

# NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET – 1 MARCH 2011

Title of report	<b>NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY</b>
Key Decision	a) Financial No b) Community Yes
Contacts	<p>Councillor Matthew Blain            07979 852069  <a href="mailto:matthew.blain@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">matthew.blain@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Director of Services            01530 454555  <a href="mailto:steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Planning Policy and Town Centres Team Manager            01530 454677  <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>
Purpose of report	To outline for members a number of key issues relating to the Core Strategy and to advise on how the Council can move forward with the Core Strategy
Reason for Decision	To provide a direction of travel for further work and discussions
Strategic aims	Sustainable Communities
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	Allowed for within existing budgets
Link to relevant CAT	Place Shaping Local Prosperity Cleaner Greener
Risk Management	A risk assessment of the project has been undertaken. As far as possible control measures have been put in place to minimise these risks, including monthly updates to the Corporate Leadership Team.
Equalities Impact Assessment	The Core Strategy will have to ensure that any policies have taken account of any diversity and equality issues. Therefore all new policies will be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment as part of their preparation.
Human Rights	None discernible

Transformational Government	Not applicable
Comments of Deputy Head of Paid Service	As author of the report, no further comments
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	None
Background papers	<p>Report to Cabinet 31 August 2010</p> <p>Letter from Chief Planning Officers DCLG dated 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010 regarding Revocation of Regional Strategies. This can be viewed at <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/1765467.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/1765467.pdf</a></p> <p>The Localism Bill which can be viewed at <a href="#">Parliament UK: Bills before Parliament</a></p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) which can be viewed at <a href="#">Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing - Planning, building and the environment - Department for Communities and Local Government</a></p> <p>2008 Household projections which can be viewed at <a href="#">Household Projections, 2008 to 2033, England - Corporate - Department for Communities and Local Government</a></p> <p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which can be viewed at <a href="#">Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment - North West Leicestershire District Council</a></p> <p>Green Wedge background paper which can be viewed at <a href="#">Core Strategy - North West Leicestershire District Council</a></p> <p>East Midlands Development Agency report 'Strategic Distribution Site Assessment' which can be viewed at <a href="#">emda - Documents Listing and Search</a></p>
Recommendations	<p>(I) <b>THAT CABINET CONSIDER THE CONCLUSIONS SET OUT AT SECTION 6 OF THIS REPORT AND ADVISE HOW THEY WISH TO RESPOND;</b></p> <p>(II) <b>THAT SUBJECT TO THE OUTCOME OF (I) FURTHER CONSULTATION BE MADE IN RESPECT OF THE CONCLUSIONS AGREED BY CABINET AND</b></p>

	<p><b>(III) THAT THE DIRECTOR OF SERVICES IN CONSULTATION WITH THE APPROPRIATE PORTFOLIO HOLDER BE DELEGATED TO CONSIDER THE RESPONSES TO THE CONSULTATION PRIOR TO THE CORE STRATEGY BEING TAKEN TO FULL COUNCIL</b></p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Members will recall that a report was prepared for consideration at Cabinet on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010 regarding the potential implications for the Core Strategy as a result of the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) by the Coalition Government.
- 1.2 Cabinet resolved that the report be deferred for the following reasons:
- To enable officers to consider alternatives to development on the Green Wedge;
  - To enable officers to consider alternative approaches in respect of the issue of Strategic Distribution;
  - To await the outcome of the CALA homes challenge to the revocation of RSS and
  - To await the publication of the Localism Bill.
- 1.3 This report starts by providing an update for Members on the latter two matters before going on to consider how best to deal with a number of key issues and then setting out the suggested next steps in the production of the Core Strategy.

## **2.0 REVOCATION OF REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGIES**

- 2.1 The result of the Legal Challenge to the revocation of RSS was announced on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2010 when the High Court upheld the appeal. This has, therefore, resulted in the re-instatement of RSS across the country.
- 2.2 Following this announcement, the Government's Chief Planning Officer wrote to all local planning authorities to advise that it was still the Government's intention to abolish RSS as part of the Localism agenda and that local planning authorities should continue to have regard to his letter of 27<sup>th</sup> May 2010 (in which he announced his intention to revoke RSS) as a material consideration in making decisions on planning matters.
- 2.3 This letter was subject to a separate Legal Challenge by CALA Homes. The High Court dismissed this latest challenge having heard the case on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2011, although it is understood that CALA Homes are seeking to appeal the High Courts decision.
- 2.4 The position, therefore, in light of this decision, is that the RSS forms part of the Development Plan for North West Leicestershire. The Government's intention to abolish the RSS can be regarded as a material consideration to which members are entitled to give appropriate weight in exercising their discretion, provided that due regard is had to that material consideration.
- 2.5 However, as outlined in the following section, this is not the end of the matter.

### **3.0 THE LOCALISM BILL**

- 3.1 The Localism Bill was published on 13th December 2010. Members will be aware that it is a wide ranging bill which has a variety of implications for local authorities including a number of provisions relating to planning.
- 3.2 The Government has made it clear that the philosophy behind the Localism Bill is to “return power to local communities”.
- 3.3 Key amongst the planning matters included in the Bill to deliver on this, is the promised revocation of RSS. In addition, the Bill proposes the introduction of Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP). These are to be prepared by local communities (either via a Parish/Town Council or a Neighbourhood Forum) and following a referendum and adoption, will form part of the Development Plan for an area (together with the various Development Plan Documents prepared as part of the Local Development Scheme).
- 3.4 Whilst the Bill proposes some changes to LDFs, including making Inspector’s Reports non-binding (Inspectors Reports are currently binding upon the local planning authority) and a number of minor procedural matters, the key point to note is that LDFs are to remain in place and local authorities are being encouraged to continue to bring forward their LDFs as speedily as possible.
- 3.5 It is currently anticipated that the Bill will complete its passage through Parliament later on this year. Whilst no firm date has been established for the enactment of the provisions of what will, by then, be the Act, the Government has previously suggested April 2012 as a possible date. At such point in time as the provisions of the Act is enacted the RSS will no longer form part of the Development Plan and the Council will no longer be bound by its various provisions.
- 3.6 Another key provision in the Bill is a proposal to introduce a duty of co-operation for local planning authorities to engage constructively and on an on-going basis in respect of the preparation of: Development Plan Documents, Local Development Documents or other activities which support the planning of development. This has potential implications for how the Council takes forward preparation of the Core Strategy.
- 3.7 The rest of the report that follows is written in the context of, and paying due regard to, the philosophy behind the Localism Bill.

### **4.0 KEY ISSUES**

- 4.1 As is noted above, the Government expects that local planning authorities will continue to progress on the preparation of their LDFs. It is essential that the Council makes progress as soon as possible in order that a strategy can be put in place to guide decisions on future development.
- 4.2 There are a number of key issues which remain to be resolved before the Council will be in a position to decide on the submission version of the Core Strategy including:
  - The period to be covered by the Core Strategy
  - The overall development strategy;

- The amount of housing required across the district and individual settlements;
- The implications of any change from the above in respect of how many strategic sites in Coalville should be included in the Core Strategy;
- What approach to take in respect of strategic distribution and
- The provision of new infrastructure to support new development.

Each of these is considered in turn below.

#### The period to be covered by the Core Strategy

- 4.3 The RSS covers the period 2006-2026. The work to date has assumed that this would be the same for the Core Strategy. As noted below, new Household Projections have been published which cover the period 2008 to 2033.
- 4.4 Whilst that there may be some merit in extending the plan period to 2033 in respect of providing greater certainty over a longer period, this has to be balanced against the fact that the evidence base has so far been predicated on an end date of 2026. To change the end date mid-stream would, it is considered, raise concerns about the 'robustness' of the current evidence base. In order to overcome this it would be necessary to revisit the evidence base which will add both cost and time.
- 4.5 It is considered, therefore, that it would be appropriate to retain a plan period of 2006 to 2026.

#### The overall development strategy

- 4.6 Members will recall that the overall strategy of the emerging Core Strategy was to focus most new development upon Coalville in accordance with the RSS which had identified Coalville as a Sub-Regional Centre. Outside of Coalville the development was to be directed to Rural Towns (i.e. Ashby, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham).
- 4.7 It is considered that the proposed revocation of the RSS as a result of the Localism Bill would not require any change to the overall strategy as, notwithstanding, the approach to concentrate development in Coalville is entirely consistent with other national policies to concentrate new development in those settlements with the best range of services and facilities. It also supports the Council's regeneration strategy for Coalville Town Centre.
- 4.8 It is, therefore, considered that no change be made to the overall development strategy in view of the proposed revocation of the RSS, but that it would be appropriate to no longer refer to Coalville as a Sub-Regional Centre. It is suggested that the term Main Town be used instead.

#### Housing Requirements - overall

- 4.9 It is clear from statements by the Coalition Government that the proposed revocation of the RSS does not mean an end to new housing development. The Government remains committed to new housing growth. Indeed, to this effect the Government has recently consulted up on its proposed New Homes Bonus which is designed to provide a financial incentive for local authorities and communities to accept new development.

- 4.10 As was noted in the August 2010 Cabinet report the Government has made it clear that any housing numbers will still need to be justified and that this should be done “*in line with current policy in [Planning Policy Statement] PPS3*”.
- 4.11 It will be recalled that the August 2010 Cabinet report considered the advice in PPS3 (Housing) and as a result identified two options for providing different housing requirements. Option A was for 8,120 dwellings over the period 2006-2026, whilst Option B was for 7,800 dwellings over the same period.
- 4.12 Since that report new household projections with a 2008 base date were published in November 2010. The projections suggest that for North West Leicestershire the number of households is projected to be 45,000 households in 2026 and 46,000 in 2031. The table below compares the 2008 projections with those from 2004, 2006 and the work initially undertaken as part of the Partial Review of the RSS for the period to 2026 and the 2008 projections to 2031. It can be seen that the latest projections are consistently lower than previous ones.

**Table 1 – Comparison of number of households**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>Growth 2006- 2026</b>	<b>2031</b>	<b>Growth 2006- 2031</b>
<b>2004 Projections</b> (the basis for figures in the RSS)	38,000	49,000	11,000		
<b>2006 Projections</b>	38,000	49,000	11,000		
<b>RSS Partial Review</b>	37,700	47,560	9,860		
<b>2008 Projections</b>	37,000	45,000	8,000	46,000	9,000

- 4.13 The figure of 8,000 dwellings for growth between 2006 and 2026 is very similar to the figure of 8,120 dwellings suggested as Option A in the August 2010 Cabinet report (this figure being based upon looking at historic build rates).
- 4.14 It is concluded that the latest household projections suggest that the case for the Council using different housing requirements from those in the RSS is much stronger now than was the case in August 2010.
- 4.15 However, as noted earlier the Localism Bill is proposing to introduce a duty of co – operation in the preparation of Development Plan Documents. Housing requirements have implications beyond the district boundary and cut across the whole of the Housing Market Area of Leicester and Leicestershire. Therefore, if the Council were minded to simply meet the figures identified in the latest household projections it could be argued that this would run counter to this new duty.
- 4.16 To assist with this duty of co-operation a study has been jointly commissioned by the County Council (acting as lead), the City Council and the other Leicestershire planning authorities to develop an evidence base and planning framework to determine locally-derived housing figures in light of emerging national policy. The consultants are expected to produce their final report in the summer. It should be noted that the study will NOT recommend housing figures, but is a technical exercise which will rather provide a

common methodology which can be used by the different local planning authorities to assist in identifying an appropriate housing figure whilst having regard to the wider cross Housing Market Area implications.

- 4.17 It is necessary to strike a balance between speedy production of the Core Strategy and having a robust, credible evidence base whilst also having regard to the proposed duty of co-operation. It is suggested therefore, that the figure of 8,000 dwellings over the period 2006 – 2026 be regarded at this stage as the likely minimum amount of housing to be required as part of the Core Strategy, subject to the outcome of the Leicester and Leicestershire study referred to above.

#### Housing Requirements - settlements

- 4.18 The issue of how housing should be distributed across settlements has been considered in previous Cabinet reports. Using the same proportions for individual settlements as previously agreed Table 2 below identifies the revised distribution based on the figure of 8000 dwellings. The most up to date published figures for housing are 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 and the amount of commitments (i.e. dwellings with planning permission or under construction) are included in the table in order that Members can appreciate how many more dwellings would still need to be provided for.

**Table 2 – Potential Housing Distribution**

	<b>Total no of dwellings required 2006 – 2026 (a)</b>	<b>Built 2006-10 (b)</b>	<b>Under construction at 31 March 2010 (c )</b>	<b>Planning permission at 31 March 2010 (d)</b>	<b>Remaining (a-b-c-d) (i.e. dwellings still to find)</b>
Ashby	785	358	24	167	236
Coalville	5098	512	41	222	4323
Ibstock	393	34	0	22	337
Kegworth	233	28	2	154	49
Castle Donington	785	46	2	7	730
Measham	313	42	7	56	208
Rest of district	393	136	40	142	75
<b>Total</b>	<b>8000</b>	<b>1156</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>5958</b>

- 4.19 The above figures are based on a 'Coalville focus' consistent with the RSS. It has already been noted that it remains appropriate for most development to be directed towards Coalville. However, in the light of the proposed revocation of the RSS it may be considered appropriate to reduce the extent of the Coalville focus by reducing the amount of development in Coalville and redirecting that development elsewhere. This could involve putting more development in say one or two of the other Rural Towns or by spreading the development amongst all of the five Rural Towns or by allowing for additional development outside of Coalville and the Rural Towns.
- 4.20 If Members are minded to agree to this, it is suggested that the amount of development in Coalville be reduced by 700 dwellings from that shown in table 2 (i.e. 4398 dwellings from 2006 to 2026, with a residual at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010 of 3623 dwellings) and that these be redistributed elsewhere across the district.

- 4.21 In considering how this development be redistributed, it would be necessary to be sure that such development could actually take place in the settlements concerned. The most up to date Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) indicates that the following levels of development could be achieved in Coalville and each of the Rural Towns in terms of potential available sites (figures are rounded):
- Coalville - 10,300 dwellings
  - Ashby – 3,500 dwellings
  - Castle Donington – 1000 dwellings
  - Ibstock – 1500 dwellings
  - Kegworth – 555 dwellings
  - Measham – 1300 dwellings
- 4.22 Other considerations would include the level of services and facilities available in each settlement. In this respect, Ashby has a significant range of services and facilities. Of the other Rural Towns, Castle Donington and Ibstock have the greatest range of shops and some secondary education provision, although not the full secondary education provision available in Coalville and Ashby, nor a range of shops comparable with Ashby. Castle Donington does however provide a significant number of employment opportunities within, and close to, the town.
- 4.23 A further consideration which would support putting some additional development in Ashby is that such development could help to fund a solution (or solutions) to the current issues associated with the River Mease. Members will be aware from earlier reports that water quality of the River Mease, which is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), has become a critical issue in respect of new development in the River Mease catchment area.
- 4.24 The issues associated with the River Mease are now largely understood, both by the Council and other partners including the Environment Agency and Natural England. To date there is no identified solution to this issue but work on finding a solution (or solutions) is ongoing, including commissioning the production of a Detailed Water Cycle Study which is due to be completed in the summer.
- 4.25 Now that the issue is more fully understood and with the attempt to find a solution (or solutions) progressing, officers are confident that the issue will be resolved. There remain however, concerns about how any solution is going to be paid for. It is likely that new development will have to make suitable financial contributions to any solution. Therefore, putting additional development in the catchment, especially in the Ashby area where the problems associated with the Packington Sewage Treatment Works are of paramount concern, will potentially release more funding whilst also ensuring that development remains viable.
- 4.26 It is suggested that the issue of how these 700 dwellings be redistributed be not determined at this time, but that the issue be subject to further consultation as outlined in Section 5 of this report and that regard also be had to any other evidence which may be forthcoming in the meantime.
- 4.27 A reduction in the amount of development in Coalville will potentially have a knock-on effect to the issue of Strategic Sites which is considered below.



### Strategic Sites

- 4.28 Previous Cabinet reports have noted that it is likely that two Strategic Sites – that is sites of at least 2000 dwellings - would need to be identified in the Core Strategy to ensure that the amount of housing in Coalville could be provided. These two sites are South East Coalville (or Bardon Grange as it has come to be known) and on that part of the Green Wedge between Stephenson Way Coalville and Hall Lane Whitwick (referred to as Stephenson Green).
- 4.29 It should be noted that planning applications have recently been submitted on these sites and will be considered by the Council's Planning Committee in due course.
- 4.30 Members will recall that the August 2010 Cabinet report concluded that the then revocation of the RSS did not change the previous conclusions reached on this issue (i.e. In terms of whether the Green Wedge is required for development, it will be necessary to consider what the most suitable location for new development is within the Coalville area and what the likely build rate within any individual location is likely to be. However, in view of the Green Wedge's close proximity to the centre of Coalville, with all its services and facilities, it is clearly a sustainable location and hence some of the Green Wedge is likely to be required).
- 4.31 In deferring the August 2010 report Cabinet asked officers to look at what alternatives there were to development on the Green Wedge.
- 4.32 In response to this request the available evidence has been reviewed, particularly that contained within the most recent Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which identifies all the potential housing sites in the district. This review has concluded that assuming a continuation of the overall development strategy and housing numbers which have been supported to date (i.e. concentrating most development in the Coalville area) that it would be necessary to accommodate some development within the Green Wedge.
- 4.33 However, in the light of the consideration of the issue of housing requirements above, it is appropriate to consider whether in the event of reduced housing requirements in Coalville there would still be a need for two Strategic Sites.
- 4.35 Based on the residual figures in Coalville of 3623 dwellings as referred to at paragraph 4.20, the final residual figure would be about 600 dwellings in the event of Bardon Grange being identified (i.e. 3623 – 3000) and 1600 dwellings if Stephenson Green were to be identified (i.e. 3623 – 2000).
- 4.36 Having regard to the evidence in the SHLAA it is considered that the residuals as outlined above could all be accommodated on other sites in the Coalville area, although the identification of Stephenson Green only would still require the development of some other significant sites. It is likely that such sites would generate some opposition from the local communities most affected. The identification of Bardon Grange would, in this respect, be easier to accommodate.
- 4.37 Therefore, in numeric terms, on the face of it, it would not be necessary to include both strategic sites on the basis of the residual figure of 3623 dwellings. The question then is which site should be included? Whilst both sites do have merits the Bardon Grange site

clearly has the potential to deliver more housing, both up to 2026 and beyond, and also has the potential to deliver, via developer funding, a range of other benefits including the Bardon Road bypass, new education facilities, a local centre and new employment. This would not be the case in respect of Stephenson Green.

- 4.38 In addition, it should be appreciated that part of the Bardon Grange area is already allocated for housing development in the adopted Local Plan (although it is not included in the figures in Table 2 or Table 3) and so there is a clear expectation that some development will take place.
- 4.39 Members will recall that the 2008 consultation generated over 500 objections to the possibility of development on the Green Wedge. Whilst there were objections to Bardon Grange the number of the objections was not as significant as those objecting to development on the Green Wedge.
- 4.40 As noted previously the Government has made it clear that the philosophy behind the Localism Bill is to “return more power to local communities” whilst recognising it will still be necessary to make provision for appropriate development. In response to the previous consultations the local communities, particularly those of Whitwick and Thringstone, have expressed a clear desire to see the Green Wedge area maintained in its current undeveloped form.
- 4.41 Having regard to the clearly expressed views of the local community and the philosophy of the Localism Bill, together with the information outlined above, it is considered that the allocation of Bardon Grange in the Core Strategy as the only Strategic Site would potentially be an appropriate approach to adopt. However, any such identification would be on the basis that the development of this site will be done in an agreed, phased manner which includes the provision of the Bardon Road bypass, as well as other infrastructure.
- 4.42 In terms of Stephenson Green, and the wider issue of the Green Wedge, a background paper on the Green Wedge was published to support the 2008 Core Strategy consultation. This concluded that designation as Green Wedge could no longer be justified having regard to the criteria for Green Wedge designation set out in the last Leicestershire Structure Plan and in the absence of any further guidance. However, the Background Paper also put forward a range of options for the Green Wedge area. Apart from the potential for development on the Green Wedge, these options included re-designating as an Area (or Areas) of Separation or as a Strategic Gap in recognition of the role that these areas played in avoiding the coalescence of Coalville with Whitwick, Thringstone and Swannington.
- 4.43 Officers remain of the view that the Green Wedge designation cannot be justified for the reasons outlined in the Background Paper.
- 4.44 Members will recall that the Prince’s Foundation recently undertook work in support of the Council’s Regeneration Strategy for Coalville. This noted that many residents were “passionate about keeping their villages’ identities as the town [Coalville] grows”. This reflected the response to the previous consultation on the Core Strategy as previously outlined.
- 4.45 In order to achieve the aim of the protecting the separate identity of the villages as highlighted in the Prince’s Foundation report, whilst also recognising that designation as

Green Wedge is not appropriate, it is considered that re-designation of the Green Wedge as an Area (or Areas) of Separation or Strategic Gap, represents a valid policy option.

- 4.46 In this instance it is considered that Area of Separation would be the most appropriate designation as it would reflect the clear role that these areas play in avoiding the coalescence of Coalville with Whitwick, Thringstone and Swannington whilst also protecting the individual character and identity of each settlement.

#### Strategic Distribution

- 4.47 Members will recall that the August 2010 Cabinet report concluded that “On the balance of the available evidence officers have concluded that continuing with a criteria-based policy would not, in the circumstances, be appropriate and that the Core Strategy should deal with this issue by way of a preferred location.” In this particular instance the preferred location referred to is a site north of East Midlands Airport and west of Junction 24 of the M1, which had been identified in an independent study as one of the best three sites in the Three-Cities sub region to meet the need for such uses.
- 4.48 Members will recall that there was significant opposition (400+ objections) from local residents in the Castle Donington/Hemington/Lockington area to this particular proposal.
- 4.49 Whilst officers remain of the view that the conclusions expressed in the August 2010 report remain appropriate, having regard to the Localism philosophy Members may consider that this approach is no longer one which they would wish to support, with the result that provision should be made in the Core strategy in respect of Strategic Distribution.

#### Infrastructure Issues

- 4.50 As noted above a Detailed Water Cycle Study has been commissioned and is scheduled to be completed in the summer. In addition to issues associated with the River Mease, this will also identify what other additional water infrastructure may be required to support new development.
- 4.51 Discussions have also taken place with the Primary Care Trust in respect of the potential impact of new development on health facilities and the County Education Authority in respect of the impact on schools. These discussions have yet to be concluded and in the event that Members agree to revise the housing figures as outlined earlier, further engagement with the appropriate stakeholders will be required.
- 4.52 Work is also progressing in respect of the potential impact of new development in the Coalville area in terms of transport. Council officers, together with the Highways Agency and County Highway Authority, have helped support and provide information to, a study commissioned by the promoters of Bardon Grange and Stephenson Green. When this work has been completed it is intended to commission further work to test the outcome from this study and to test transport implications beyond Coalville.
- 4.53 It will also be necessary to consider what other infrastructure issues may arise as a result of new development, including other public services (e.g. libraries, waste collection, emergency services) as well as physical infrastructure, such as cycle and walking routes and general ‘green infrastructure’. Work to identify such needs is ongoing.

## **5.0 NEXT STEPS**

- 5.1 The next formal stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy will be for Full Council to agree the pre-submission version which it wishes to put forward. This will then be subject to a six week formal consultation. If this consultation does not raise any significant additional issues from those already considered, then the Core Strategy is 'submitted' to the Secretary of State who will then ask the Planning Inspectorate to arrange a public examination to test the Core Strategy for 'Soundness'.
- 5.2 If Members are minded to agree to the changes outlined in this report it will be necessary to have a further round of consultation in order to give all those with an interest in the Core Strategy an opportunity to comment before the Council agrees to the pre-submission version.
- 5.3 It would not be appropriate for this consultation to take place until after the local elections in May. It is suggested, therefore, that further consultation take place in June/July with a view to Council determining the pre-submission version in the autumn. This will also enable the findings of the Detailed Water Cycle Study and the Leicester and Leicestershire housing study to be taken into account. It is not envisaged that any further consultation will be required beyond that outlined, unless either of these two studies (or other new information which may come forward) raise significant issues or suggest potential changes from the course of action outlined in this report.
- 5.4 If the Core Strategy is submitted to the Secretary of State in early 2012 it is likely that the Core Strategy would then be adopted in late 2012.

## **6.0 CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 Having regard to the above the following summarises the suggested approach in respect of those matters considered in this report:
- Plan period to remain as 2006 to 2026
  - Overall development strategy remains as per previous consultations, with a Coalville focus
  - Housing numbers reduced to about 8,000 dwellings across the district (2006 to 2026) to reflect historic rates and new household projections (subject to the outcome of the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area housing requirements study)
  - Reduction in the amount of development in Coalville to about 4,400 dwellings in total, with about 3,600 dwellings remaining to be found at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2010.
  - Redistribution of 700 dwellings from Coalville to other parts of the district.
  - 1 strategic development site in the district – Bardon Grange, 4,500 houses (although around 3,000 in plan period up to 2026)

- Green Wedge protected but proposed to re-designate as Areas of Separation as the justification for keeping them is to prevent the coalescence and protect the identity of individual villages
- No change in respect of the Strategic Distribution issue from that previously recommended (i.e. that the Core Strategy make provision for a site for Strategic Distribution on the basis of the emda 2010 report).