

Charnwood Local Plan Examination

Inspectors - Mrs S Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI &
Mr Hayden Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI
Programme Officer – Mr Ian Kemp
jdkemp@icloud.com
07723 009166

HEARING SESSION AGENDA

29 June 2022 09.30 am and 2.00pm

Please Note: All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the Hearing Statements (and any relevant evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.

The Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) relating to this session are appended for ease of reference. The MIQ number is listed on the left of this agenda together with the bullet points on which the Inspectors require further information or clarification and which will form the basis of the discussion at the hearing sessions.

1. Inspectors' introduction
2. Participant introductions
3. Follow Up Items
4. **Matter 2: Vision, Objectives, Sustainable Development and the Development Strategy**

Key Documents

Settlement Hierarchy Assessment (EB/DS/3)
Settlement Limits to Development Assessment (EB/DS/5&5a)
Development Strategy and Site Selection Topic Paper (Exam7)
Urban Capacity Study (EB/DS/4)
Sustainability Appraisal (SD/5)
Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (Exam 4)

5. **Issue 1 - Are the Vision for Charnwood 2037 and the Plan's objectives soundly based and will they contribute to the achievement of sustainable development?**

MIQ

2.1 Whether the Plan's vision and objectives address the challenges and
2.2 opportunities facing the Borough including in relation to:

- Addressing health inequalities and providing healthy environments
- Reducing carbon emissions and addressing the impact of climate change
- The need for strategic warehousing and distribution development
- The role of Service Centres in providing new housing
- Meeting unmet need for housing and employment

Is the Plan sufficiently clear about how it will contribute to achieving sustainable development?

Issue 2 – Is the proposed settlement hierarchy positively prepared and justified by the evidence and are the proposed limits to development justified and soundly based?

2.3 The Settlement Hierarchy Assessment (EB/DS/3) and whether any clarifications or updates are necessary

2.4 Whether the settlement hierarchy in Table 4 is clear and effective
2.5 and ensuring consistency with other Plan policies, diagrams and the
2.6 Policies Map

2.7

2.8

2.10 Whether any modifications to the limits to development on the Policies Map are necessary for effectiveness, including in relation to:

Housing site allocations

Moor Lane, Loughborough

Queniborough Old Hall

Sustainable Urban Extension North East of Leicester (Policy LUA2)

Rothley

Wymeswold

Any other corrections, updates or clarification.

Issue 3: The Development Strategy

2.11 Whether Policy DS1 (Development Strategy) is justified, clear and
2.12 effective and any main modifications necessary for soundness,
2.13 including:

2.14

2.15 • Expressing the figures in the table on page 30 as minimum numbers

- Ensuring that the policy sets out a clear approach to directing future development to achieve urban concentration and intensification and to locations where there is a choice of sustainable transport modes
- The criteria against which proposals will be assessed in circumstances where there is no five year supply

2.16 Whether the scale of new housing growth allocated to Service
 2.17 Centres is justified, including in relation to infrastructure
 2.18

2.19 Whether Policy SC1 (Service Centres) is clear and effective

2.20 Whether the scale of new housing growth allocated to Other
 2.21 Settlements is justified, including in relation to infrastructure
 2.22

Whether Policy OS1(Other Settlements) is clear and effective

2.23 Whether Policy C1 (Countryside) is clear and effective
 2.24

5. Review of Matter 2 main modifications necessary for the soundness of the Plan

6. Follow up items and close of hearing session

MATTER 2: VISION, OBJECTIVES, SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Issue 1 - Are the Vision for Charnwood 2037 and the Plan's objectives soundly based and will they contribute to the achievement of sustainable development?

- 2.1 Do the Plan's vision and objectives cover the full range of opportunities, challenges and priorities that need to be addressed in the Borough over the Plan period? Is it clear how the policies will help to deliver the vision and objectives over the Plan period?
- 2.2 Will the Plan contribute to achieving sustainable development, including a sustainable pattern of development, as set out at NPPF paragraph 11a and if so, how?

Issue 2 – Is the proposed settlement hierarchy positively prepared and justified by the evidence and are the proposed limits to development justified and soundly based?

- 2.3 Is the Settlement Hierarchy Assessment (EB/DS/3) based on a robust methodology and relevant criteria in relation to the availability of and access to services and facilities?
- 2.4 How has the Settlement Hierarchy Assessment informed the development strategy in Policy DS1?
- 2.5 Are the settlements included within the settlement hierarchy categories of Urban Centre (Loughborough), Urban Settlement, Other Settlements and Small Villages or Hamlets in the Countryside justified? (Table 4 of the Plan). Does the settlement hierarchy appropriately reflect the role and function of these settlements?
- 2.6 How does the 'Leicester Urban Area' relate to the settlement hierarchy in Table 4?
- 2.7 The Plan also refers to 'Urban Areas', for example in paragraph 3.206. What areas are being referred to and is this clear?
- 2.8 Should the Sustainable Urban Extensions be identified as urban settlements in the hierarchy?
- 2.9 Why have small villages or hamlets been identified as a separate category in the settlement hierarchy if they are subject to the same policy approach as the countryside in Policy C1?

2.10 Are the limits to development based on a robust and credible evidence base and are they appropriately drawn on the Policies Map?

Issue 3 – The Development Strategy

2.11 Is the distribution of development in Policy DS1 justified by the evidence and were all options for the level and distribution of growth tested through the Sustainability Appraisal? What is the justification for a greater proportion of new dwellings being delivered in the Service Centres compared with the 'hybrid' option tested?

2.12 Does Policy DS1 set out a clear approach to the distribution of future housing and employment development across the different settlements in the hierarchy?

2.13 Should the figures in the table in Policy DS1 be expressed as minimum numbers?

2.14 Will the distribution of housing development set out in the table within Policy DS1 achieve the overall stated aim of Policy DS1 for urban concentration and intensification, as well as minimising the need to travel, particularly by private car, and to prioritise sustainable modes of transport?

2.15 Is Policy DS1 justified in allowing for development adjacent to settlement limits in circumstances where a five year supply of deliverable housing land cannot be demonstrated? How would proposals be expected to accord with the pattern of development set out in the table in Policy DS1?

Policy SC1 - Service Centres

2.16 What is the justification for the level of growth being directed to Service Centres given the Sustainability Appraisal's finding (paragraph 5.1.2) that there is potential for negative effects above 1600 dwellings?

2.17 Are the site allocations in the Service Centres of Anstey, Barrow upon Soar and Sileby (served by Cossington primary school) as proposed in Policies DS1 and DS3 justified when there is a lack of capacity in their respective primary schools? How would this be addressed?

2.18 What is the relationship between the Service Centre category in the settlement hierarchy and the District Centre/Local Centre

designation? Is there any potential for confusion about the role of the Service Centres?

- 2.19 How would a 'proven local need' for off street parking in the last bullet of Policy SC1 be identified and is this part of the policy justified?

Policy OS1 – Other Settlements

- 2.20 How would 'small scale' development in bullet two of the policy be defined and is the policy clear and effective in this regard?
- 2.21 Why are proposals for new services and facilities required to meet a 'proven local need' (bullet four)? What would be the harm in approving new services and facilities without a demonstration of proven local need?
- 2.22 Should the policy give more support to development outside the Development Limits on brownfield or underused land?

Policy C1 - Countryside

- 2.23 How would 'small scale new built development' in bullet two of the policy be defined and is the policy clear and effective in this regard?
- 2.24 What is the justification for requiring new services and facilities to meet a 'proven local need' (bullet three)? What harms would arise if new services and facilities are approved without a demonstration of proven local need?
- 2.25 Overall, will the Plan's vision and objectives contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and is the development strategy justified by the evidence and positively prepared? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?