

CHARNWOOD LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

MATTER 6 SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT:

URBAN AREA POLICIES, SITE SELECTION, SUSTAINABLE URBAN EXTENSIONS AND HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS

RIDGE

Introduction

This Representation has been undertaken by Ridge and Partners LLP on behalf of Parker Strategic Land Limited. Parker Strategic Land are one of the promoters involved in an urban extension to the south of Loughborough, west of the A6004 Terry Yardley Way, south-east of Woodthorpe, which is allocated for development in the emerging Local Plan (Site HA15). Previous representations have been made to the Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ), and the answers to those questions should be relied upon. This supplementary statement simply updates the position in relation to the site, as it now benefits from planning permission.

The key matter which is contested is the requirement for a site wide masterplan for Site HA15, prior to the granting of planning permission. This requirement within Policy DS3(HA15) is not considered to be justified and therefore should be removed from the policy in order for it to be found sound.

Parker Strategic Land confirms attendance at the Hearing Sessions on 14th and 15th February 2023 in order to expand on these points if necessary.

Matter 6 Responses

Issue 4 - Housing allocations

Question 6.16

a) Is the proposed scale of housing development justified, having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?

Policy DS3 identifies the Site's capacity as 723 new homes. The 'Key HA15 Diagram' at Page 43 of the Pre-Submission Plan does not reflect the recent planning permission on the site for 120 dwellings, as set out further below, which supports a greater level of housing development than set out within the 'housing within allocation' parcels on the plan. In the context of the above, and in order to ensure the plan has been positively prepared, it is suggested that the 723 is defined as a minimum figure.

c) What is the likely impact of the proposed development on the following factors:

- **settlement separation and identity and landscape character;**
- **biodiversity, green infrastructure including public rights of way and agricultural land quality;**
- **heritage assets;**
- **the strategic and local highway network and other infrastructure including health facilities, education and open space;**
- **air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.**

Previous answers to these questions are relied upon, but it is important to note the site context. As set out further below, the northernmost parcel of the allocated site now benefits from outline planning permission for development of up to 120 new dwellings with access from Main Street. The application and appeal was supported by a number of technical documents, which demonstrate that there are no overriding constraints that would prevent or delay development of the site. The development was considered to be acceptable in relation to the issues identified within this question.

e) Has any planning permission been granted for residential development and if so, what are the details?

As above, the northernmost parcel of the allocated site now benefits from outline planning permission for the development of up to 120 new dwellings with access from Main Street. Planning permission was granted via a non-determination appeal (application ref P/21/0550/2, appeal ref APP/X2410/W/21/3289048). However, it is noted that following the lodging of the appeal, the Council considered the application at a committee meeting and resolved that it would have approved the application had an appeal not been lodged, subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement.

The application and appeal was supported by a number of technical documents, which demonstrate that there are no overriding constraints that would prevent or delay development of the site. This is confirmed by the granting of the appeal.

The Key HA15 Diagram at Page 43 of the Pre-Submission Plan suggests a smaller parcel of development within the northern part of the site than proposed as part of the outline application. The outline application demonstrates that 120 dwellings in this area is acceptable across the entirety of that area; as such, it is recommended that the Key HA15 Diagram is updated to reflect the current application.

HA15 – Land south of Loughborough

Is the requirement for a masterplan justified?

The final criterion of the policy HA15 requires an agreed masterplan for the whole allocated site covering delivery and phasing to achieve comprehensive development before the granting of outline planning permission.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the Council will wish for each phase of development to be mindful of the overarching allocation, the site is to be phased as demonstrated by the outline planning permission. The outline planning permission on part of the site has the effect of nullifying this requirement of the policy as it is impossible to achieve.

Within the committee report for the above application, the Council accepts that the development of the application site could take place without prejudicing to the remainder of the allocation provided safeguards are in place to prevent the 'sterilisation' of the remainder, including the use of planning conditions. As such, the Council has accepted that the use of planning conditions can ensure the same control over the delivery of the allocation as a whole.

As part of the appeal, the Council took the view that a condition requiring a masterplan to be submitted was required to ensure the comprehensive delivery of the site. The Inspector disagreed with this, stating that the condition was unnecessary, and that the proposal for 120 dwellings would not undermine the aspirations of delivering the level of development envisaged by HA15. The Inspector concluded at Paragraph 31 of the appeal decision that *'for the reasons set out earlier in my decision, I have not included a condition to submit a Masterplan.'*

Given the relatively limited residual size of the site (the proposed housing being likely to come forward in 3 parts based on the 3 separate ownerships), and the planning permission granted, we would question the purpose of a masterplan needing to be submitted for the remaining two parcels of development. Requesting a masterplan to be prepared and agreed by the LPA will add time and expense to the delivery of much needed

new housing. To this extent one should only be required where it is necessary to do so, which we believe doesn't apply here.

In the context of the above, and the outline planning permission that exists on part of the site, it is not considered that the requirement for a masterplan is justified and it is requested that this requirement is removed, reflecting the inevitable phased delivery of the site.

Ridge and Partners LLP

16/01/2023