



NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL – LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW
MAIN MODIFICATIONS CONSULTATION
SCHEDULE OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSE OF DISTRICT COUNCIL

January 2021

Contents

Main Modification	Page
General Comments	2
MM1	5
MM2	6
MM3	7
MM4	8
MM5	9
MM6	10
MM7	11
MM8	12

Main Modifications - General Comments

Respondent: Natural England		Representation Number: 0024/01/gen
Comments:	Council Response:	
<p>Thank you for your consultation of 30th November 2020 regarding the Main Modifications for the North West Leicestershire Local Plan Partial Review.</p> <p>I can confirm that Natural England has reviewed the modifications and has no comments to make.</p>	Noted	

Respondent: Sport England		Representation Number: 0016/01/gen
Comments:	Council Response:	
<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above.</p> <p>I can confirm that Sport England does not wish to raise any issues or comment on both the main or minor modifications.</p>	Noted	

Respondent: Breaston Parish Council		Representation Number: 0039/01/gen
Comments:	Council Response:	
<p>I write to confirm that Breaston Parish Council has reviewed the document and has no objections to the modifications.</p>	Noted	

Respondent: Measham Parish Council		Representation Number: 0040/01/gen
Comments: Measham Parish Council has considered the proposed modifications both main and minor and have no comments to make.	Council Response: Noted	

Respondent: Castle Donington Parish Council		Representation Number: 003/01/gen
Comments: Castle Donington Parish Council has no comments to make at this point.	Council Response: Noted	

Respondent: The Coal Authority		Representation Number: 0014/01/gen
Comments: I have reviewed the Main Modifications proposed and can confirm that we have no specific comments to make.	Council Response: Noted	

Respondent: The Environment Agency		Representation Number: 0037/01/gen
Comments: The Environment Agency does not wish to make any comment on this Main Modifications consultation and this form has been issued for completeness.	Council Response: Noted	

Respondent: Historic England		Representation Number: 0020/01/gen
Comments:	Council Response:	
I am writing to advise that Historic England has no comments to make on the proposed Main Modifications for the Local Plan Partial Review.	Noted	

Respondent: Highways England		Representation Number: 0010/01/gen
Comments:	Council Response:	
<p>We have reviewed Main Modifications being proposed to the NWLLP Partial Review document and do not consider that they will have direct relevance to Highways England, although we welcome the changes proposed to provide better context for the NWLLP Partial Review and clarify the distinction with the Substantive Review. The Main Modifications also provide clarity in respect of how the issue of unmet need in Leicester City will be addressed and on the timeframe for submission of the Substantive Review, which is welcomed.</p> <p>We therefore consider that the proposed Modifications do not materially affect our previous position on the NWLLP Partial Review, detailed in Highways England's response letter dated 18 December 2019.</p>	Noted	

Main Modification MM1

Respondent: Gladman	Representation Number: 0025/01/MM1
Comments: Gladman support the changes made to Paragraph 1.3 through Main Modification 1 as they clarify matters related to the scope of the partial review and the scope of the forthcoming substantive review of the Local Plan. Gladman particularly welcome the additional wording that has been proposed setting out that the Partial Review did not include any review of development needs in the district or land allocations to meet those needs. This is a significant clarification as Gladman had raised concerns that users of the Local Plan may have considered that the Partial Review represented a resetting of the clock on the requirement to assess development needs within the district. Gladman also welcome the additional wording setting out that the Council are undertaking a substantive review which will assess and meet the current needs of the district going forward.	Council Response: Noted

Respondent: Leicester City Council	Representation Number: 0019/01/MM1
Comments: Okay with this modification	Council Response: Noted

Main Modification MM2

Respondent: Leicester City council		Representation Number: 0019/02/MM2
Comments: Okay with this modification	Council Response: Noted	

Main Modification MM3

Respondent: Leicester City Council		Representation Number: 0019/03/MM3
Comments: Okay with this modification	Council Response: Noted	

Main Modification MM4

Respondent: Gladman	Representation Number: 0025/02/MM4
Comments: Gladman support the recognition in Paragraph 5.9 that the Government has introduced a new way to identify housing requirements in the district since the Local Plan was adopted and that the Partial Review was based upon the previous HEDNA, rather than taking account of the new Standard Method. Gladman also support the recognition contained in Paragraph 5.9 that the issue of unmet housing needs from Leicester have not been dealt with through the Partial Review of the Local Plan. Whilst Gladman has significant concerns over the amount of time that has been taken to assess, quantify and deal with the issue of unmet housing needs in Leicestershire, recognition in the Plan that it remains as a key priority is welcomed.	Council Response: Noted

Respondent: Leicester City Council	Representation Number: 0019/04/MM4
Comments: Okay as it's for clarification the new para has been added. Although would like to see in your reason for modification to say 'for clarification'.	Council Response: Noted

Main Modification MM5

Respondent: Gladman		Representation Number: 0025/03/MM5
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Gladman support the modifications made under MM5 specifically the reference to the Substantive Review taking account of any unmet need from elsewhere in the HMA including Leicester City. This is essential, as the issue of unmet needs has been unaddressed for a significant amount of time.</p> <p>However, Gladman are still concerned with the SoCG approach detailed in the latter part of MM5, especially if the SoCG is never actually signed because of a change in circumstances. It is to be welcomed that NW Leicestershire are seeking to put in place a mechanism for this eventuality, as articulated through MM6, but that does not state that NW Leicestershire will take account of their proportion of the unmet needs should they occur and the SoCG process fail.</p>		<p>Council Response:</p> <p>As noted, the proposed modification now allows for a circumstance whereby the SoCG is not signed or is unduly delayed. The issue of unmet need, whether a SoCG is in place or not, and whether (or how) such unmet need is met is a matter to be addressed as part of the Substantive Review. It is considered that it is not necessary for the modification to include a commitment such as that suggested in the response.</p>

Respondent: Leicester City Council		Representation Number: 0019/05/MM5
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Okay with this modification</p>		<p>Council Response:</p> <p>Noted</p>

Main Modification MM6

Respondent: Gladman	Representation Number: 0025/04/MM6
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Gladman recognise that the SoCG process is not entirely in the Council’s control. We are also supportive of the Council recognising that a back-stop position is required should the SoCG never be signed by all parties.</p> <p>The NW Leicestershire Local Plan Substantive Review must continue to be progressed should the SoCG not be signed or be significantly delayed and we are supportive of the commitment proposed in MM6 to submit the Substantive Review within 18 months of 21 May 2021.</p> <p>However, we do not consider that this Main Modification goes far enough in terms of dealing with the issue of unmet needs. Additional wording should therefore be added to set out that should the SoCG not materialise as planned, then not only will the NW Leicestershire Local Plan progress, but it will also deal with its proportion of identified unmet needs from the HMA, as set out in the most recent version of the SoCG.</p>	<p>Council Response:</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The council does not consider that it is necessary for the modification to include a commitment such as suggested in this representation as it is a matter to be properly considered as part of the Substantive Review having regard to the circumstances at that point in time. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that in preparing Local Plans they need to ‘positively prepared’ which includes considering unmet housing needs from elsewhere (e.g. paragraphs 17, 60 and 65). It is not necessary for the Local Plan to, in effect, duplicate national policy.</p>

Respondent: Leicester City Council	Representation Number: 0019/06/MM6
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Okay with this modification</p>	<p>Council Response:</p> <p>Noted</p>

Main Modification MM7

Respondent: Gladman	Representation Number: 0025/05/MM7
Comments: Gladman welcome the recognition set out in MM7 that the Substantive Review will have regard to the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan (SGP). However, the SGP is not a statutory planning document and was prepared without substantial public scrutiny through the formal plan making processes. The NW Leicestershire Local Plan should therefore also have regard to the deliverability of the schemes contained in the SGP and any other deliverable strategic development opportunities that arise in the meantime.	Council Response: Noted. The Substantive Review will need to have regard to the circumstances pertinent at that point in time, including potentially available sites.

Respondent: Leicester City Council	Representation Number: 0019/07/MM7
Comments: Okay Okay with this modification	Council Response: Noted

Main Modification MM8

Respondent: National Forest E-Bike Holidays		Representation Number: 0038/01/MM8
Comments: Provision will also be made for 7,300sq metres for shopping purposes. - Given the huge change in retail habits, is this truly a requirement? Should we not be focusing on encouraging people to visit our existing retail centres more often?	Council Response: Noted. The need for additional retail floorspace is based on an assessment of future needs taking account of forecast growth in population and households. The retail policies direct this additional floorspace to existing centres, which will help to make them more attractive and so encourage more people to use them. The Substantive Review will also address future retail needs, taking account of new household and population forecasts, as well as any changes in the retail sector.	
Respondent: Gladman		Representation Number: 0025/06/MM8
Comments: Gladman refer to our comments made to MM6 above which are also pertinent to this Modification.	Council Response: See response to MM6	

Respondent: Leicester City Council	Representation Number: 0019/08/MM8
Comments: Okay with this modification	Council Response: Noted