good afternoon everybody

good afternoon uh could everyone who's

taking part again put their cameras on

marvelous thank you um come on can i

just check whether we have

anybody new observing or whether it's

just

the people who've been observing

throughout

it's the same people as this morning

okay thank you there's no one different

okay thank you so i don't need to to do

introductions again or anything like

that thank you

well welcome to the afternoon session um

of the hearings for the second day

um we are going to move on now to

uh discussing the wider

statement of common ground uh triggers

and timing of submission of a

replacement local plan that's covered

in questions 6 6a

and 6b um we'll also cover

question and 6c we'll also cover

question

7 as well as to any other plans

which have the potential to impact on

matters being discussed

it would be very helpful for me to turn

first to

the statement of common ground

on the comparison of triggers used in

recent local plans

in leicestershire uh it has been

uh agreed uh between north west

leicestershire

and some of the other participants

does has everybody else seen a copy of

it

who hasn't been involved in the drawing

up of the

agreement okay

thank you come to mr nelson i think

first to

to explain the the reason for for

submitting the statements of common

ground

and what you hoped would happen

uh as a as a result of it um i think

it would be useful to discuss that or at

least give me a summary anyway

yes yes thank you

the purpose behind it was when i was

reading the various representations

uh that made uh comments about uh other

local plans in leicestershire which had

triggers in um

i must admit i was getting confused uh

and obviously i know leicestershire

probably better than than most people

uh so it just seemed to make sense to

try and pull something together

to uh sort of summarize as easily as

possible

what those different uh policies in

those different local plans were saying

try to pick out some of the common

factors or or not common factors

uh just as a a means really to a

discussion today

um that was that was the simple purpose

uh

behind you do it um

okay uh sorry carry on no carry on no

if you hadn't finished i just heard

somebody in the background

no likewise um yeah so i mean obviously

uh what we've put forward in terms of a

change policy one

does in include one trigger which is the

wider statement of common ground

um if you look at some of the other

local plans in leicestershire they they

do include other

triggers but as noted in the statement

of common ground

those triggers are always about uh

starting a review

obviously that is a process which we

know from this morning that we are

already fully engaged in anyway

our trigger is is a trigger after which

the plan has to be submitted

okay

um and some i i having looked at this

some also have triggers i suppose

following

um following that as well don't they i

just want to clear up a

a basic question i suppose um

a couple of the the policies mention

a statement of common ground and a

couple mention

memorandum of understanding and i think

one

mentions both so i i

it would just be helpful to understand

from your perspective if you

if you're able to mr nelson what what

the difference is

uh if there is a difference

my understanding is that there isn't a

difference i think it's just a case of

terminology changes through time

so if we go back to when the headner was

being produced and even before that

actually

uh memorandum understandings were agreed

by the local authorities

obviously now the government has uh sort

of formalized some of the duty to

cooperate

cooperate arrangements a little bit more

uh and refers to statements of common

ground so

my view would be that they are one and

the same thing

um i noticed mr thornhill is is

uh present today and he was at the heart

he was at harbor at the time that they

had their examination so i don't know

whether he

he would agree with that view because i

think the harbor plan does talk about

both

on memory

uh yes yeah i would and then i'll come

to you mr bamford

um yeah so so yeah in
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summary there is fair i think the reason

why it refers to both

uh at harborough i think when the policy

was originally drafted it probably

referred to memorandum of understanding

then

the new mppf was published and although

it was tested against the

the old mppf it was just to update the

terminology to cover all bases basically

so

it's a terminology point of view that

the general substance of them

was intended to be the same okay thank

you

uh mr bamford uh would you like to say

something and i know you're one of the

parties that signs the agreement aren't

you

uh we're we are mum yes um it's it's

more just to concur with what both mr

nelson mr thornhill said i've had the

pleasure to be at all of those local

plan examinations

um all took um kind of

placing different points in time and it

is simply um where we

were at that particular point in time

which terminology was used

in the uh in the particular trigger

mechanism

so if if you were um looking at

one of these particular policies are any

of you

suggesting that one is

more relevant than the other perhaps to

northwest leicestershire's or

is there anything contained within

uh parts of these policies that you

think would be

relevant just

just to help out otherwise i i suppose

there's still a a

a kind of pick and mix choice isn't

there

i think i think for our our purposes mom

it is a pick and mix

um exercise uh obviously

i think northwest leicester

leicestershire were the first through

this particular process and that's

probably

led uh partly to the wording that was

included in that

uh in that policy not being quite um

appropriate for now certainly

um i think as we went through those

processes we tweaked that wording

um and i think it's

we're now moved on considerably from

that that point again

and i think it is a pick and mix process

to get the best of those

um trigger policies into um

that whatever the trigger policy is for

for northwest leicestershire

i think the concern from our point of

view has has always revolved around

um both time frame um and

some kind of backstop stroke failsafe um

should progress not or sufficient

progress not be made and i think that's

that's the critical element of getting

this trigger mechanism right for for

northwest

okay thank you uh did anybody else who

wanted to comment i will come back to

you mr richards in a minute

uh anybody else who signed up to the

statement of common ground for the

triggers want to add anything

uh mr fox yes thank you mom we were

involved in um interrupting

and agreeing this statement as well um

just going to mention

i think from our perspective we think

the statement of common ground

approach the trigger to that is is

absolutely fine but i think

if you look at things ob and wigston and

also harborough

they do have backstop dates built in so

they have an additional backstop date in

addition to the

memorandum or the statement of common

ground i think both of those

are they both equate to 30 months when

you add up the two triggers

so i think from our perspective we'd

welcome

some form of backstop being built into

the into the policy

mike sorry sorry man one other point as

well is that having looked at the

wording of the

of the revised policy the draft policy

um it's referring to leicester city's

unmet needs

specifically in the second second

element of the paragraph

whereas if you look at um

melton and obi and wiggston they're both

referring to

to a general unmet needs across the hma

and i think given what we discussed this

morning whereby

there's a potential that leicester may

be able to meet its own needs

under any new standard method but there

could be unmet needs

elsewhere in the hma i think that's just

something which should be

um should be allowed for in the policy

rather than being definitive

and specific just to leicester city

thank you yeah thank you i'll come back

to mr nelson on one point but i will

hear from

the others so just bear with me while i

can i can't see

everybody on the screen at the moment so

i'm just checking

who's raised their hand i said mr

richards i will come back to you

um miss green

thank you mom um yes we're we're also um

one of the parties who is involved in

um putting together this statement of

common ground

um i mean we feel that it's um it's sort

of a factual

statement and i think that

the table shows how

this type of policy in the

leicestershire hma

area has sort of evolved over time as

we've gone through

numerous examinations of local plans

um and i i agree with mr mr bamford that

um

that it that the approach probably is a

bit of a pick and mix

um but what i felt that the um

statement common ground and the table

enabled us to do

is is almost to move the um the

discussion along by

sort of saying well if you had a final

column

you know what would you be putting into

that final column

with regards to each of the each of the

lines

so i felt that it was that it was a

useful

document to have produced to help us to

sort of move forward on on what kind of

triggers um we think should be in there

and we share the concern of most of

participants

that we don't want we feel that as

as the policy is currently drafted

um it is just too too open-ended

um and it could it might never come to a

resolution

so we were also seeking um

to have some more to try and put in a

little bit more

certainty um but equally

with sufficient flexibility there so

that

um as mr fox has mentioned at the moment

there is reference just to unmet needs

from leicester

um but looking forward and building on

the discussion that we were having this

this morning it may be that in actual

fact other unmet needs evolve

if we move to the new standard

methodology etc so

we need to have some flexibility in

there as well as trying to

create some more certainties as to time

scales thank you that's helpful

um it might be worth taking your idea of

the

uh of the final column uh into

the discussion as we go along uh but i

will hear

from mr pendleton and mr richards uh mr

fox have you

finished your hands still up so that's

okay thanks

uh mr pendle thank you mom i won't

reiterate what um

the points that others have just made um

but you know certainly would endorse

those um it strikes me that um each of

the policies are very much of

their time um and use the terminology

it's probably prevalent

in in the individual local plant

examination cases

um something that that strikes me is

um the difference between what a

document is called

and what it deals with and and to what

extent it deals with it

um so for example memorandum of

understanding previously

has dealt with um the vehicle

for potential agreement officer member

groups not necessarily

the the extent the extent or scope of

evidential matters that might need to be

dealt with

um and of course even that second part

of that you know the evidence around

what we're trying to achieve here

is is a further step removed from from

actual policy

where we might actually ultimately end

up in terms of what we're actually

trying to achieve

in terms of spatial planning so

so what the document's called is one

matter

you know but if it's dealing with

process policy or mechanism

is another matter and for me one of the

things that

as i said the individual trigger

policies are very much of their time and

i think we can recognize that we

recognize that

harbor trigger policy talks about the

leicester city plan because that was

writ large during that examination

process and indeed we are

where we are now um and and you know you

heard me make comments about

the existing trigger policy being um

being a product of the northwest

leicester plan

as it was then um so i think to try and

sort of move us along

ms green's mention this final column i

think if if we can

focus on what it is that we're trying to

wrestle with rather than what the

document may mean to be called um that

would probably be helpful you know what

is the explicit matter

that results in the need for action to

be taken

um because of course you know i made the

comment this morning joint statements

statements of common ground mous you

know they are what they are it's what

they're actually

saying what they do that really matters

the second second point i'll just

briefly make perhaps save me from coming

back on in a moment

um would be the trigger as written in

the adopted local plan

um effectively hit the

um the alarm and set it at the point the

inspector's report came

out gave that that date for three months

for the review will commence mr nelson's

quite well you know

obviously correctly said we've already

commenced our review

um but in but in hitting the alarm or

setting the alarm it then sets

the end date for for that to have

happened

um so in other words the alarm set it's

running

and we know when it's going to go off

and within that period of time

the type of matters that i've just been

talking about rather than the actual

name of the document or or you know

directing us towards somebody else's

stuff

um it was the actual content that

northwest leicestershire are under

pressure to try and influence

in order to keep some life in their plan

notwithstanding comments we'll have

later on deeming clauses no doubt

um but it put the pressure on them to

work with their partners to achieve that

what we've got now of course is

well the clock has started on the local

plan review

but potentially the alarm doesn't go off

until such time as maybe or maybe not a

statement of common ground is

achieved which may be or may not deal

with actual matters of

numbers spatial distribution and

responsibilities and roles for different

local authorities

so for example if statement common

ground is is issued which

simply deals with a new mechanism and

doesn't pick up on in

any of those things i've just mentioned

then it's arguable that

the time scales for for submitting the

plan or completing it

no longer relevant so so for me it's

content

and um and having

you know with the best will in the world

and you know mr nelson i know i've got a

lot of sympathy with him so we've worked

on local plans together before and had

exactly this problem

the the the individual partners in the

hma need the pressure

to work together and it can't simply be

left

to um a statement to common ground which

may or may not happen

and of course the alarms only hit if it

happens you know yes

yeah i mean that that was uh that was

the point of my second bullet point

on the agenda was it was to what extent

actually can

can the wider statement of common ground

and its contents be influenced by

by the partial review itself um you know

i i i'm not

entirely convinced that um it it's for

the

the partial review itself just to set to

set what the statement of common ground

will be i mean obviously

uh it's it's a discussion that will be

had but equally uh

all the leicestershire authorities

aren't here at the moment so they

they won't be party to to this

uh discussion i think we'll come back to

that and certainly to

um to this hypothetical final column at

the moment

in the that we we might have for the for

the triggers statement of common ground

uh mr richards you you wanted to say

something

yes thank you madam it seems to me that

there are three issues that we're going

to be grappling with

during this afternoon the first is

should there be a trigger for submitting

the local plan

and at the moment the council is

proceeding on the basis that they should

be unless you

tell us otherwise

but everybody's noted that we're already

embarked on the substantive local plan

review

so it's not a trigger requiring us to

commence a review

we're talking about a trigger to

submit the local plan for examination

the second question then is if there

should be a trigger what should that

trigger be

and and it seems to me that there are

only two possibilities

one is a fixed date

the 25th of december 2022

for example or

a date relating unknown

but relating to the time of or after

a future event

that's the sort of trigger being

proposed by the council

and the future event is the agreement of

a statement of common ground

other people might say no no it ought to

be a different event

and if they think that then we think

that would be helpful

if they identified the event they have

in mind

and then lastly which we'll come on to

later which we're not embarked on at the

moment

the final question is should there be

any consequences

spelt out in the policy in the event of

a failure to meet the trigger

should it be a deeming clause or some

other consequence

should there be any consequences spelt

out

so it seems to me that those are the

three things that we're wrestling with

um and

it appears that everybody thinks there

should be a trigger

but we're not all necessarily agreed on

what that event should be

and then some people say there should be

consequences and other people say they

shouldn't

including the council spelt out but

we'll come back to the consequences

debate

later at the moment we're focusing on

the trigger

we think that the content as mr pendle

correctly described it

is when everybody has agreed what the

unmet

need is and where it should be met
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and the vehicle that we've identified

for that

is this statement of common ground but

if somebody thinks that it should be a

different vehicle then we're very

willing to listen

okay thank you i mean just just coming

on to that that point

that's that's the first point isn't it

that's made in this

table in the comparisons um about

addressing

uh unmet needs either in leicester city

or

elsewhere mr nelson what are your

thoughts on that i mean obviously

leicester city was referred to

specifically because that was an issue

at the time

um have things moved on in that respect

do you think

well not in the sense that nobody else

has declared an unmet need but i do take

mr fox's

point on board and i think there would

be some merits in

a slight rewording of that part of the

policy to make it clear it isn't just

leicester city it could be any of the

authorities

within the housing market area

particularly within the

context of government's proposals for

the standard methodology which

uh who knows what that might mean for

other authorities across leicestershire

um some authorities who currently are

are able to meet their own need they may

not be able to

possibly we don't know so i think it

would allow for that possibility as well

okay thank you mr lees

thank you madam um yeah i'm just

wondering to what extent

um the precise wording is is um is

material

to the actual situation

of the council undertaking a review

because again i think what we're all

what we're all trying to achieve is a

mechanism whereby

the council is going to undertake a

comprehensive the substantial

review as um as swiftly as possible um

so i think that's where we're all trying

to get to anyway

um the the um

i guess the question is to what extent

does any wording here

um change um the

statutory requirement for reviewing uh

plans

um in any event obviously for those

reviews

to be completed no later than five years

from the adoption of a plan as well so

so i guess it's just it's just

understanding how quickly

north west leicestershire could in in

any event having

already started as mr richard says the

process

of the substantial review not formally

we haven't had a reg

18 consultation yet for the um

for the comprehensive review um

so so so it's just understanding how

how the wording here is going to relate

to

other provisions which is the statute

provisions here and anything that might

come out

might come out in the in the white paper

um

because i i understand the predicament

um

this review is needed um within five

years

of the november 17 adoption of the

existing local plan

and in terms of the changing

circumstance that changing circumstance

is this

unmet need that needs to be established

so i'm just thinking how quickly could

that be done anyway really

if we've got some comfort in terms of

the timing of the statement to common

ground

and if mr fox says you know there is

potentially a long stop date in there

that might give that might give some

comfort but but i was just thinking how

much

how critical is the wording here when

you know they're gonna get they're gonna

have to get cracking on it anyway

yeah yeah mr nelson did you want to

comment your hands raised yeah it was

just the

um the comment from mr lee's about not

not been any reg 18 consultation on the

substantive review obviously we

we did start the substantive what is

will become the substantive review

process in february

uh 18 as required by policy s1

we ended up in this situation where we

then had to sort of diverge

between the substantive review and the

partial review

and but certainly the consultation we've

undertaken so far will

it feed into or is part of the

substantive review

okay thank you mr richards

yes just some to make sure that we're

not proceeding on a missile

under a misapprehension of of the law

i i share mr um lisa's enthusiasm for

getting on with it but the requirement

to conduct a review

in the nppf and in regulation 10a

is a requirement to conduct a review

not to complete you

so that the review there ppg makes clear

is um a review to decide whether your

plan needs updating so every five years

you have to decide

whether the plan needs updating this

council's already done that

and said yes it does it needs a

substantive review

so that five year period mentioned in

the nppf is is for that process

it's not five years between adopting one

plan and adopting the next

which is what we thought it would be

when the idea was first floated but in

fact

the um mppf and the ppg

and the regulations say something

different

okay thank you um still got

mr nelson mr pendle's uh hands up did

you

want to say anything else again

yes sorry i just want to go back to what

i what i said earlier on and

probably uh just to sort of correct

something i suppose

uh in policy s1 um as it currently

stands

um it does actually refer to

the district council will work with the

the other authorities to establish the

scale

and distribution of any additional

provision that may be necessary north

west leicestershire

and elsewhere in the housing market area

as a result of the inability of

one or more authority to accommodate its

own needs

so i'm sort of going back again to mr

fox's point so it does recognize

that there there may be a need to

accommodate um

and met needs someone else well than

leicester but then the final part of

that policy does just refer to

uh redistribution from uh from leicester

city

so whether that part needs looking at

but just just to be absolutely clear the

policy does do that anyway

yeah i i think it would be uh helpful

for it to be consistent in that respect

so that that would be something that

would need to be looked at

just so it's clear what the aim of the

policy is

okay um

mr richards was referring to

um what the trigger should be

um i i think the majority of

uh participants here seem to agree

that the statement of common ground is

the appropriate trigger

is that is that correct is uh or have i

misread

uh anybody's comments

so i think that's right it's just

whether there is an additional

backstop i think or other dates referred

to

so um just coming on to

the statement of common ground then um

yeah i mean there was a bit of a

discussion about

what um what the statement of

common ground should include

uh i again i i'm not entirely sure

whether that that is something that this

particular

examination can influence to any greater

extent

i would suggest that's a matter for for

the authorities i i do know

um i think mr lee's you you suggested

uh some things that the statement of

common ground could include like

commitments from

each authority to meet its own housing

needs uh

cumulative figures is that correct is

that what you were suggesting that

yeah it was just uh i guess i was

looking for um

really for the purposes of this

examination potentially having

um because we've got the statement of

common ground which is in support of

this examination uh november 2019 and

then we've got this emerging

statement of common ground between the

authorities in terms of the

redistribution

and clearly where i was really getting

at for the purposes of

for this examination having a a

meaningful

uh an effective um

statement of common ground uh was was

was to have

more detail as part of that same to

common ground for this process

clearly we can't we can't uh um fill it

in and

ascribe the numbers obviously um

there is a significant process to go

through for that but it was just

having a bit more detail about what

that statement of common ground might be

and if that is

an iteration um and if we're moving on

away from a duty to cooperate point

obviously a statement to common ground

is a is a living document

um you know the extent to which um

you know that that is something that

could move on but i appreciate that you

know trying to get all the authorities

to sign it

if it's just for the purposes of this

examination whilst the main focus is on

the meaningful statement of common

ground if i can put it like that uh

i understand the problems with that so

so

i think it's a bit much to ask for um

for that to happen

in any reasonable time frame for the

purposes of

this this examination but yeah

some comfort however it's presented as

part of the examination in terms of what

that

future statement of common ground will

contain and

time period within which it is likely

what they're aiming towards i appreciate

there's politics there's a

huge amount of politics involved in

agreeing to a redistribution of housing

need as well as all the uh

sustainability appraisal work so

i appreciate it's a lot to be gone

through but if we can be given some

some comfort as to um what it's going to

include in

time scales without it being a sign

statement of common ground that would be

i think very helpful to give the

participants

to this examination and yourself madam

um some comfort about

putting in a lunch potentially a long

stop back date

um as part of the wording for this

policy okay

thank you oh i'll come mr pendle you've

got your hand up still is that

a new comment you want to make or is

that

um it is mom i mean i i hovered over

reacting to your question about whether

or not everyone was agreed

that it would be a statement of common

ground and i don't want to be the jonah

here who says no

um but but my point about the content of

it you know

is is written largely in my mind and

certainly

you know mr lee's has just run through

very definitely some of the reasons

you know that i certainly agree with for

that

and i suppose it's trying to tread a

fine line

between what we may ordinarily expect

of a local planet examination and

obviously in this case

north west leicestershire

versus power 11b of the mppf

and how we reconcile unmet needs from

neighbouring authorities

when we're testing a local plan

soundness um

and clearly you know mr inspector sims

went through that um journey went on

that journey

in very similar circumstances and

arrived at the trigger

um and there was a backstop you know if

i cut the story short

you know i agree mr mr lee's has very

you know

carefully just said the comfort would

come from the backstop that's where

inspector sims

arrived at and i think probably i

i would find support from others on the

screen

in the room if i said if it was left to

a statement to common ground which may

or may not

take place to work out what should

happen with them that need

you know we already know there isn't

that need um

and for that to then set the clock

ticking that would be not that would not

be enough to encourage the partners to

work together

okay well we'll come back on to what the

the backstop

might be um just just shortly but

mr nelson you had your hand up and then

i'd like to come to mr thornhill i think

just to

talk about the process that we're going

through in terms of the statement of

common ground

it may well be that i accidentally cover

some of that um if i do apologies

yeah it was just to make the point that

um paragraph 2.5 of the

um joint state position statement that

was

uh published on on monday

is very clear there about um what the

unmet need is for both housing and

employment

um and also it does give uh some idea

of of of what the times table is for uh

for for getting that all agreed so the

sort of

information that people said is needed

is is now there in that joint position

statement

thank you um and then in that case

uh mr thornhill does does it does

the the joint position statement does

that provide the basis for

uh the statement of common ground will

it

slow from it will it say similar things

or will it provide more detail have you

got any idea of

what the contents of the statement of

common ground will be

yeah the content that will be quite

simple is just getting the evidence

together to support that in my mind it

will be a simple table

which will set out the uh the the

housing

targets for for each of the authorities

basically with the unmet need

redistributed as part of that um

we've mentioned we've discussed about

flexibility in that so

there's probably a discussion that we

need to have internally amongst the

authorities about how we can build in

some flexibility to that if leicester

need uh changes within a reasonable

range you know could could we agree a

range instead of a specific number

um we're not at the point where where

where we've discussed that in any detail

and know the answer to that

but obviously the duty to cooperate is

ongoing anyway so there's only a certain

degree of flexibility

um you can build in um and if things

change dramatically then we'll obviously

have to do

um a new statement of common ground that

responds to that so

in my mind this is an ongoing

never-ending

process really um we're at the start of

it now

um or towards the start of it given

the situation that we're in that with

the emerging situation as we've

discussed

um but i think

that you mentioned the backstop there i

think we just need to be careful

um if if if mom you're minded to go down

that route

that we we don't assume um

that um that leicester will have an

unmet need

because we don't what i don't want to do

is start the clock

like like like we've got with uh with

the situation at the moment where it was

assumed

leicester would have an unmet need and

it would be dealt with in a specific

time

we've discussed the emerging housing

figures

um which the government's consulting on

at the moment not as part of the white

paper the

the changes to the current planning

system consultation and the changes to

the standard method there

if the government was to adopt that in

two

three months time there may not be an

unmet need

um to deal with so if we've got a

trigger that's linked specifically to

leicester's unmet need or the timing of

leicester's plan

then northwest leicestershire might find

themselves in a similar situation where

they've got uh

a trigger that that set the clock

running

and they've got to submit a plan for an

event that hasn't actually happened

so i'm not saying that a backstop isn't

possible

we just need to be careful we don't

repeat what happened

um last time basically we we're where

we're pre-judging

what's going to happen when we don't

actually know if you

i mean it needs to be a more a more

general backstop i would suggest if

you're minded to go down that route

okay and the the wider statement of

common ground

that is intended at the moment just to

deal with less

assuming that there is an unmet need for

leicester it's just going to deal with

that and not any potential from

any other authorities so there might

need to be other mechanisms

to deal with that yeah we've got a

really very complex situation here

because

we've got an authority particularly

charm wood looking to submit a plan

uh relatively early in 2021

so there are transition arrangements at

the moment in the

in the current consultation um

to to change the standard method where

if the government bring that standard

method in there's then

three months to submit a plan um and so

charm would and possibly leicester could

quite easily but

be submitting a plan in those transition

arrangements

so even if the new standard methods

brought in

um in the next month or two

there's a strong possibility that that

one or possibly two plans

will be submitted under those transition

arrangements based on the current

standard method

in that scenario we end up in a sort of

a parallel universe where we have an

unmet need

for leicester that only exists for

charmwood's local plan

and nobody else so so you can see how it

gets

very very complicated very quickly

depending on what the government do um

so

there's a huge um push

to get this statement of common ground

over the line come what may

because it's likely that at least one

authority

will be submitting a local plan based on

these need figures

that we know about at the moment and an

unmet need in leicester

but other authorities and the north west

leicestershire

substantive review may well go through

um in a different situation um their

plans likely to go to 2039

not 2036 and obviously we're dealing

with a situation here

up to 2036 their current plan

that we're that we're involved with here

is to 2031

and leicester's unmet need to 2031 is

only around 1800 homes according to

their trajectory published on monday

so um there's a whole set of complex

um scenarios that that can emerge um so

i just think it's important whatever we

do with the trigger

um and if there is a backstop um

that it that it's linked to um

events i mean in my mind in my mind the

the mppf provides the solution anyway in

terms of

it requires authorities to carry out a

review

and to to establish whether they need to

whether their plans out of date

effectively and whether they need to

update the plan

so i think i think the mechanisms in the

mppf

um in my mind as it is um

whether whether we want to go further in

terms of specific wording in the plan

um is obviously not a discussion for me

but um but but that's a matter for her

for yourself

can i can i just like a couple of uh

participants have mentioned charnwood

that

john would uh as far as i understand it

are aren't intending to meet uh any

other need

except their own is that correct at this

stage

at this stage the the their plan hasn't

been based on meeting

uh unmet need um but obviously that's

um that's yet to be decided through this

process

so um so it's not the process hasn't

been

been finished or completed but i suppose

they were in a similar situation to

most authorities that have adopted plans

um

over the last few years in that they've

been progressing a plan but we haven't

had a quantified

need for leicester that's obviously

recently come to the forum that the

consultation's happening at the moment

okay thank you i've got a number of

people with their hands up so i'll come

to

mr nelson first and then mr richards and

then uh others

yeah it's just to pick up on that a

point about john wood

um i don't think you'd be too surprised

to hear that we

we we did pick up uh what they'd said in

their local plan and expressed

our surprised shall we say that they

were making what seemed to be a

unilateral decision

and but my understanding is it was uh it

wasn't intended

to be them them to be saying that they

are not going to take any on that need

from leicester it's just that at that

point in time

they weren't required to because

obviously as we've said that

uh that the level of unmet need and the

discussions about how that was

redisputed hadn't been

hadn't been undertaken okay so that that

might evolve then

depending on the signing of the

statement to common ground or not or

agreement

uh mr richards

yes ma'am can i just i just thought it

might be helpful because i'm not clear

what is meant by backstop when people on

the screen are talking about

there needs to be a backstop at the

moment

there is um the date of the statement of

common ground

and then there is a a requirement

to submit within 18 months of that

beyond that is there any need for a

further

trigger or is the reference to a

backstop

what i what i call the consequences i

can understand that

people on the screen are keen that the

substantive review should progress

and if the council doesn't progress it

sufficiently swiftly

or with sufficient energy then quite

obviously

what they want to achieve is the

engagement of the tilted balance

that that's that's the practical outcome

everybody is quite happy and led system

to

work but what they want is some comfort

that if it doesn't work

to their satisfaction then the tilted

balance will be engaged

but um why do you need anything more

than that which already exists in

paragraph 11d of the framework

yeah i mean i i have to say i my sense

of what people were saying when they

this talking about the backstop was a

number of people have

referred again to the plan being out of

date

if you if you have a deeming out of date

provision

sorry i was talking overview if you have

a deeming out of date provision that

takes us back to where we are now

otherwise paragraph 11d in the framework

is is perfectly clear

if as a matter of planning judgment a

decision taker

being be it the council's committee or

an inspector on a section 78 appeal

decides that the council has not been

moving along sufficiently swiftly

that decision taker can say as a matter

of planning judgment i think this plans

out

sufficient progress and with its

replacement is not being made

and therefore i'm going to apply the

tilted balance

and and no doubt um that might be the

subject of arguments

against a known factual background in a

future section 78 appeal or planning

committee meeting

but for you to try and predict that into

the future

is fraught with difficulty in a plan

making context in my respectful

submission

thank you yeah that that's what i was

going to say anyway

i i yeah we were we're going to be back

in the same position that we

we are now i think it would that's my

sense anyway with the

with uh some of the suggestions about

the plan being out of date

uh mrs french sorry you've been waiting

patiently for a while

what what would you like to say hi thank

you

um a couple of points really um i think

i'm a simple planner and i like to

see things very simply ultimately i

think what we're

trying to achieve is that

the required number of houses within the

housing market area

are delivered in the most sustainable

locations and

turning to mr richardson's mr richardson

point

um i think the backstop will provide

certainty so that everyone can

understand

what other consequences if this happens

or if that happens

and i think the way that these plans

have evolved the statement of common

ground

is a is a good point of reference but

it might change it might be something

else and having another reference

would allow for that change to happen so

it wouldn't necessarily

have to be the statement of common

ground it could be you know the

um the sustainability appraisal or

something else that comes forward

and provides the indication of

where the houses are needed and when

they need to be provided

so so when you're referring to a

backstop and when others

are what is it that is in your mind when

you're saying

back what is a backstop for you what

does that mean

for me what i would like and what i'd

like to be able to tell my clients

is um is is when

when that plan or when those numbers are

going to come out basically that's

that's what i want to know i think that

it will provide and

some form of clarity for the whole of

the leicestershire

area and um and i think it will

provide a focus of when that could

happen

okay and at the moment that seems to me

that the statement of common ground

is currently the only vehicle for for

the numbers

uh and where they'll be distributed if

if that is the case i would agree at the

moment i think

that is the document that we're all

looking at or looking for

um but that might not be the case in the

future

okay thank you mr lees

thank you madam and yeah there's a

couple of um

people have spoken since i put my hand

up there's a couple of um

perhaps things i'd like to respond to in

one go um i think firstly from

from mr richard's point of view uh um

we haven't got a date for the statement

of common ground so

the whole timing process of undertaking

a review is established common ground

and there's no date for for the signing

of that

um or the agreement if that's just that

it will be agreed

and obviously it's pertinent your your

next question uh i think 6b

is what's the implications if the same

to common ground it isn't agreed

um mr nelson alluded to a few times

about the plan led system

and the need for a plan led system um

you know we need to be planning

for the housing requirements of the

housing market area

as a whole so each plan needs to set

a housing requirement figure that takes

into account

dealing with the housing needs of the

hma

as a whole that's what we all want to

see um

and therefore you know any issue in

terms of

uh um looking at the the relevance of of

of policies and plans and so forth

is so well and good if you're looking to

make an appeal but

the bottom line is we want we want

up-to-date plans that meet the housing

need

so it's all about getting plans in place

for me that's meeting the housing need

which brings me back to the

this this uh same to common ground uh um

and i was interested to hear uh mr

thornhill talking about that and mr

nelson

i was i was comforted by what mr nelson

said in an earlier session about it will

have some flexibility in there

in terms of potentially looking at a

range and that the sustainability

appraisal will test a range

of figures because on the one hand once

we're keen to get this agreed

and so each authority has a figure to

work with

the nervousness is obviously things that

things always change

and and how quickly is that figure then

going to become out of date

so what would be interested for yourself

madam from

is is from mr thornhill is is to

understand

the potential for that statement of

common ground

to to deal with potential different

scenarios

once we've got a figure which is the

base figure we can work on from

leicester city now just over 7 000

houses

if we have a range either side of that

figure

which is agreed within the statement of

common ground you know that may

you know lee tony is having one

statement to common ground and we

haven't

go back and revisit that in six months

time because it's

because it's out of date um so it's just

understanding the

the ability for that statement to common

ground to include some

flexibility to take account of potential

future changes

now as part of that one statement to

common ground because trying to go and

agree this

politically and through sustainability

appraisal is

very difficult again i don't envy mr

thornhill's task in terms of trying to

do that

as well so if you can build that in and

you can nail it with each of the

authorities once

um you know if it's this we'll accept

this but you know if it's a percentage

or something then

clearly that's going to help help

everybody moving forward and therefore

each planned process hasn't then got to

be halted or weight

pending the signing of a new sex um

statement to common ground

everybody can crack on effectively which

will be a good place to be

for everybody i think across uh across

leicestershire

okay okay thank you i'll come back to mr

thornhill i have a question for him in a

moment

uh miss green you you wanted to say

something

yes it was it was answering answering

the question of

what why are we talking about um

the need for a long stop date

and i think that the origin of that is

that if you read the policy

it says that the submission of a

replacement local plan will take place

within 18 months of the date at which

the

statement of common ground is agreed by

all the authorities

and i think that what's concerned

participants is

that but what happens if

it's never agreed if the statement of

common ground is never agreed

then there isn't a date from which

you measure 18 months on from to

submission and that that has been a

concern

because um as we've said we've we've

been

in this situation for a number of years

and we keep being told

that you know the statement of common

ground is being prepared and it will be

signed

and we've never reached a point of

actually seeing that

and therefore you know our faith is

dwindling

that um that it will get agreed

um and if it doesn't get agreed then

there is there is no time frame um and

that that is what has concerned

um parties around the table and that is

why

we have put forward the commentary that

we feel that there needs to be um

another date

a long stop date by which submission of

the substantive review

shouldn't go um and also while

why we've brought up conversations about

the fact that

there should be um some consequence

um so that that's that's where the

origin of

the discussion about um longest update

derives from is the fact that

and i think i'm i may have jumped ahead

on the the agenda because i think we

have

there is a question about what does

agree mean and disagree mean signed

etcetera

um but but that that's that's the the

origin really of why

we have been pushing for um an alternate

date

in case it isn't agreed and what would

your alternate date be

um well i mean we had the same

discussion at that the harbor

examination and as people have said this

afternoon

a lot of these clauses um are

um are are of their time of what was

happening at that point

and at that point it was um as has been

said it was all very focused on unmet

needing

in leicester city um as we've said that

things are evolving that that may no

longer be the case looking

looking forward um but i think possibly

as

a long stop date um i think mr richards

perhaps i don't know if it was

tongue-in-cheek but he did suggest what

was it the 22nd of december

2022 yeah

now you may say well that was a

tongue-in-cheek

comment but i think has also been

clarified

um that would be around about the date

that the council should have been

looking to

see whether they needed to do a review

in sense of their plan being updated but

as mr riches has said that doesn't mean

that they would at that point

have submitted a replacement plan for

examination

so perhaps putting that in as a date

is actually saying well we will have

submitted

a replacement plan not just

as in as set out in the mppf we will be

thinking about whether we need to be

doing a review of our plan

okay thank you i mean that that does go

further than uh

the the other plans a lot of the other

plans to try tied to

have certain triggers don't they and

uh again you know just looking at harbor

as it was 12 months

of leicester city's reg 19 plan being

submitted um or within six months of the

statement of common ground i suppose

whichever is earlier

all monitoring so there are a number of

triggers there i'm not sure

um whether a specific date

would be helpful but mr nelson can you

just comment on that

yes thank you uh yeah i was just going

to come back and say yeah you're quite

right in terms of the harbor plan

because that

is about when the review is to commence

we are

already in that review the review the

substantive review

you know is ongoing we have started that

process

um and in effect it was policy s1 that

required us to do that anyway

and that's always been the problem i've

had is when people have been talking

about um

additional sort of triggers uh and again

i might be jumping ahead slightly

to the on the agenda but uh i think a

number of people have made references

to uh if there's been a significant

change as a result of say

changes to the standard method but again

that's about triggering

a review that is a review process that

we've already started

what we're talking of here is is

something different it is about an

end date yeah just just looking further

down the

the tables uh odby and harbor both have

their

uh have a period within which the review

should be submitted

for examination for it would be its 24

months

and uh harbor 30 months

so is that that's similar to your 18

months isn't it

from the statement of common ground yes

and the reason why we we put in 18

months was

um is that we recognized that the

process

had already started so certainly you

know 30 months

such as was agreed at harbor would

i would have to concede be unreasonable

um so

but where's 18 months seem more

reasonable

okay thank you we'll come back on that

mr pendleton do you want to say

something

yeah thank you mom and that that's

really helpful from from mr nelson

i think um and i sort of

see on the one hand um a comment that

you know local plan can be out of date

by virtue of the mppf

review every five years ms green's

cleverly made the point consider whether

to review it every five years

you know that's probably been noted by

all of us but on the one hand there's

that

um the potential for that to happen

in other words no need for a trigger

policy at all actually because

you could stand back and say the mppf

takes care of it

um on the other hand mr thornhill

has suggested that there's a whole host

of different things that could happen

here and play out

and certainly the melton

and harbor policies include a number of

clauses

for a variety of different things that

could take place that could lead them to

need to do a review

and so on the other hand you know you go

from the mppf taking care of it to

actually trying to cover all your bases

potentially within a

trigger policy and of course that's very

difficult that that's very difficult

to achieve because where do you stop um

i i minded you know i mentioned mr

nelson's

suggestions very helpful 30 months would

would you know be unreasonable 18 months

is more akin or more aligned to

harborough and melton um

and far be it from me to say what the

answer is and i know you might ask me

mom

and and i i would struggle to answer

this question because this is a question

for

the partners you know where you've got

local plans which

are out of step with each other there's

the potential for the unmet need to be

passed around

like past the parcel every single

examination

and never get dealt with because either

there's no appetite from the authority

that's currently examination

um or there is no agreed position um

across the partnership

now you know plenty of examinations have

explored that haven't they

and and you know i'll say it potential

issues with you to cooperate

in that matter and not being due to to

agree but the reason i mention mr

nelson's comment being very helpful is

because it's possible

for the partners to arrive at a view

when they think they should have an

understanding of where their algorithm

met need

so that there can be some form of

alignment in in local plans

and to prevent unmet need from being

passed around

each examination always with a

potentially a trigger policy and it

never being resolved because it's not

pertinent to that examination

um and that leads me back to the comment

i made earlier about

power 11b and and whether or not you

know this is a question

clearly for you for you to answer mom

and i i'm not going to answer it

but under power 11b whether or not it's

possible given the circumstances that

we've got

to seal off the trigger policy

examine that now without having any

regard to

the reasons that it existed and simply

move forwards or whether actually under

power 11b we have an issue

an issue for this albeit partial review

but a review that will result in a full

replacement local plan as mr nelson

mentioned earlier

um so so i say these things to try and

be helpful

i i appreciate that quite difficult

things to wrestle

which is one of the reasons why i say um

helpful for mr nelson but something for

the partners to

to consider there yeah i mean

the the position that we are in as as

far as i understand it and i'm taking it

is that the the substantial review has

already

commenced so we're not i

i'm i'm not looking for triggers that

relate to a

review commencing because they already

have for

for me i think the important thing is is

this is a submission

um when the intended submission is

um and you know i think that

um whether the

statement of common ground is is the

right trigger

or not it seems to be the general

agreement that

whatever it's called um it's it's the

only thing that

uh is that is going to be agreed by the

party

assuming that they all agree but uh is

is leading us in the right direction mr

nelson and i do

i do need to come back to mr thornhill

but mr nelson

i'm just going to throw something out

there um

and i i'm not wanting to prejudge what

you may or may not decide in terms of

this review

but it is is this is adoption shall we

say of

this partial review by the council

another possible

it's something that is obviously within

the council's full control

we we want to get this partial review

adopted

for the reasons we've set out about

ensuring that we have an up-to-date

development plan that we can continue to

rely upon

i just wonder whether i don't know is

that say another option

as well as sustain the common ground

whichever is

the earlier the sooner whatever however

we decided but i'm just throwing out out

for debate more than anything else

okay thank you yeah i'd need you to give

some thought then to how that might look

in terms of

a modification um

just just to get a sense of of what it

might mean for the policy um

so we'll come i i i'm going to ask you

to do a list

of actions uh following on from the

discussion today so that i think that

would

form part of it um

mr thornhill um you have

kind of raised a few issues about the

statement of common ground

what it's likely to take form what's it

what it's likely to take the form of

uh where you are with a sustainability

appraisal

i'm just wondering whether it'd be

helpful if you could set that out in a

very

very brief note for me um just so i have

something in writing um to refer

to that that could be in front of uh all

the parties it doesn't have to be long

but just set out

um uh the the kind of processes that you

you have in mind all the um the group

have in mind the task and finish group

do you think is that a reasonable

request yeah

no that's fine yeah it's quite a it's

just a simple

um what would just be a handful of

bullet points basically the stages where

we're at and then

and where we've got to get to is that

okay yeah that's that's fine yeah it

doesn't have to

to be a complicated note just to set out

um

some of the kind of key matters that

you'll be dealing with

i mean mr mr lee's referred to we don't

have a date for the

the wider statement of common ground but

that

is not correct in as i thought

you in the joint position statement you

have got a date for completion in early

2021.

is that pressure yeah and clearly the

key driver here is

um i think the partners recognize that

when you've got a quantified unmet need

in the housing market area

um and the strengthening of the of the

duty to cooperate that's happened in uh

uh over the last sort of couple of years

with the new mppf

it's gonna be very difficult now i think

for authorities to

to get a local plan through not having

dealt with this

properly so um so i think we're in a

slightly different world to

to the past where we didn't know what it

was authorities were able to put trigger

for reviewing

um and uh and get plans through to

adoption

we've now got a figure um and and

clearly

one of the key drivers for this is the

charm with local plant which is a

you know very advanced stage um so

they're going to need

as the statement of common ground for

their local plan

for the when they submit us essentially

so um

so so that's the that's the driver is

with the circumstances have changed

really

and um the the phrase well the word in

uh the joint position statement says for

completion

um north west leicestershire have

referred to

uh agreement and i think leicester city

council have

uh also suggested that it should be

signed by the parties as well so i'm

just

trying to understand what what the

difference is if

if there is any from from your

perspective anyway

um

yeah i i i don't know is the answer to

that i don't there's nothing they're not

it's not intended to mean something

different

i suppose it's just three words that

mean something very similar isn't it

so in my mind there's no

um i suppose there could of course be a

scenario where

the authority where the authorities or

an authority doesn't agree to it

um that that wouldn't be unusual in um

you know nationally that's happened in

other areas it could happen here i'm not

suggesting it will do for a moment

but um uh but yeah that that that is a

scenario that

that could of course emerge yeah if if

that was the case would

uh would that prevent the whole the

statement of common ground not being

signed by anybody or would it just be

that

that some wouldn't sign um

well i mean i think in that context that

um

the authorities that agreed with it

would obviously sign up to it and those

that weren't signed up wouldn't be part

of it

you know if it was one or two

authorities for example that weren't

signed up for any particular reason then

then that obviously affects their

ability to meet the duty to cooperate

um through their planning process so um

so it's complex and it's and it's two

way but um

but i don't see i think it would be

a big risk for for any authority not to

not to sign up to uh to a statement of

common ground dealing with this because

when it's their turn um to submit a plan

uh or progress their local plan then um

then they then end up with uh with

challenging issues around duty to

cooperate

thank you i'll come to you in a moment

mr nelson mr decosta

you wanted to say something yeah um

yes as mr thornton says it's a little

bit complex but i think our comments

were

i guess clarity and really what does

what's the difference between agreed and

signed what weight does an agree

agreement have compared to a document

with actually

signed by all authorities which in our

opinion holds more weight than something

that which is just agreed and i think

the draft policy we're suggesting the

draft policy as it is should

should contain something which says

agreed and signed by all authorities

um to hold more weight really and

particularly as we've got to take it

through our politicians as well

i think that's that's you know um

that that that is something that we've

done in the past and note that for i

think the november

2019 northwest um

statement of common ground was signed by

all all authorities agreed and signed by

all authorities so it's just been

consistent as well

okay but if if it's um if it's not

if it's not signed or not agreed by all

authorities

if you if you're referring to all of the

authorities if it's not

then that doesn't engage the trigger

um yeah so that that i think that would

be

my concern um mr nelson

do you want to say anything

uh yeah i mean i'll i'll come back on on

that point and i think we've said it out

in our response to this this

uh question that you you set us earlier

on in the year

um that's partly our concern is that you

know what

what if not every authority signs um

i'm not saying this is likely well first

of all i'm not saying that it's likely

to happen i've got no reason to think it

would but

let's assume one or even more

authorities didn't sign where would that

leave us in terms of plan particularly

if somebody wanted to

um shall we say make mischief so we

you know we decided no we were going to

carry on on the basis of the statement

of common ground that was agreed by

six or seven of the authorities whatever

somebody might want to make some

mischief to say well you shouldn't be

doing that

because it wasn't signed by all of the

authorities um and that that was the

concern we had

um i noticed actually in the uh harbor

trigger interestingly enough that that

refers to or that their policy

that actually refers to i believe

um the adoption by the council of an mou

or statement to common ground

which proposes a quantity of housing or

employment development

to 2031 that is significantly greater

than the housing requirement or

employment need identifying this local

plan

whether that provides a potential basis

and again i know we're talking about

another modification there but

just on reflecting on on looking at that

and again you've got the there is a

comfort there that

the adoption is by the council it is in

their control

so you're suggesting the the adoption

could you could you adopt that is that

something got to prove

yeah i it probably approved might be um

might be a more suitable word than adopt

because the doctors tend to have some

quite legal

specific legal um understanding

to it the other point i was just going

to

to make is going back what mr thornhill

was saying is

uh and i'm sure you'll correct me if i'm

wrong here but in terms of process

the task and finnish group are charged

with leading on the work on the

state of common ground and

redistribution once we have

that agreement at that level it would be

referred up to the

strategic planning group and then on to

the

member advisory group and thereafter

each because the member advisory group

doesn't have decision making powers that

was

that was how it's set up it would then

be for each authority

to ratify through their own internal

processes

okay and that's where the signing would

would come in

yeah certainly that's what happened with

the the

our statement to common ground um the

difference was there a lot of

authorities had delegated authority to

deal with that

something like this is most certainly

not i would imagine for most authorities

i know certainly for us for example it

will need to go to our fourth council

okay thank you mr fox you wanted to add

something

yes thank you mom just just a minor

point we just add on from mr nelson i

think

that that very same wording is also set

out for for melton

from matt melton's local plan it says

the adoption by the council of the

strategic growth plan

um and the memorandum of understanding

okay thank you that helps we'll come on

to the strategic

growth plan in a minute mr costa did you

want to say anything else

uh your hands still raised sorry sorry

no

i didn't want to say anything else thank

you thank you

did anybody want to make any further

points um in relation to the

the triggers i um

it seems like we've been through most of

the points

um the

so look just looking at this list uh the

only one that has a similar approach in

the

as to the current policy s1 is the

odb and wigston um

police policy which refers to i think

it's the policies being or relevant

policies in the review being out of date

um the position uh

that that's assuming that that's a

partial review i'm assuming if it's full

review then all the policies would be

out of date and it would be a similar

position

uh that exists here um

is is any are any parties still

suggesting that there should be a

provision

of the plan or policies being deemed out

of date

if the target for submission is missed

anybody want to comment on that

so um

mr nelson are you able to fill in that

final uh final blank column

on that statement of common ground

triggers or at least

something that um represents the

discussion that we've had today i

i think it's worth pointing out as well

obviously triggers for the review

itself aren't necessarily relevant

because it triggers

because the trigger's already taken

place

um but whether their

their scope for including in in that

final column the discussions that we've

had in terms of

possible changes to the policy

does that does that make sense yeah i

mean i think i

i think i just probably just need a

little bit of guidance as to

the specific points that you're thinking

of just so i don't miss them

yeah i think we'd um just need to go

back

through them because a number of points

were made

so um

uh there was the issue of the statement

of common ground

covering uh other unmet need

and ensuring consistency in the policy

in that respect

um your column says no for generic needs

but

from what you said the policy does cover

it it's just that the final paragraph

just focuses solely on leicester

yeah so it's really that final paragraph

i think

yeah um the statement of common ground

we now have a date

of some sort so um

whether that needs to be specifically

referred to in the policy or supporting

text because obviously the

program might change i mean how set is

the program mr thornhill

i seem fairly certain that there's an

urgency with it in relation to charm

wood

so you're unmuted

apologies yeah so so the the program for

that is

is set as far as it can be but obviously

with so many parties involved in getting

agreement through individual governance

processes

um there's there's nine governance

processes to go through so

so that's where the uncertainty around

uh i suppose precise states comes from

um i i suppose there is a there is a

scenario though that um if the

government

does publish its standard method in its

current form then um

then there won't be you know in

leicester

so the the there probably will be a

statement of common ground of some sorts

but it won't be dealing with

an unmet need potentially um so

i think that's why the trigger really

needs to refer to

uh the statement of common ground and a

bit like harbour

trigger policy does it refers to a

statement of common ground

identifying an unmet need that that

leads to a

significantly different figure for

harbor

or north west leicestershire because

there is a

there could obviously be uh a scenario

where northwest leicestershire don't

need to meet any of leicester's unmet

need at all

so so again there wouldn't be a reason

for all of a sudden for

for ripping the the plan up so to speak

and um

and starting again that they might still

be in a position where

the the plan's up to date so um

so yeah sorry that that's probably more

questions than answers there but but

yeah in terms of the time

in terms of the timetable for the

statement of common ground that that's

that's fairly strongly embedded

um because of the the imperatives of

imminent local plan submissions

basically yeah i mean that that's an

important point about whether

uh whether it's uh whether it is

uh whether northwest leicestershire is

having to to meet

meet the needs um just uh

looking back to the um

to to whether that could be included in

the

um reference to generic uh unmet needs

as well

should that be the case

um i i think i think referring to

i think where where we've got an unmet

need in the housing market area

and where that leads to where that

leads to northwest leicestershire's

housing figure

changing significantly uh above what

it's got in its plan

to 2031 then then clearly a review

of the of the plan will be needed

if northwest leicestershire isn't

picking up any of leicester's met need

i'm not saying that's that or that will

be the case

but but it is something that could

happen or if leicester's unmet need

disappears

because of the changes to the standard

method

then again what why would northwest

leicester's plan

become out of date and and need an

immediate

review okay thank you and unless

unless obviously the their their own

housing need increases significantly

um in which case they'd have a cliff

edge

in november 2022 anyway because the

five-year supply

cliff edge would kick in at that point

and and the local housing

and that their policies would be deemed

out of date um unless they were

miraculously able to find a significant

number of homes in that in that period

okay thank you uh mr fox you wanted to

say something

yes thank you just wanted to add one

more one more point i think it's

probably something we haven't really

touched on but we've also been focused

quite a lot on housing

and the generics or housing unmet needs

across the

hma but i think it's important we don't

lose sight of the

strategic ba needs um which is going to

be an important element of the

of the substantive review um

and i know that the previous plan there

was a

strategic distribution study which

identified a need across the whole of

the

fema which is similar to the hma

and there's another study has been

updated and i think it's close to being

completed but

i think it's just important that policy

s1

um in terms of the the sort of generic

needs

it's important it doesn't just focus on

housing it needs to be

cognizant of sort of strategic

especially logistics

yeah requirements yeah we'll discuss

that to some extent tomorrow as well but

yeah just looking at the joint position

statement obviously that does

identify an uh an employment land need

as well

so um yeah um the

the policy would need to to cover that

uh if it's

identified obviously that north west

lester is somewhere that that

that need is met uh mr nelson

yes i mean it's just to say that in in

terms of the certainly the unmet need

from leicester city on employment

uh at the time that the the policy the

draft policy was being prepared and

indeed submitted

we we weren't aware of an unmet leader

we weren't notified by that until i

think it was march time

but yes certainly it would

any issue of unmet need would be housing

or employment

okay and does the policy specifically

say that or would that need an

additional

change

just

yeah just talked about met needs uh i'm

within the housing market area okay it's

housing market area

which is the same thing as the the femur

but now you just talked about unmet need

so i'm not sure it does need to

necessarily say anything else

is it worth referring to to the the

femur as well um just to

be certain yeah perhaps stay hma slash

fema

okay so that was a another alteration

potentially and you also have referred

mr nelson to the

adoption of the partial review of it as

a another trigger

um i think

uh if you could draw up some wording in

relation to that

um

i think that's all i've got and then

there was a note from

mr thornhill

we uh perhaps just were saying now we

were looking at the policy earlier on

uh just in discussion internally and

within the policy

as as it's currently proposed um

just before the the the insertion of the

the bill about the standard common

ground um

where it talks about the result of uh

inability of one or more authority to

accommodate

its own needs as identified in the

leicester and leicestershire housing

economic development needs assessment

i actually think it's probably useful to

just take that out

um and i think that picks up to some

extent on the point that leicester city

um because actually the unmet needs

might not be to do with the head and it

might be to do with the standard method

it might be do

to do with another piece of evidence

that nobody's aware of at the moment

yeah yeah i think that that would be

uh that would be sensible on that basis

um i did want to come back to

question 6b and um the

the timetables the timing so

if the statement of common ground was

agreed

uh early in 2021 how does that

affect your replacement local plan being

in place by november

2022

um yeah it depends exactly what you mean

by in place i suppose but if we're

talking of submission

um i suspect there's not a huge

difference

being realistic you know we're talking

early

21 so february sort of march time

18 months take you through to august

september 22

um and november 22 in terms of the local

planet five being five years old so it's

not a huge difference

but virtually the same okay

no big impact there yeah and

just thinking about if you were to go

with um adoption of this

partial review whilst i haven't looked

at it in any

great detail um i do know for example

that we have a council

in february of next year um

that may be that may just be possible um

so again we're on sort of similar

uh time frames okay

um does anybody else have any points to

make in terms of the triggers the time

scales

dealing with question six six to six c

that we haven't covered uh at all or you

just want to make an additional

point i just want to be certain that

everybody's had

had had their say and that we've not

missed any points that you made

no

um is everybody happy just to continue

on to

question seven uh we've we have been

going for an hour and a half but uh is

everybody happy just to carry on for a

few moments

yeah okay i just seen see miss miss

green have a sip of water

it's quite warm this afternoon so

does anybody need a comfort break or to

cool down no

okay so um question seven relates to

uh other emerging plans or plans such as

the strategic growth plan which have the

potential to impact on the statement of

common ground

or the substantive review

might be helpful to understand a little

bit more about the strategic growth plan

i think

a couple of participants or

representatives have suggested that the

policy

should refer specifically to the growth

plan um

but it'd be helpful to understand a

little bit more about its status

where it sits in terms of the planning

framework for the area

mr nelson would you be the person to

answer that or would that be mr

thornhill

uh i can i can certainly start on that

uh so the strategic growth plan

is is already in place it was approved

by the

various local authorities i'm hoping

this is where ms thornhill might come

and he might have the uh

more exact date but it it it is in place

it has been agreed

um it is an informal plan it's not it's

not a statutory plan

although we did try to uh mimic as much

as possible the process for doing

a statutory plan but for example it

wasn't subject to examination

but it was but it was subject to a

sustainability appraisal

and its intention was to first of all

set out a long-term

vision strategy up to 2050 and

set out some quite ambitious uh growth

targets

and it was to provide a a framework for

for local plan preparation so for

example

uh in terms of the substantive review

which we we're currently engaged in

uh we're already looking to sort of a

2039

sort of end date and we're looking at

how we can take on board

um the the strategy in the strategic

growth plan

so and you'll see it made reference to a

number of representations about the

leicestershire international gateway

which is uh

not a is certainly not a defined area

but it covers the northern part of

northwest leicestershire and charnwood

and up to 2050 it identifies that there

is potential to accommodate about 11

000 new homes in that area so for

example

the work we're doing on the substantive

review is looking

at a number of strategic developments

that have been put forward to us

through our sheila process uh in the

northern part of the district and i

think i referred earlier on to

today to the fact we've had an

infrastructure study done to look at

what that might mean so that's that's

how the strategic growth plan

would be sort of taken into account in

as part of the substantive review

so so just just to then say so

um again a lot of the discussion has

been about triggers

but the growth plan is already in place

okay so it's already in place and

it's informing the work that you're

doing for for the substantive review

did anybody want to make any points

about the strategic growth plan

i know a number of of you have done um

if anybody want to say yes mrs french

thank you madam and i i just like to say

really

and that i feel the strategic growth

plan

is quite important although it doesn't

have the statutory

um status i think it's quite important

for identifying

infrastructural needs and in the longer

term

and i think it's evolved from where it

started

but um it is important to make sure that

development doesn't preclude future

development in

in strategic areas okay and and

would it be your suggestion to include a

reference to it then in

within the policy or supporting text

i i think it would be helpful given that

it doesn't have any formal status

but i don't think it's the end of the

world if it's not there

okay all right thank you uh if if you

were to suggest

somewhere for it um

where would that go if you had a any

thoughts about where you think

the reference should be should it be

within the policy itself or

supporting text background

i would say supporting text but um i

haven't

specifically thought about that okay

thank you

thank you mr pendle

thank you mom um i don't know about

other people's screens on my screen mr

thornhill has frozen

um and i'm i'm he may or may not be

there of course

um the comments about the growth plan

already being done um mr thornhill has

uh you know told us that there's a

never-ending task here

um and clearly there will be other

iterations of the

growth plan the current growth plan of

course deals with hedner and we've

we've had a conversation mr nelson

suggested that wording associated with

the

partner is is taken out of the policy um

because it's part of a past regime

and of course we're now standard method

and an emerging standard method

um that leads me to think that the

strategic growth plan that is adopted

um has you know

it has a certain shelf life um i i agree

with

miss french it's very good at

painting a picture of the future and

what that future may

look like in terms of strategic growth

and strategic infrastructure

required to deliver that growth how you

how you fit your your housing and

employment pieces

together around that strategy is a

different question

um so whilst the what's the strategic

growth plan has been done

uh you know clearly has been done mr

nelson's not not incorrect

in saying that there will be another

version

um and and mr mr thornhill's back now

so perhaps perhaps um you know through

you mom we could just hear a little bit

about that because

my senses um you know when i talk about

being less concerned with the names of

documents are more concerned with

the the ingredients that we use for plan

making

i think it's important to know what the

strategic growth plan

might do next um and i appreciate mr

thornton

thornhill can't say well it'll be x

thousand here in x thousand there i

don't mean that

i mean what you know will there be

another one are we done um

i don't think we are i'd expect to say

no we're not there will be another

version

in which case it might be important to

understand what relationship that might

have

with the policy and so with hedner

coming out question mark over what it's

replaced by

um and to answer your question

of miss french my sense is that that

would

the appropriate place for that would be

in the reason justification in the

supporting text

um for that to be explained for the

rationale for that to be explained

but for the thing that we are trying to

deal with which is which is unmet need

that's

sloshing around um the gunnels of the

unmet need ship be referenced probably

in the policy

um but but i'll hold my council on on

the rest of that mom if i might um but i

just wanted to hear

perhaps that future of the strategic

growth plan given the

um certainly a sense i picked up that

perhaps that's done

um but but i wouldn't necessarily expect

it to to be so

yeah i mean i will come to mr thornhill

um that i noticed the joint position

statement

is is kind of marketed under the the

banner

of the strategic growth plan so

is it is it something that is going to

continue and

will there be updates to that

um yes i suppose the way i um

the way i view this 3d growth plan is

it's a long-term vision

to 2050 um and

quite an ambitious one and i think in

terms of this

local plan um the growth plan really

looks post 2031

so it looks at that time post 2031 to

2050

so uh in terms of the the the

the plan that we're dealing with here um

the growth plan doesn't really

bite on on that plan the idea is that we

we can't continue doing what we've been

doing in the past we need a more

strategic long-term approach and so

there'll be

the substantive review which obviously

goes to 2039

will be influenced to an extent by the

growth plan

so what we've got is a vision a really

long term one out to 2050

and then what what the intention is to

use the duty to cooperate and joint

working

to ensure that remains relevant to local

plans

which consider shorter time scales

so the the first step is dealing with

leicester's unmet need

that it has now um so we're looking to

do the statement of common ground to

uh to 2036 to deal with leicester's

unmet need

the sustainability appraisal that we're

doing will inform that

but obviously the strategic growth plan

which is where we want to end up at in

2050 in some respects

will be a factor that that's considered

within that not the only not the only

factor there are obviously others

because we're

we're dealing with a shorter time scale

in much more detail than the growth plan

did

and then obviously as as time goes on um

the the duty to cooperate remains and

it's a constantly ongoing process so

we'll be looking to update um the

evidence strategically and jointly as

we go through the process and that will

layer up over time

um leading in some respect either either

to the delivery of the growth plan or

or if the evidence as agendas change

over time

and leads to a slightly different

outcome then we'll obviously have to

respond to that and potentially

review the growth plan so um so yeah so

it's there it's a vision that

that sits there in the background as the

authorities have agreed where they'd

like to

like to get to um but we need to make

sure that stays relevant and up-to-date

by

constantly updating the evidence through

the duty to cooperate

so that local so that it's relevant to

local plans

at whatever time they submit obviously

we're dealing with north west here

charm would are coming up soon and in

two or three years time there'll be

other plans going that deal with longer

time scales

yeah and then just on on charm would

have they had regard to the

strategic growth plan at this stage is

it something that's been relevant to

their

plan considerations yes it's in there

it's mentioned quite a lot actually in

their in their local plan

um so so it is in there so there's a

there's a kind of forerunner for how how

it shows how that influences

uh the more local plans as you said that

that's what its intention was

okay did anybody want to add anything in

relation to the strategic growth plan

or uh refer to any other

um plans or

other things that might affect

uh the replacement local plan or the

partial review

no okay anybody got any

final comments to make for the day

mr nelson uh yeah i just

wanted to i suppose two things first of

all the discussion that we just had with

uh mrs french

uh about reference to the strategic

growth plan and in the supporting text

is that something you want

to look at trying to weave in to

changes to the text to support policy s1

um i think it it would help it

it would certainly help set some context

i think um

and um but not only that but also

referring to

uh matters like the standard methodology

because you're taking out that reference

to the hedner

but i think maybe part of the the uh

not replacement in the policy but a

further kind of explanation of

of all those things that might influence

or will influence

um future needs so it would certainly be

helpful to include it in that

okay i mean we've we've already started

that process so

that that's fine and i suppose then that

follows on from that

is in terms of

any thoughts you have about the process

for for doing this yes we can

obviously we can draft something do you

want us to share it with

the participants do you want us to just

send it to you in the first instance

i i think like what i'd like to see

first is that we get an

agreed set of actions so if we've

referred to a number of points

um i i think it with that

um i don't want to see the detailed

wording of main modifications but a

summary of what it's likely

to contain because i think we've

referred to quite a few things today so

uh we'll we'll agree that list between

us

and once that listed agreed then there

will be a process of

agreeing uh modifications that will then

be

produced for for conformal consultation

through the main modifications process

okay that list of actions would be

uh a document that we would publish

publish on the website so everybody can

see the outcome of

of the discussions

does anybody else have any comments to

make

again on anything we've discussed

just as a final point and i'd like to

thank you all again for

for taking part uh it's been slightly

warmer this afternoon in here

i think so i meant to say to you for

those that you're wearing your jacket

please don't you don't have to um

[Laughter]

sorry i forgot right at the start please

please don't be

so formal it's uh unless you're not used

to it

yeah probably i'm not used to after six

months of wearing a t-shirt

it felt really uncomfortable yesterday

you're now you're now going to start a

hair running as to what we're wearing

tomorrow morning

well i think it's going to be another

warm day so as long as

i don't mind if you're not if for the

gentleman if you're not wearing jackets

that's okay

um if you're if your house is like mine

it's not air conditioned then

um i i don't see why you you need to to

sit in warm jackets for the day

um i'd like to thank everybody for for

taking part today

um i i hope um you've you've found it

okay

in terms of the process um and

yes thank you and carmel as well for uh

inviting you all to the um to the

uh the sessions and for keeping quiet as

well

i haven't heard a peep from anybody

whilst i've logged on so thank you

thank you very much um and i'll say

goodbye i'll see some of you tomorrow

but for those that aren't coming along

tomorrow thank you for your

participation

thank you okay thank you i shall leave

now thank you

bye