

For and on behalf of
Gloebal Ltd

**Charnwood Local Plan
Examination in Public
Supplementary Matters, Issues & Questions
Matter 1: Duty to Cooperate and Other Legal Requirements**

**Land at Oakley Road (HA33) and
Land North of Hallamford Road and West of Shepshed (HA35)**

**Prepared by
Strategic Planning Research Unit
DLP Planning Ltd
Sheffield**

January 2023

Prepared by:	Megan Wilson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI CIHCM Associate Director
Checked by:	Adam Place MRTPI Associate Planner
Approved by:	Jon Goodall MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI Director
Date: January 2023	Office: Sheffield

Strategic Planning Research Unit

[Redacted text block containing multiple lines of blacked-out information]

DLP Consulting Group disclaims any responsibility to the client and others in respect of matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence. This report is confidential to the client and DLP Planning Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 Introduction.....	4
2.0 Issue 3 – Whether the Plan has been prepared in compliance with other legal requirements.....	5

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This response to the supplementary Matter 1 MIQs in respect of the Charnwood Local Plan (CLP) 2021-37 Examination has been prepared by the Strategic Planning Research Unit ('SPRU') of DLP Planning Ltd. SPRU have been instructed to appear at the Examination on behalf of Gloeal Limited.
- 1.2 SPRU have made submissions on behalf of Gloeal Ltd to the Regulation 19 consultation (July – August 2021) on the emerging Local Plan, along with detailed written statements relating to Matter 1 in June 2022. This statement should be read in conjunction with these submissions (representation numbers PSLP/562 and PSLP/563).
- 1.3 DLP's previous submissions also address outstanding questions under this Matter to be considered as part of the resumed Hearings. DLP also prepared written submissions and appeared on behalf of Gloeal Ltd and other clients in respect of Matter 10 (Unmet Housing Needs)
- 1.4 These earlier submissions set out that the allocation of sites HA33 (Land at Oakley Road) and HA35 (Land North of Hallamford Road and West of Shepshed) is supported and that the allocation of the sites for residential development is sound. Details of both sites are contained within Statements of Common Ground agreed with the Council in EXAM49 and EXAM50 respectively.
- 1.5 The evidence highlights that the sites are being actively promoted and are progressing towards the submission of planning applications. Supporting work to facilitate bringing forward the abovementioned sites, including the preparation of indicative masterplans, further demonstrates that the allocation of the land in question, including an increase to the capacities for development proposed in the submission version Plan, would be justified and effective and that development would be deliverable and developable in the early years of the plan period following adoption.
- 1.6 In addition, the sites would constitute a well related and logical extension to the urban area (as well as the other proposed allocations and previously constructed developments along the north western side of Shepshed) in a sustainable location, supporting and offering prospective residents good access to public transport, education, employment and other local facilities and services. The sites are therefore well placed to encourage more sustainable patterns of travel and reduced reliance on the private car, consistent with the principles for sustainable development set out in the NPPF.
- 1.7 This statement outlines Gloeal Ltd.'s comments in respect of the supplementary Matter 1, with responses to the Inspector's MIQ's (Matter 1) set out below.

2.0 ISSUE 3 – WHETHER THE PLAN HAS BEEN PREPARED IN COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

1. ARE ANY ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PLAN PERIOD (2021 – 2037) NECESSARY TO ACCORD WITH NPPF PARAGRAPH 22 WHICH STATES THAT STRATEGIC POLICIES SHOULD LOOK AHEAD FOR A MINIMUM 15 YEAR PERIOD FROM ADOPTION, HAVING REGARD TO THE DELAYS IN THE EXAMINATION PROCESS?

- 2.1 As is set out at paragraph 4.2 of our Matter 1 Statement, we support an extension to the Plan period to 2038. With the delays, as a result of consideration of Leicester's unmet need, to the Examination process, the Local Plan period, post adoption, will run for another 14-years.
- 2.2 In line with national policy (paragraph 22 of the NPPF21) strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum period of 15-years. Beyond this minimum requirement, paragraph 22 is clear that it may be appropriate for Plans that include the allocation of large-scale strategic sites, such as the SUE's proposed as part of this Plan, it may be appropriate to seek to extend the Plan period yet further.
- 2.3 Notwithstanding this, in order to be compliant with the requirements of the NPPF, the Council should increase the Plan period as a minimum to 2021-2038.
- 2.4 It is, therefore, necessary as part of the requirements for soundness for the Plan to demonstrate sufficient provision to meet the minimum housing requirement for a period of 15 years from adoption together with measures to address shortfall from the base-date in 2021.
- 2.5 The provision for a minimum 15 year plan period is considered achievable broadly within the context of the strategy within the submission version Plan. Satisfying this element within national policy is consistent with ensuring that the strategy provides an effective and positively prepared response to address long-term requirements but this should be viewed within the context of the opportunity to support early delivery and a boost to supply upon adoption. This is particularly important in the context of worsening affordability and recent delivery being substantially below levels of minimum annual local housing need.
- 2.6 In other words, provision for an additional year in the plan period would reasonably strike a balance between different elements of sustainable development. Firstly this reflects expected additional provision partly comprising 'rolling forward' residual capacity on larger sites beyond the end of the current proposed plan period in 2037. Secondly, addressing necessary modifications to the housing requirement to provide for Leicester's unmet needs (and worsening affordability) supports (by the Council's own admission) increasing and maximising the opportunities for development on sites proposed for allocation in the submission version Plan.
- 2.7 Our client's position regarding an increase to the proposed allocated capacity for development on sites HA33 and HA35 (see EXAM49 and EXAM50) is consistent with this second element and the spatial strategy for Shepshed as it relates to the submission version Plan.
- 2.8 Consistent with the Inspectors' conclusions in EXAM55 there is a substantial benefit to consider the potential increase to supply as a result of this process positively and flexibly. Where opportunities exist to increase supply over-and-above the minimum additional contributions towards unmet needs it is self-evident that this demonstrates that provision for an additional year of the plan period is appropriate and achievable.
- 2.9 Within this context additional large-scale strategic sites are unlikely to be necessary to meet little if any of the provision required for just one additional year of the plan period using the proposed housing requirement. Making provision for a minimum 15-year plan period would reinforce rather than undermine the flexibility of the Charnwood Local Plan to respond to

changing circumstances and would complement and potentially reduce the scope of requirements for a wider review of strategic policies under Policy DS2 (for example in relation to providing for additional unmet needs).

2.10

2. IS AN UPDATE TO THE LATEST LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (EXAM 34) NECESSARY TO PROVIDE AN UPDATED TIMESCALE FOR PLAN ADOPTION?

2.11 No response.



BEDFORD

Planning / SDD / SPRU

bedford@dlpconsultants.co.uk

BRISTOL

Planning / SDD / SPRU

bristol@dlpconsultants.co.uk

EAST MIDLANDS

Planning/ SDD

nottingham@dlpconsultants.co.uk

LEEDS

Planning

leeds@dlpconsultants.co.uk

LONDON

Planning

london@dlpconsultants.co.uk

MILTON KEYNES

Planning

miltonkeynes@dlpconsultants.co.uk

RUGBY

Planning

rugby.enquiries@dlpconsultants.co.uk

SHEFFIELD

Planning/ SDD / SPRU

sheffield@dlpconsultants.co.uk



RTPI

Chartered Town Planner

