution) sound?

5.2 What is the justification for making a distinction between strategic and non-strategic distribution, why is the threshold 9,000 square metres and what evidence supports the non-strategic limitation on the L1 allocation?

5.3 Is there sufficient justification, based on evidence, for the allocation of an additional 700,000 square metres of strategic distribution floorspace?

5.4 What would be the impact of such development on the business and employment objectives of other development plans in the region?

5.5 What would be the effects of such development on the local road network, in respect of both logistics traffic and journeys to work?

5.6 What would be the effect of such development on the local community, landscape and countryside?

5.7 Given the scale of the development envisaged in Policy BE2, why has no plan allocation been made?

5.8 Does Policy BE4 in respect of Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground strike a reasonable balance between securing a prosperous economy, as set out in the NPPF, and protecting the countryside and local communities?

## **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Daventry District Council  
Leicester City Council  
Lichfields for Prologis  
Marrons for C Walton Ltd  
Marrons for Landowner Consortium East Lutterworth  
Now Planning for Gazeley

## **Thursday 4 October**

### **6. Spatial strategy**

(Site specific elements of the spatial strategy are dealt with under the site allocation headings, below.)

6.1 Is it sound to accord Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby, on the outer edges of Leicester, and relatively distant from the centre, a higher place in the hierarchy than Market Harborough?

6.2 Are the Kibworths accorded an appropriate place in the hierarchy having regard to their size relative to other rural centres? What is the justification for not making further housing allocations there? What are the implications for local housing need over the plan period?

6.3 Having regard to the number of homes planned for Broughton Astley, in comparison with Lutterworth and with lower order settlements, is the plan sound in not making further housing allocations there? What are the implications for local housing need over the plan period?

6.4 Is the amount of development apportioned to Fleckney sound?

6.5 Is the plan sound in grouping several villages together, such as the Claybrookes, in order to ascertain their position in the hierarchy and their capacity for development?

6.6 Regarding Policy GD2 Settlement Development, in response to my Initial Question 13, the Council's state that they will distinguish development within settlements from development contiguous with them, and to apply the criteria to development adjoining settlements, based on the individual settlements' targets. What would a sound policy look like?

## **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Armstrong Rigg for Manor Oak Homes  
Bidwells for Davidsons Developments  
Define for Bloor Homes  
Marrons for Landowner Consortium East Lutterworth  
PlanitX for Scraftoft & Thurnby & Bushby Parish Councils  
Savills for Taylor Wimpey  
Sworders for Mr & Mrs Crane  
Turley for Catesby

## **7. Built Environment and Heritage Assets**

7.1 The Council has provided a new form of wording for Policy HC1 (see IC4) and in the circumstances I have no questions to raise at the Hearing on this matter.

**Tuesday 9 October**

## **8. Site Allocations**

### ***SC1 Scraftoft North Strategic Development Area***

(Development rates and risks to delivery are dealt with under agenda item 3.3 above.)

- 8.1 Do the transport studies that have been carried out provide sufficient evidence to enable this allocation to be made?
- 8.2 What analysis has been carried out of the effect of additional traffic on the quality of life of the communities through which it would pass?
- 8.3 What analysis has been carried out of the effect of the additional traffic on the character of the areas affected?
- 8.4 What analysis has been carried out of the effect of the additional traffic on the significance of the heritage assets affected?
- 8.5 What work has been carried out to assess the feasibility and viability of the measures which would appear to be required to facilitate movement from this site through the surrounding area? These include Keyham Lane West "upgrading works", Hamiton Lane traffic calming, the Scraptoft one way system, work to New Romney Crerscent, traffic calming near schools, and the provision of off road parking bays. On the latter, who owns the land and what capacity would the bays have?
- 8.6 What consultation has taken place with the local communities in respect of these suggested measures?
- 8.7 What would be the timing of these measures?
- 8.8 What work has been undertaken in respect of ascertaining the feasibility of providing bus routes into Leicester from the site, including the list of "possibles" referred to by the City Council?
- 8.9 Are the triggers for social and community infrastructure appropriate?
- 8.10 In respect of SC1 (2), at what stage would the design reviews and community consultations take place? Should the policy or supporting text be more specific about what is required?
- 8.11 Would the Green Wedge be effective in protecting the identity of Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby and would it provide adequate access to open space?
- 8.12 Is any compensatory provision being made in respect of the loss of the local nature reserve?

8.13 Is it sound that the development of this site is not tied to the re-provision of the golf course?

### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Andrew Hiorns for Parker Strategic Land  
Brett Bibby  
Leicester City Council  
PlanitX for Scraftoft & Thurnby & Bushby Parish Councils  
TPS for Nelson Renner

### **Wednesday 10 October**

#### ***MH3 Burnmill Park***

8.14 What is the present character of Kingston Way and Bates Close? How should it be classified, having regard to LCC's Highway Design Guide? What would be the appropriate number of dwellings to be served from such an access? How would access to the site allocation actually be gained?

### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Bruton Knowles for the Trustees of the Bowden Settlement  
Fisher German for David Wilson Homes  
Mr & Mrs Gilding

#### ***MH4 Airfield Farm***

(The Council's suggestion to modify the policy to make access more flexible is noted and on that basis I have no questions on this subject at the Hearing.)

#### ***L1 Lutterworth SDA***

8.15 What work has been carried out to assess the feasibility of creating links with the centre of Lutterworth to ensure that they are in fact attractive to pedestrians and cyclists? - for example, how could users of the routes be protected from noise and exposure from the M1? What steps could be taken to limit the severance created by the motorway, the spine road and the employment area? What could an effective policy say about this?



(Note: the indicative masterplan shows the pedestrian route crossing the M1 and then running along its eastern side)

8.16 What measures are to be taken to protect residents in respect of noise and air quality?

(Note: the indicative masterplan shows residential development in the crook of the M1/A4303 junction)

8.17 In respect of L1 (2), at what stage would the design reviews and community consultations take place? Should the policy or supporting text be more specific about what is required?

8.18 What consultation has taken place with Highways England in respect of M1 J20 (having regard to the cumulative effects of L1 and BE2) and in respect of the provision of the new bridge?

8.19 What would be the timing of the new bridge?

8.20 Are the thresholds for the provision of social and community facilities appropriate?

8.21 Should the policy be more specific about its requirements in respect of the protection of heritage assets on / adjacent to the site?

8.22 Is the evidence base sufficient at this stage to give confidence that there will be no adverse effect on the SSSI? Is the approach to the SSSI taken by the policy sound?

## **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Lutterworth Town Council  
Marrons for Landowner Consortium East Lutterworth

## ***K1 Land south and west of Priory Business Park***

8.23 The Council's response in its statement is noted. However, it is not sound to make an allocation that does not reflect the terms of the extant planning permission. The policy will need to be modified to reflect the terms of the application, including the retail element and the size of units, allowing for reasonable flexibility in implementation. I invite the Council to submit appropriate wording. I do not intend to discuss this matter at the Hearings.

**Thursday 11 October**

## **9. Green Infrastructure**

### ***Cemeteries***

9.1 Is Policy G13 sound? Was the process leading to the identification of land to the east of Harborough Road for a cemetery soundly based?

### ***Local Green Space***

9.2 Is Policy G14 sound? Was the process leading to the identification of land near Lutterworth for LGS soundly based?

### **Participants**

Harborough District Council  
Pegasus for William Davis  
Turley for Kate Thompson

## **10. Review**

10.1 This will be a session which will consider whether additional work is required of the Council, and will also review the emerging list of main modifications.

### **Participants**

Harborough District Council

Jonathan Bore  
INSPECTOR

01 October 2018