

MAY 2012

NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

DISTRIBUTION OF NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND PAPER



CONTENTS

	Page
1. Background	3
2. What is the distribution of new housing development?	4
3. Outline of the evolution of the proposed distribution	5
4. How was the distribution determined?	6
Appendix 1 - Options considered as part of 2008 consultation	13
Appendix 2 – Potential distribution of housing development in Cabinet Reports	14
Appendix 3 – Ranges of potential number of dwellings from SHLAA	15
Appendix 4 – Distribution of all dwellings as at 2006	16
Appendix 5 – Distribution of all new dwellings built 1991-2006	17
Appendix 6 – Distribution of all jobs as at 2006	18

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A key issue to be resolved through the Core Strategy is how the housing growth will be distributed across the District.
- 1.2 At the outset it is important to understand that there is no 'absolute' or 'definitive' distribution of new housing. However, any distribution needs to be reasoned and justified.
- 1.3 This paper outlines the justification for the proposed distribution and the history of how the distribution proposed in the Core Strategy has evolved.

2.0 WHAT IS THE DISTRIBUTION OF NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT?

2.1 Policy CS15 identifies the following distribution of development:

- **Coalville Urban Area** at least 4,950 dwellings
- **Ashby** at least 1,400 dwellings
- **Castle Donington** at least 1,300 dwellings
- **Ibstock** at least 550 dwellings
- **Kegworth** at least 450 dwellings
- **Measham** at least 550 dwellings
- **Sustainable Villages** at least 500 dwellings

3.0 OUTLINE OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION

- 3.1 The 2008 Consultation put forward 4 options, but it was made clear that the final distribution would not necessarily reflect one particular option per se. The options consulted on are set out at Appendix 1.
- 3.2 A consistent theme of all of these options was that Coalville was always identified as having the largest amount of development to reflect the requirements of the Regional Plan that development should be “mainly” located at Coalville. However, the amount of development in Coalville varied between the different options, as did the amounts of development in the other main settlements (referred to at that time as Rural Towns).
- 3.3 Subsequent work on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identified that both Option 1 and 2 had very serious deliverability issues in the Coalville area. This was noted in a report to Cabinet on 14 July 2009 and suggested that Options 3 and 4 to be considered further as providing the basis for the distribution of development.
- 3.4 Reports to the Council’s Cabinet on 20th October 2009, 1st March 2011 and 18th October 2011 suggested both different amounts of total development (10,200 dwellings, 8,000 dwellings and 9,700 dwellings respectively) and different distributions. The suggested distributions are set out in Appendix 2.
- 3.5 These various distributions were then subjected to Sustainability Appraisal in order to assess whether one or more of the distributions was more sustainable than the others. More details of the Sustainability Appraisal can be found in a separate paper (Sustainability Appraisal Housing Distribution).
- 3.6 The result of the Sustainability Appraisal was that the March 2011 distribution was considered to be the most sustainable of the three options suggested. However, this option:
- included an overall housing requirement of only 8,000 dwellings compared to the final requirement of 9,700 dwellings and
 - did not allocate 700 dwellings to any settlement so was not a complete distribution.
- 3.7 Therefore, in view of the outcome of the Sustainability Appraisal and the above points it was necessary to re-consider the issue of distribution of new housing. The remainder of this paper outlines the considerations which have applied in determining the appropriate distribution of development in the Core Strategy.

4.0 HOW WAS THE DISTRIBUTION DETERMINED?

- 4.1 A key challenge for the Core Strategy is to be able to demonstrate that whatever distribution is proposed can be delivered. In this respect the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA) (2009, 2010 and 2011) are important as they provide an indication of what could potentially be delivered in the various settlements across the district. A summary of findings from the SHLAA are included at Appendix 3).
- 4.2 It should be noted that the overall district total from the SHLAAs are significantly more than the 9,700 dwellings required in the Core Strategy, ranging from about 17,000 to 19,000. Therefore, the figures in the SHLAA are useful for proving an indication of the scale of development that can be delivered, but not the distribution in absolute numerical terms due to this difference to what is actually required.
- 4.3 There are also other factors which need to be considered alongside deliverability, including the provisions of national and regional policies and any local factors which could influence the amount of development that is appropriate.
- 4.4 In looking at the distribution of development regard has also been had to information in respect of the following, partly as justification but also to provide a comparison and sense check on the distribution:
- The distribution of housing as at 2006 (Appendix 4);
 - Build rates from 1991 to 2006 (Appendix 5); and
 - The distribution of jobs at 2006 (Appendix 6).
- 4.5 The following section outlines the justification for the amount of development on a settlement-by-settlement basis for the larger settlements and for the rest of the district.

Coalville Urban Area

- 4.6 The starting point in considering the distribution of development is the role played by Coalville (referred to in the Core Strategy as the Coalville Urban Area). This is the largest settlement in the district and is identified in the Regional Plan as a Sub-Regional Centre. The Regional Plan says that development is to be "located mainly at Coalville, including sustainable urban extensions as necessary" (Policy Three Cities SRS 3).
- 4.7 The suggested distributions up to and including October 2011 proposed various percentages in Coalville, ranging from 49% in Option 3 in 2008 up to 89% in Option 1

in 2008. However, as already noted above Option 1 was discounted from consideration (along with Option 2) due to issues related to deliverability.

- 4.8 There is no definition in the Regional Plan as to what 'mainly' means. The dictionary definition refers to "greatest in size or extent". Using this definition in this particular instance this is taken as meaning at least 51% of all development. Based on a figure of 9,700 dwellings this would produce a requirement for Coalville of 4,947 dwellings (4,950 dwellings when rounded).
- 4.9 A figure of 5,000 dwellings is deliverable having regard to the evidence in the three Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA) which have been produced (2009, 2010 and 2011) and have identified a range of figures for Coalville of 8,464 dwellings (2010) up to 8,986 dwellings (2009) (Appendix 3).
- 4.10 The figure of 51% of all development would be higher than:
- The number of dwellings in Coalville as a proportion of all dwellings in the district (39%) as at 2006 (Appendix 4); and
 - The number of new builds in Coalville as a proportion of all new builds across the district (37%) from 1991 to 2006 (Appendix 5).
- 4.11 However, the Regional Plan represents a 'step change' which reflects the thrust of national policy to direct development to the most sustainable locations, such as Coalville and, as noted, requires that development is "mainly" located at Coalville.
- 4.12 It is considered, therefore, that a figure of **4,950** dwellings is appropriate for Coalville.

Ashby de la Zouch

- 4.13 In policy terms Ashby de la Zouch has historically been accorded a status equal to that of Coalville. However, this is no longer the case with the Regional Plan which identifies Coalville as a Sub-Regional Centre. Furthermore, in terms of their size and range of services and facilities Coalville is clearly a more sustainable location for development than Ashby.
- 4.14 The three SHLAAs have identified a potential range of dwellings from 3,285 (2009) to 3,847 (2011) dwellings (Appendix 3). An important consideration in Ashby is that of the River Mease SAC and ensuring that any development does not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC. Discussions with Severn Trent Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England has concluded that as at March 2012 the headroom

capacity at Packington Sewage Treatment Works , where effluent from Ashby is treated, was estimated to be 1,218 dwellings.

- 4.15 The Water Cycle Study has identified that working within this headroom provides a suitable way forward to enable development to take place without affecting the SAC. It also identifies potential solutions for the longer term which could increase the capacity for development in the catchment. However, at this time there is no certainty as to when (or if) such improvements could be made. Therefore, it is considered that the prudent approach would be to use the existing headroom as a ceiling for the amount of development in Ashby. It would also be prudent to ensure a buffer to this ceiling by having a requirement a little way short of the headroom.
- 4.16 A figure of 1,000 dwellings would provide such a buffer being about 80% of the headroom. Looking at the plan period as a whole and allowing for development from 2006 to 2011 (384 dwellings), would provide an overall figure (rounded up) of **1,400** dwellings in Ashby. This would represent 14% of all new development, slightly above the number of dwellings in Ashby as a proportion of all dwellings (13%) (Appendix 4) but slightly below the number of new builds in Ashby as a proportion of all new builds from 1991 to 2006 (16%) (Appendix 5).

Castle Donington

- 4.17 Castle Donington is not as large as Ashby de la Zouch but has a good range of services and facilities. It plays a significant role in terms of number of jobs as evidenced at Appendix 6 where it can be seen that 24% of all jobs in the district are in the Castle Donington area, second only to Coalville at 34% and well above what would normally be expected for a settlement of its size.
- 4.18 The 2001 Census identified that there were net journeys in to Castle Donington ward in the order of 6,000 and that people were coming from a wide variety of places and distances. This largely reflects the draw of East Midlands Airport as an employment destination. The development of the East Midlands Distribution Centre which adjoins the north-west edge of Castle Donington is likely to add further to this in commuting. At the same time the 2001 Census recorded that 45% of journeys to work from Castle Donington stayed within the ward, suggesting a healthy degree of self containment. In contrast, the figures for the Ashby wards are lower (Castle 19%, Holywell 37% and Ivanhoe 22%) as are those for Ibstock (33%), Kegworth (27% and Measham (28%).
- 4.19 A key aim of national policy is to create a sustainable pattern of development which reduces the need to travel as far as possible. The fact that such significant numbers of people are commuting in to Castle Donington suggests that there is a need to redress this balance to some degree.

- 4.20 The Sustainability Appraisal of the 2008 Consultation noted that the PTOLEMY assessment was more favourable for those options where more housing was directed to the area around East Midlands Airport.
- 4.21 The three SHLAAs have identified a potential range of dwellings from 991 (2010) dwellings to 1,200 (2009) dwellings (Appendix 3). The latter figure would represent 12.4% of all development district wide, which is more than both the number of dwellings in Castle Donington as a proportion of all dwellings (7.42%) (Appendix 4) and the number of new builds in Castle Donington as a proportion of all new builds from 1991 to 2006 (4%)(Appendix 5).
- 4.22 However, part of the reason for a low build rate between 1991 and 2006 is due to the fact that there were few development opportunities in Castle Donington during that period. Ashby has twice the population of Castle Donington but had four times the amount of development between 1991 and 2006. In addition, strategic policies in previous Structure Plans had favoured Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch as the primary location for new housing development.
- 4.23 The latest SHLAA figure for Castle Donington (1,001) does not take account of the fact that consent exists, and development has started, on land to the north of Park Lane (275 dwellings). Therefore, allowing for this development as well as what is allowed in the SHLAA would produce a figure of 1,300 dwellings.
- 4.24 It is considered, therefore, that a figure of **1,300** dwellings for Castle Donington is appropriate for the period 2006 to 2031, particularly as it would help to address the need to try and provide a greater balance between jobs and homes in this part of the District.

Ibstock

- 4.25 Ibstock is about the same size, in population terms, as Castle Donington but does not have such a wide range of services and facilities, particularly in respect of employment. Ibstock is also part of the immediate hinterland for Coalville which provides many of the services and facilities not available in Ibstock. It also has good public transport connections to Coalville
- 4.26 The three SHLAAs have identified a potential range of dwellings from 963 (2009) to 1,213 (2010) dwellings (Appendix 3). The latter figure would, if used, represent 37% of all development across the district, which significantly exceeds both the number of dwellings in Ibstock as a proportion (7.02%) of all dwellings (Appendix 4) and the number of new builds in Ibstock as a proportion (6%) of all new builds from 1991 to 2006 (Appendix 5).

- 4.27 In view of the above, and the fact that Ibstock does not have as good a range of services and facilities as Castle Donington and Ashby and that it is part of the hinterland of Coalville, a figure approaching that of the SHLAA is considered to be unreasonable. A more reasonable figure would be 550 dwellings which represents 5.6% of all development, broadly similar to the figures outlined in the previous paragraph in respect of proportion of all dwellings and proportion of new builds.
- 4.28 The SHLAA demonstrates that this figure is achievable and therefore, it is considered a figure of **550** dwellings for Ibstock would be appropriate.

Kegworth

- 4.29 Kegworth is the smallest of the Rural Centres and has a more limited range of services and facilities as a result.
- 4.30 The three SHLAAs have identified a potential range of dwellings from 469 (2011) to 555 (2009 and 2010) dwellings (Appendix 3), significantly less than any of the other Rural Centres.
- 4.31 The number of dwellings in Kegworth as a proportion of all dwellings (Appendix 4) is 4.17% whilst the number of new builds in Kegworth as a proportion of all new builds from 1991 to 2006 (Appendix 5) was just 2%. If the SHLAA ranges were used as an appropriate figure these would represent between 4.8% and 5.7% of all new development.
- 4.32 A degree of caution with the SHLAA figures would suggest that a figure of **450** dwellings (4.6% of all new development) is deliverable and reasonable and is consistent with Kegworth's historic role in the district.

Measham

- 4.33 Measham lies within the hinterland of Ashby de la Zouch but still has a good range of services and facilities and also serves many of the smaller surrounding villages.
- 4.34 The three SHLAAs have identified a potential range of dwellings from 1,042 to 1,310 dwellings (Appendix 3).
- 4.35 The number of dwellings in Measham as a proportion of all dwellings in 2006 (Appendix 4) is 5.53% whilst the number of new builds in Measham as a proportion of all new builds from 1991 to 2006 (Appendix 5) was 8%. This latter figure is higher than might be anticipated in a settlement of this size and reflects the efforts which have been made to regenerate Measham over the last 20 years.
- 4.36 A key objective in Measham will be to continue with the regeneration of the town, with new development playing an important role in this.

- 4.37 If the SHLAA ranges were used as an appropriate figure these would represent between 10.7% and 13.5% of all new development respectively. Such amounts of development would be unreasonable, particularly as Meaham only accounts for 3.6% of all jobs and, as with Ibstock, itself lies within the hinterland of a larger settlement (Ashby de la Zouch). In addition, Measham is located within the River Mease catchment and so it is necessary to ensure that development does not adversely affect the integrity of the River Mease SAC. Discussions with Severn Trent Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England has concluded that as at March 2012 the headroom capacity at the Measham Sewage Treatment Works , where effluent from Measham is treated, was estimated to be 1,163 dwellings. The figures for the SHLAA are within this range, but as with Ashby it is considered that a buffer is required.
- 4.38 Therefore, an allocation for Measham of **550** dwellings is proposed. This would represent 5.6% of all development, broadly similar to the figures outlined at paragraph 4.35 and one which the SHLAA suggest that can be delivered, without impacting up on the River Mease SAC and which can ensure the continued regeneration of Measham .

Rest of District

- 4.39 The Rest of the District comprises of a number of villages ranging in size and extent of provision of services and facilities. The settlements included in this category are the smaller ones which by definition are not as sustainable as Coalville or the various Rural Centres.
- 4.40 The Sustainability Appraisal carried out in respect of the previous suggested distributions judged that the amount of development in the rest of the district in some of these was of concern from a sustainability point of view.
- 4.41 Taking account of the figures for the main settlements set out above produces a total of 9,200 dwellings. This would leave a figure of 500 dwellings for the rest of the district.
- 4.42 The three SHLAAs identify potential development well in excess of this figure, ranging from 1,568 dwellings (2009) to 2,723 dwellings (2011).
- 4.43 A figure of 500 dwellings would represent 5% of all new development. This compares to the number of dwellings in the Rest of the District as a proportion of all dwellings in 2006 (Appendix 4) of 23.5%, whilst the number of new builds in the Rest of the District as a proportion of all new builds from 1991 to 2006 (Appendix 5) was 26%.

- 4.44 Clearly there is a very significant difference between the residual figure of 500 dwellings and what has previously been achieved. However, to some extent the existing distribution and proportion of all new build figures are interlinked and from a policy point of view they are more backward looking rather than forward looking. Whilst a figure of 500 dwellings would represent a dramatic departure from previous performance, to some extent this could be viewed as a 'corrective' measure to achieve the desired aim of as sustainable pattern of development as possible, whilst also still allowing for some development to maintain the villages concerned .
- 4.45 It is considered, therefore, that a figure of **500** dwellings in the Rest of the District would be appropriate in order to move towards as sustainable a pattern of development as possible and one which is also deliverable.

APPENDIX 1- OPTIONS CONSIDERED AS PART OF 2008 CONSULTATION

Settlement	Option 1 – The Coalville Focus Option	Option 2 - Coalville focus with significant amount in a Rural Town	Option 3 - Coalville focus with a significant amount in two of the Rural Towns	Option 4 – Coalville focus with significant amount in two of the Rural Towns
Coalville	9800 dwellings	8000 dwellings	5400 dwellings	7700 dwellings
Ashby de la Zouch	500 dwellings	2400 dwellings	1800 dwellings	500 dwellings
Castle Donington	500 dwellings	350 dwellings	1200 dwellings	1000 dwellings
Ibstock	100 dwellings	100 dwellings	1000 dwellings	1000 dwellings
Kegworth	50 dwellings	75 dwellings	800 dwellings	400 dwellings
Measham	50 dwellings	75 dwellings	800 dwellings	400 dwellings

APPENDIX 2 – POTENTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN CABINET REPORTS

	OCTOBER 2009	MARCH 2011	OCTOBER 2011
Coalville	6,500	4,398	5,000
Ashby	1,000	785	1,400
Castle Donington	1,000	785	1,000
Ibstock	500	393	500
Kegworth	300	233	450
Measham	400	313	450
Outside Coalville and Rural Towns**	500	393	900
Total	10,200	8,000*	9,700

* a figure of 700 dwellings was to be re-distributed from Coalville to other settlements.

** Now referred to as Rural centres

APPENDIX 3 – RANGES OF POTENTIAL NUMBER OF DWELLINGS FROM SHLAA

	Maximum number of dwellings in SHLAA 2009	Maximum number of dwellings in SHLAA 20010	Maximum number of dwellings in SHLAA 20011
Total	18,460	19,111	18,211
Coalville	8,464	8,639	8,696
Ashby	3,554	3,847	3,562
Castle Donington	991	1,001	1,064
Ibstock	1,213	1,122	1,099
Kegworth	555	469	526
Measham	1,310	1,310	1,042
Rest of District	2,373	2,723	2,221

APPENDIX 4 - DISTRIBUTION OF ALL DWELLINGS AS AT 2006

	Total number of dwellings at 2006	Dwellings as % of all dwellings
NWL	42,297	100.00
Coalville	14,603	39.15
Ashby	9,932	13.22
Castle Donington	2,763	7.42
Ibstock	2,617	7.02
Kegworth	1,555	4.17
Measham	2,062	5.53
Rest of District	8,765	23.50

APPENDIX 5 - DISTRIBUTION OF ALL NEW DWELLINGS BUILT 1991-2006

	Dwellings built 1991-2006	Dwellings as % of all new dwellings
Total	7,873	
Coalville	2,940	37
Ashby	1,292	16
Castle Donington	342	4
Ibstock	478	6
Kegworth	145	2
Measham	631	8
Rest of District	2,045	26

APPENDIX 6 - DISTRIBUTION OF ALL JOBS AS AT 2006

	Number of Jobs	Jobs as % of all Jobs
Total	49,500	100
Coalville	17,100	34.5
Ashby	8,000	16.2
Castle Donington	12,000	24.2
Ibstock *	2,700	5.5
Kegworth **	1,900	3.8
Measham	1,800	3.6
Rest of District	6,000	12.1

Source – Annual Business Inquiry

Figures may not add to 100 due to rounding

* includes Heather

** includes Long Whatton