



Report to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

by Raymond Michael MBA BSc Dip
TP MRTPI ARICS MIM
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
0117 372 8000

Date 27 November 2009

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

FINAL REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE HINCKLEY &
BOSWORTH CORE STRATEGY

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Document submitted for examination on 30 January 2009

Examination hearings held between 19 and 29 May 2009 and on
14 October 2009

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction and Overall Conclusions	4
Changes Proposed by the Council	5
2. Legal Requirements	6
3. Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy Tests	8
General Comments	8
Main Issues	9
• Spatial Strategy	9
• Housing Proposals	14
• Affordable Housing	27
• Economic Regeneration	35
• Transport Proposals	39
• Green Infrastructure	44
• Infrastructure Plan	48
• Monitoring Framework	50
4. Overall Conclusions	52
Annex 1: Schedule of Minor Post-Publication Changes	53
Annex 2: Schedule of Minor Post-Hearing Changes	66
Annex 3: Local Plan Policies Replaced by Core Strategy	92
Annex 4: Council's Revised Housing Trajectory	93
Annex 5: Revised Policy 15	94
Annex 6: Revised Policy 5	96
Annex 7: Key Infrastructure (for Core Strategy)	97
Annex 8: Revised Chapter 5	104
Annex 9: Revised Monitoring Framework	107
Annex 10: Summary of Inspector's Proposed Changes	112

Abbreviations used in the Report

AAP	Area Action Plan
AHVA	Affordable Housing Viability Assessment
AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
CD	Core Document
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CS	Core Strategy
CSH	Code for Sustainable Homes
DPD	Development Plan Document
EiP	Examination in Public
ELS	Employment Land Study (the PACEC Report)
EMRA	East Midlands Regional Assembly
EMRP	East Midlands Regional Plan
GI	Green Infrastructure
GOEM	Government Office for the East Midlands
GTAA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment
GW	Green Wedge
HA	Highways Agency
HMA	Housing Market Area
IP	Infrastructure Plan
IPC	Inspector's Proposed Change
KRC	Key Rural Centre
LDD	Local Development Document
LDF	Local Development Framework
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
PC	Proposed Change
PDL	Previously-developed land
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SAGDCDPD	Site Allocations & Generic Development Control DPD
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SRC	Sub-Regional Centre
SUE	Sustainable Urban Extension

1 Introduction and Overall Conclusions

- 1.1 Under the terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the purpose of the independent examination of a development plan document (DPD) is to determine:
- (a) whether it satisfies the requirements of s19 and s24(1) of the 2004 Act, the regulations under s17(7), and any regulations under s36 relating to the preparation of the document
 - (b) whether it is sound.
- 1.2 This report contains my assessment of the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy DPD in terms of the above matters, along with my recommendations and the reasons for them, as required by s20(7) of the 2004 Act.
- 1.3 I am satisfied that, with the changes proposed, the DPD meets the requirements of the Act and Regulations. My role is also to consider the soundness of the submitted Core Strategy against the guidance set out in PPS12 paragraphs 4.51-4.52. In line with national policy, the starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The changes I have specified in this binding report are made only where there is a clear need to amend the document in the light of the legal requirements and/or the guidance on soundness in PPS12. None of these changes should materially alter the substance of the overall plan and its policies, or undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes already undertaken. In view of the need for substantive changes to Policy 15 (Affordable Housing), the Council has reconsulted on that section of the CS and carried out a sustainability appraisal of the revised proposals.
- 1.4 My report firstly considers the legal requirements, and then deals with the relevant matters and issues considered during the examination in terms of testing justification, effectiveness and consistency with national policy. My overall conclusion is that the Core Strategy is sound, provided it is changed in the ways specified. The principal changes which are required are, in summary:
- a) Amend the housing figures as set out in the revised housing trajectory submitted by the Council (Annex 4) to incorporate the targets in the East Midlands Regional Plan and further recommendations in this report;
 - b) Amend the affordable housing policy as set out in the revisions submitted by the Council (Annex 5) to reflect the findings of the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment;
 - c) Revise the proposals for transport improvements to reflect the changes brought forward in the Sustainable Transport Package submitted during the Examination (Annex 2, Appendix 2), and amend Policy 5 to incorporate those changes (Annex 6).

- d) Delete the Infrastructure Plan from the CS and replace it with a schedule of Key Infrastructure in the CS (Annex 7), and redraft Chapter 5 (Annex 8).
- e) Revise the Monitoring Framework to provide clarification between Targets and Indicators, and to make the targets more robust (Annex 9).

The report sets out all the detailed changes required to ensure that the plan meets the legal requirements and the guidance on soundness.

Changes Proposed by the Council

- 1.5 Following the formal consultation period under Section 27 the Council published a schedule of proposed minor post-publication changes (PCs) which incorporated corrections and clarifications to the submission draft, together with textual amendments to reflect representations made. At my request those changes were the subject of formal consultation during the period 20 February - 3 April 2009, prior to the commencement of the hearings. The Council's post-publication changes are numbered PCs 1 – 126, and are shown in Annex 1.
- 1.6 A further schedule of changes was submitted by the Council which arise from the discussions which took place at the hearings. Those post-hearing changes are numbered PCs 127 – 230, and shown in Annex 2. The changes consist of minor clarifications and corrections which do not change the substantive policies in the CS. Many of the changes update the CS to reflect the recent approval of the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP), and other points represent clarifications of the CS which arise from discussion at the hearings. A number make explicit elements of the Strategy which were previously implicit, for example the need to review settlement boundaries and Green Wedge (GW) boundaries as part of the Site Allocations DPD, the proposed housing density range, and the target for the re-use of previously-developed land. Other changes clarify the Council's alternative strategy for development to ensure that the CS provides the flexibility required by PPS12. PCs 199-228 provide an update and corrections to the IP and will ensure that the information is the most accurate available at the time of adoption.
- 1.7 The Council's proposed changes do not affect the soundness of the CS, and are of a minor nature necessary to update the DPD or to otherwise correct or clarify the document. Subject to any further amendments proposed in this report, I endorse the Council's proposed minor changes, and any consequential corrections to the paragraph numbering. I also endorse the correction of any other spelling or grammatical errors that do not affect the sense or meaning of the document.

2 Legal Requirements

- 2.1 The Core Strategy DPD (CS) is contained within the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS), the updated version being approved in January 2007. It is shown as having a submission date of September/October 2008 although, in the event, the CS was not formally submitted until January 2009 due to minor delays in its preparation. However, it was only 3-4 months late and this is not so significant a lapse that it would be in the public interest to cause further delay to the adoption process.
- 2.2 At the Hearings the Council referred to its proposal to prepare an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the proposed Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) at Barwell and Earl Shilton. However, that document is not included in the LDS, and the Scheme should be updated at an early opportunity to incorporate that proposal. The Council has drafted a programme for the preparation and approval of the proposed AAP, and it intends to prepare an amendment to the LDS to reflect the proposal.
- 2.3 There are differences between the policies listed in Appendix 2 of the LDS as being replaced by the CS and those identified by the Council at the Examination. The Council advised that the reason for the differences is that a number of the policies were not 'saved' by the Secretary of State under the transitional arrangements for the introduction of the new development plan system, and others are no longer needed because they repeat national guidance or will be covered in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control DPD (SAGDCDPD). The submission CS did not contain a list of the replaced policies as required under Regulation 13(5), but a list has been submitted subsequently by the Council. The list of policies replaced is set down in Annex 3, and should be included in the CS as Appendix 3 (IPC1).
- 2.4 The LDS contains provision for monitoring the CS through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), which will assess whether it is meeting the milestones set down in the LDS, whether the Council is meeting national, regional or local targets, and what actions need to be taken to address any concerns identified.
- 2.5 I am satisfied that, as the preparation of the CS has been generally in accordance with the LDS, this test has been met.
- 2.6 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been found to be sound by the Secretary of State and was formally adopted by the Council in November 2006. It is evident from the documents submitted by the Council, including the Regulation 30(d) and 30(e) Statements and its Self Assessment Paper, that the Council has met the requirements as set out in the Regulations.

- 2.7 Alongside the preparation of the CS it is evident that the Council has carried out a parallel process of sustainability appraisal (CDs 10/10(a) – 10/10(e)).
- 2.8 I am content that, as a result of the scoping exercise carried out by the Council, there is no need for an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive. The Council confirms that there are no sites of European importance within the borough or within 10 kms of the borough boundaries, and Natural England has advised that the Council has satisfactorily considered the provisions of the Habitats Regulations.
- 2.9 I am satisfied that, subject to the changes proposed in this report, the CS has had regard to national policy.
- 2.10 The East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA) has indicated that the CS is in general conformity with the approved East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP) published by the Secretary of State in March 2009, and I am satisfied that, subject to the changes proposed in this report, it is in general conformity.
- 2.11 The CS and the Borough's Community Plan (CD10/02) were consulted upon together in July/August 2006 to ensure synergy between the documents. In addition, the spatial objectives in the CS reflect the themes and priorities of the Leicestershire Sustainable Communities Strategy 2008 (CD2/08(a)) and the Community Plan. I am satisfied that the CS has had regard to the sustainable community strategy for the area.
- 2.12 I am satisfied that, with the addition of the appendix of replaced policies, the CS complies with the specific requirements of the 2004 Regulations (as amended) including the requirements in relation to publication of the prescribed documents; availability of them for Inspection and local advertisement; notification of DPD bodies and provision of a list of superseded saved policies. The CS has been subject to public consultation at Issues and Options stage (2003), Preferred Options stage (2007), and Submission stage (2008).

Conclusions

- 2.13 Accordingly, subject to the recommendations below, I am satisfied that the legal requirements have all been satisfied.

Recommendation

The following change is necessary in order to comply with Regulation 13(5) of the Local Development Regulations 2004:

Inspector's Proposed Change 1 (IPC1): Include the schedule of replaced policies set out in Annex 3 as Appendix 3 of the CS.

3 Justified, Effective, and Consistent with National Policy Tests.

General comments

- 3.1 The CS runs to 106 pages, including appendices. This is too long for a DPD and that is reflected in a significant amount of repetition, particularly in the Spatial Strategy and Policies section. That section could have been considerably shortened if a more rigorous approach had been adopted to drafting and layout. Whilst that is not directly an issue of soundness, it does result in a diminution of the policy message, and leads to some confusion within the overall layout of the document. It also makes the document more difficult and less accessible for the eventual users to comprehend.
- 3.2 Section 3 (Issues, Vision and Objectives) is fairly concise and relevant, and provides a good basis for the policy section which follows. However, although sections 1 and 2 (Introduction and Policy Context) are informative, they are not an essential part of the CS, and the necessary information therein could have been provided more succinctly or through a brief accompanying document. Similarly, the references in Appendix 1 to other strategies considered adds little to the general understanding of the CS.
- 3.3 It is not part of my role to redraft the CS significantly other than where it is necessary to make it sound, and I therefore make no general proposals in this regard, but I consider that the document would have been more user-friendly if the layout and content of the policies had been structured in such a way as to avoid the lengthy repetition which occurs in many cases.
- 3.4 I also question whether it is necessary to include the degree of detail contained within the IP, since much of the content appears to be aspirational rather than necessary to deliver the CS. It would have been more appropriate to limit the content to those elements of infrastructure which were essential to the delivery of the CS, and incorporate the other elements in a less formal document. The approach adopted by the Council could lead to problems in reviewing the IP if the monitoring process identifies significant difficulty in delivery of some of the items, since they will form part of the statutory Local Development Framework (LDF). I make more detailed recommendations on this matter later in the report.
- 3.5 Where a DPD contains policies which apply to specific sites the adopted proposals map should be updated to identify any changes which arise. However, the Council has indicated that no changes are proposed to the proposals map, and to clarify the situation PC147A has been submitted to remove references to specific sites in Policy 4. In the light of that amendment I am satisfied that no changes are required to the Local Plan proposals map.

- 3.6 The Green Infrastructure (GI) plans shown on page 22(a) are largely unreadable, and of little help to users of the CS. However, the Council proposes to upsize the GI zonal maps to A4 (PC9), and that will substantially address the concerns which I have.

Conclusions

- 3.7 The changes proposed by the Council, together with those recommended in this report will address any concerns in respect of the soundness of the CS.

Main Issues

- 3.8 The main issues identified through the Examination are set out below, together with my considerations, conclusions and proposed changes where appropriate.

Issue 1 - Whether the CS provides the most appropriate spatial strategy for the future development of the borough, and strikes the right balance between growth in the urban areas and retaining the vitality of rural settlements.

Directions for Growth

- 3.9 The Council looked at 7 broad options for growth in the borough, which were distilled into the Directions for Growth paper (CD11/05). The options contained varying balances of development around the urban areas, the urban fringe settlements around Leicester, the Key Rural Centres (KRCs), and other rural settlements. The Council adopted a combination of Options 4 and 6, as the one which provided the best balance of development. That allows for the concentration of growth in the Hinckley Sub Regional Centre (SRC) (as defined by the Council), together with limited market and affordable housing in the KRCs and other rural settlements.
- 3.10 The strategy generally follows the approach in Policy 3 of the EMRP (CD2/020(c)), which concentrates new development in the Principal Urban Areas (PUAs), with appropriate development of a lesser scale for Sub-Regional Centres (SRCs), which include Hinckley. The EMRP also identifies a requirement to provide for the development needs of other settlements and rural areas, whilst maintaining their character and vitality, and ensuring their sustainability.
- 3.11 The Council considered an option to provide a greater amount of development in the urban fringe settlements around Leicester. Whilst that approach might be seen as consistent with the EMRP policy to concentrate development in and adjoining the PUAs, those settlements do not fall within the definition of the Leicester PUA set

out in Policy Three Cities SRS1 in the EMRP (CD2/02(c)), and such development would not support the role and function of the SRC. Consequently, I agree with the Council's view that such a strategy would not meet the policy requirements of the EMRP.

Hinckley Sub-Regional Centre

- 3.12 The CS provides for the concentration of new development in the Hinckley SRC through the allocation of housing land to provide for a minimum of 1120 dwellings in and around the town itself, and an additional 295 dwellings at Burbage. In addition, two Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) are proposed at Barwell (2500 homes) and Earl Shilton (2000 homes), close to Hinckley. That addresses Policy Three Cities SRS 3 of the EMRP, which provides that development in Hinckley & Bosworth should be located mainly at Hinckley, including sustainable urban extensions as necessary.
- 3.13 The Council considers that Barwell, Earl Shilton and Burbage form part of the Hinckley SRC, and meet the locational requirements of the EMRP. To that end, it made representations to the Regional Plan Examination in Public (EiP) to include those areas specifically within the SRC. The approved EMRP remains silent on the precise definition of the SRC, but the Panel report following the EiP (CD2/09) indicates that 'there should be greater flexibility to allow the most appropriate pattern of development away from the PUsAs to be discussed and tested through the examination of Core Strategies'.
- 3.14 The Panel report also includes a change in Policy Three Cities SRS 3 which deletes the reference to development as 'a sustainable urban extension to Hinckley', and inserts an alternative formulation which provides that development 'should be directed towards Hinckley'.
- 3.15 The Panel's recommendations introduce greater flexibility into the definition of the Hinckley SRC, and leave the determination of the most appropriate distribution of development to the CS examination. However, the changes add some weight to the Council's view that the SUEs at Barwell and Earl Shilton do not conflict with regional policy. EMRA has confirmed that the CS is in general conformity with the EMRP, and that provides further support for the Council's view.
- 3.16 The alternative to the inclusion of Barwell/Earl Shilton within the SRC would be to concentrate the majority of new development in urban extensions around Hinckley itself (including Burbage), and the Council considered a range of options for that in CD11/05. The conclusions of that study are that there are a variety of constraints on the land east, west and south of Burbage (although the latter may be appropriate for an urban extension). Similarly, the land north-west of Hinckley could be appropriate for development, although there are also constraints on that area. The land between Hinckley and Barwell is mainly Green Wedge (GW), but has limited

development potential, and the area north of Earl Shilton also has physical constraints which would inhibit development.

- 3.17 A second phase analysis looked at the most appropriate alternatives (i.e. south of Burbage, north-west of Hinckley, south of Earl Shilton and west of Barwell) in terms of accessibility to services and facilities such as hospitals, schools, shops and town centres. The study concluded that the differences in respect of those areas are finely balanced, but that the Barwell and Earl Shilton options are most appropriate because they have limited constraints, the Earl Shilton by-pass provides a defensible boundary to one of the areas, and development will contribute towards the regeneration of the 2 settlements, which are among the most deprived areas in the borough.
- 3.18 The settlements of Hinckley and Burbage are physically contiguous, separated only by a railway line, and I therefore see no reason to conclude other than that Burbage is part of the Hinckley SRC. The settlements of Barwell and Earl Shilton are contiguous to each other, but are physically separated from Hinckley by an existing GW. At its narrowest point the GW is some 600m wide between Hinckley and Barwell, extending to about 2.5km between Hinckley and Earl Shilton. At present, Barwell and Earl Shilton are seen as separate settlements from Hinckley, and the CS maintains their physical integrity. Therefore, if the strategy to include Barwell and Earl Shilton as part of the SRC is to become a reality it is critical that the CS strengthens the relationships between the settlements, particularly in relation to the transport linkages. I consider the latter in more detail later in the report.
- 3.19 The benefits of the Council's approach are the opportunity to address concerns about areas of deprivation, particularly in Barwell and Earl Shilton, and the ability to provide enhancements to local services and infrastructure. The location of most development in or close to Hinckley provides the opportunity to relate new development more closely to existing and proposed employment locations, and to improve the provision of non-car modes of transport within the area. This meets both national and regional policies for growth to be sustainable and meets the Government's requirements for a sequential approach to the identification of development land, whilst allowing some growth within the rural communities to underwrite their vitality. On that basis, I concur with the Council's view that the broad spatial strategy adopted reflects the policy framework set down in the EMRP.
- 3.20 Overall, I am satisfied that the Council's approach to the definition of the SRC has been properly based on an analysis of the options available. Whilst the GW acts as a physical separation between Hinckley/Burbage and Barwell/Earl Shilton, the settlements are in close proximity, and function as a single urban area for such activities as employment, shopping and recreation. However, the satisfactory implementation of the Council's strategy for the area

will be dependent on ensuring that the SRC is further integrated through the planning process and, in particular, through the transport linkages which are established as part of the SUE development programmes.

Rural Settlements

- 3.21 The Directions for Growth study (CD11/05) identifies KRCs by population (settlements with over 1500 people), services (such as primary school, shops, Post Office, GP, etc), employment, and bus services. The centres are also assessed by accessibility to services and facilities such as secondary schools, hospitals, town centres, etc. Nine such centres are identified, and those settlements form the top tier of the rural settlement hierarchy. The criteria appear to me to be acceptable, and no alternative basis for assessment was advanced during the Examination. I shall therefore make my considerations against the criteria proposed by the Council. Policy 7 of the CS sets out a framework for development in these settlements, and Policies 8, 10 and 11 provide detail of appropriate development in each.
- 3.22 There are 3 anomalies in the KRCs which do not meet the criteria in full. Bagworth and Thornton (which are jointly identified as a KRC) have a low level of services, including the lack of a GP and secondary school in both villages. However, the 2004 population is estimated at over 2200, and the settlements are well-related to employment opportunities. The second anomaly is Barlestone, which has a good range of facilities serving a 2004 population estimate of nearly 2500, but has no local employment provision. The third anomaly is Stoke Golding, which has an estimated 2004 population of nearly 1700, has good access to local shops, education and primary health facilities, but has no bus service on Saturdays. Nevertheless, all of those are substantial settlements which are significant within their hinterland, and I concur with the Council's assessment that they should be included in the list of KRCs.
- 3.23 The other KRCs all meet the full set of criteria to a greater or lesser degree. Consequently, I am satisfied that they are justified against the criteria adopted.
- 3.24 There are 2 options for development in and around KRCs, either by concentrating development on a limited number of settlements or by distributing development across the 9 identified settlements. The latter approach is more congruent with the objectives to maintain existing services whilst minimising the impact of development on rural areas, and I am satisfied that the strategy to distribute development widely among the KRCs is soundly-based on the analysis in CD11/05.
- 3.25 Below the KRCs the CS splits rural settlements into villages and hamlets, based on the level of services which they contain. Policy

12 of the CS provides for a range of housing, employment, and other development within the settlement boundaries of Rural Villages, and detailed sub-sets of the policy identify specific proposals for each village to address their particular needs. Policy 13 provides a similar framework for Rural Hamlets, with a more restricted range of development identified as acceptable.

- 3.26 Settlement boundaries for all KRCs and other rural settlements will be reviewed as part of the site allocations process in the SAGDCDPD (PC137), and amendments made to boundaries where appropriate. Priority in the identification of sites will be given to the development of land within existing boundaries.
- 3.27 The strategy generally reflects the guidance set down in Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7) in that, away from urban areas, most new development is focussed in or near to local service centres. The CS also provides for some limited development in, or next to, other rural settlements, in order to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of communities. The national guidance is particularly supportive of provision for employment and community services in rural areas. PPS7 also advises that local authorities should make sufficient land available within or adjoining villages to meet the needs of local people, and that approach is also reflected in the Council's proposed strategy.
- 3.28 The CS reflects the guidance in Policy 3 of the EMRP, which indicates the need to provide for the development needs of settlements and rural areas outside the SRCs, and the approach in Policy 12 which indicates that employment and housing should be located within or adjoining settlements, and in scale with the size of those settlements.
- 3.29 The sustainability of the rural development proposals is addressed in Policy 14, which sets out the Council's aspirations for rural transport. I deal in greater detail with this later but, whilst I am concerned that there is limited information in the CS about the implementation of the proposals, I am satisfied that the Local Transport Plan (CD7/01) provides sufficient support and funding for many of the proposals to give confidence that they will be substantially delivered.
- 3.30 I am satisfied that the approach taken in the CS as a whole seeks to match the provision of additional housing with support for the development of local employment and services, and the promotion of improvements to accessibility in rural areas. As a consequence, I conclude that the general approach to rural development in the CS satisfactorily addresses the issue of sustainability, and adequately reflects national and regional policy.
- 3.31 There is little indication in the CS as to what alternative spatial strategies would be available if circumstances change over a period

of time. To overcome this, the Council has put forward a revision to the CS (PC 139) indicating its alternative strategy in the event that the delivery of the housing targets were to be in doubt. I discuss that in more detail below but I am satisfied that, with the proposed changes, the CS provides the flexibility required by PPS12.

Minor Changes to Policies

- 3.32 The Council's Proposed Post-Hearing Changes (Annex 2) include the renaming of Policy 17 as Local Needs (PC184). Consequently, references to that policy in Policies 7, 12 and 13 should be amended to Policy 17: Local Needs (IPC2).

Conclusions

- 3.33 The Council's general approach in the spatial strategy reflects both the national and regional policy framework by concentrating development in the Hinckley SRC, focussing most development in rural areas on the KRCs, and providing for some development in the other rural settlements to assist in maintaining their vitality. The proposals to improve rural transport provide an opportunity to mitigate the impact of additional rural development on the sustainability of the countryside.

Recommendation

The following change is necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC2: Delete references in Policies 7, 12 and 13 to 'Policy 17: Local Choice', and replace with 'Policy 17: Local Needs'.

Issue 2 – Whether the housing proposals are appropriate and achievable, and provide for sustainable development across the borough.

Changes to Regional Housing Policy

- 3.34 Policy 13a of the approved EMRP introduces amendments to the format and content of the regional housing targets. In particular, the time-scale for the EMRP housing figures is revised to cover 2006-2026 (omitting the period 2001-2006), and the housing target for the borough is changed to 9,000 dwellings for the revised period, with an annual apportionment of 450 dwellings. Those changes are reflected in paragraph 4.2 of the CS by the Council's Proposed Change 132 (PC132), and in paragraph 4.4 by PC135.
- 3.35 The figures in Table 1 of the CS are also revised by PC134, which sets out the revised housing supply position. Taking account of

completions since 2006, existing commitments, and identified urban housing sites, the current potential supply totals 3,992 dwellings, leaving a balance of 5,008 dwellings for which land needs to be identified. I set out a further change to the Small Site Commitments below under IPC3.

Economic Context

- 3.36 There are obvious concerns about the effect of the current economic recession, and the consequent decline in house-building nationally. There is no doubt that the recession will impact on housing delivery in the early years of the Plan period. At the present time there is no reliable forecast of the length and depth of that recession. It may be that the impact of the economic difficulties will be felt mainly in the immediate years, and the development industry will emerge from the trough in a relatively short period. Nevertheless, it is likely that the delivery of development in the early years of the CS period will be below forecast levels. However, the Regional Plan and the CS represent a long-term view of development over a time-scale of 20 years, and I therefore conclude that there is no need for me to revisit the housing targets set out in the EMRP or the CS.
- 3.37 In the event that the current economic circumstances persist for a substantial period there would need to be a review of both national and regional guidance, and that would have repercussions for the CS. Similarly, when the Regional Plan is reviewed or if the Council's monitoring identifies significant shortfalls in housing delivery, it will be necessary to review the housing figures at some future occasion to reflect the changed circumstances. Notwithstanding those provisos, for the purposes of this report I shall consider the situation as currently outlined in the EMRP and the CS.

Housing Land Supply

- 3.38 The housing allocations for the CS are informed by a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (CD11/03) which was prepared as a joint exercise with other local authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA). The assessment looked at a total of 676 sites on a settlement by settlement basis and, when added to existing provision, identified sufficient sites to meet the requirement for a five-year supply of deliverable and developable sites (i.e. sites which are available, suitable, and achievable). It also identifies developable sites available in the periods 6-10 years and 11-15 years which provide land in excess of that required to meet the borough's housing target. Many of those latter sites are adjacent to settlement boundaries and will be assessed through the SAGDCDPD. The proposed review of settlement boundaries will enable some of the sites currently in the category beyond 5 years to be brought forward into the first 5 years.

- 3.39 A number of sites were assessed as non-developable due to lack of suitability, availability, or achievability. Those sites are not included within the trajectory. However, in some cases the constraints may change in future, and in that situation the Council proposes to bring forward previously-developed land (pdl) ahead of greenfield sites as part of the SAGDCDPD.
- 3.40 The housing trajectory contained in the submission CS has been amended to reflect the changed requirements of the approved EMRP, and a revised trajectory was submitted by the Council (Annex 4). I endorse that revision as a replacement for Appendix 2 in the submission CS, subject to the further changes set out below (IPC3).
- 3.41 The trajectory shows a total housing provision of 10,085 dwellings over the period 2006-2026, compared with the EMRP requirement of 9,000 dwellings, an over-provision of about 12%. That does not conflict with the EMRP, since Policy 13a provides that local authorities can test higher numbers through their DPDs, provided they are consistent with the principles of sustainable development and tested through sustainability appraisal. The additional provision identified provides a degree of flexibility to meet possible future increases in the overall housing requirement, and to assist in accommodating any shortfalls in delivery which might arise from delays in the implementation of the larger schemes or any shortfall in site capacity for those areas.
- 3.42 The CS sets out the broad framework for development, and the detail of specific sites will be provided by the Site Allocations DPD which is due for Examination in 2010. I am satisfied that the Council's LDS demonstrates that it has put into place a process which will meet the housing land supply requirements of PPS3.
- 3.43 The revised trajectory shows shortfalls in housing delivery against the annual apportionment of 450pa given in the EMRP in the years 2006-2008, 2009/10, and in 2012-2017. However, those shortfalls are made good in the years post-2017/18 when the major developments in the SUEs come on stream fully, and the trajectory shows a surplus of dwellings by the end of the Plan period.
- 3.44 PPS3 requires that sufficient 'deliverable' sites are identified in the first 5 years from adoption. The revised trajectory shows a cumulative provision of 2288 dwellings in the period 2010-2015, compared with the EMRP apportionment of 2250 dwellings. Those sites are considered by the Council to be 'deliverable' and 'developable' in the terms set out in paragraphs 54-57 of PPS3. The submission draft therefore makes sufficient provision for the first 5-years from adoption of the CS, subject to detailed allocations made in the SAGDCDPD.
- 3.45 The housing trajectory includes existing planning permissions (Large Site Commitments and Small Site Commitments). There is

some doubt as to whether the small sites, in particular, will all be developed, and it may be appropriate to discount those sites in order to reflect the possibility that some will not proceed. Data held by the Council demonstrate that about 3% of extant planning permissions have expired before development takes place over the past 3 years. However, given the current uncertainties in the development market I consider that figure could rise in the next few years, and I propose to discount the small site commitments by about 10% (i.e. to 80 dwellings pa) to reflect that situation and to ensure that the CS is based on robust evidence (IPC3). Consequently, the overall housing provision for the period 2010-15 would reduce to 2258 dwellings. That figure would still provide the 5 year supply required by PPS3. Subsequent to 2014 it would be appropriate to apply a smaller discount of about 5% to any small site commitments to reflect an anticipated upturn in the housing market. A consequent revision is necessary to the Small Site Commitments shown in Table 1, which should be reduced to 400.

- 3.46 Local authorities should not generally include allowances for windfalls in the first 10 years of land supply. Rows 5 and 7 of the housing trajectory include 'settlement amendments and brownfield sites in urban areas' and 'brownfield sites and sites outside existing settlement boundaries' respectively. Those figures are derived from sites identified in the SHLAA, and are sites which will be tested through the SAGDCDPD and allocated at the end of that process. Consequently, they do not fall within the definition of windfall sites set out in footnote 31 on page 19 of PPS3, and are therefore appropriately included within the housing provision figures.
- 3.47 PC137 indicates that a number of the sites in Rows 5 and 7 could come forward within the first 5 years of the CS, once the Site Allocation process has been completed, thus increasing the potential housing supply for that phase of the Plan. However, the scale of that change can only be estimated at this time, and I see no reason for any adjustment to the housing trajectory at this stage to reflect that potential.
- 3.48 The capacity of the SUEs to accommodate the planned 4500 dwellings will be, in part, dependent on the densities adopted for the development and the master-planning of the areas. The Council has indicated that it will be seeking a density of 40dpha in the SUEs (PC180), but the detailed capacity figures for the SUEs cannot be conclusively identified until the completion of the proposed AAP and master-plan for the area. However, the over-provision made by the Council in its overall housing land supply will provide one way in which any shortfall could be absorbed were it to arise. I discuss later the need for further flexibility within the CS and the requirement for an alternative strategy in the event that there were to be capacity or programming problems with the SUEs.
- 3.49 The ability of the SUEs to deliver completions at the projected peak level of 476 units per annum is a key factor in achieving the

housing targets. An alternative trajectory submitted by representors suggested that the figure advanced by the Council is unlikely to be achieved, and put forward a reduced peak figure of 376 units per annum. That scenario would result in a shortfall of housing in the SUEs of 500 units in the Plan period. Further amendments put forward relating to windfalls and expired permissions would result in a revised total housing delivery of 8,696 dwellings compared with the 9,000 dwellings target set in the EMRP. I have considered the matter of windfalls and expired permission earlier, and have made appropriate adjustments to the Council's figures where necessary.

- 3.50 Achieving the peak development figures set out in the revised housing trajectory will require significant resources and organisation. However, the build rates have been agreed as part of the SHLAA methodology with the Developer Panel at 50-80 dwellings pa per site (CD11/03). That figure has been reduced to 30 dwellings pa per site for the period until 2011 to reflect the current market conditions, and thereafter the build rate has been assumed to be 60 dwellings pa per site. The completion rate for the SUEs therefore envisages up to 8 development companies working on the 2 areas at the peak of development.
- 3.51 Examples of other large-scale developments in which the developers have been involved were submitted to the Examination, indicating that outputs in excess of 400 dwellings pa had been achieved by development consortia in developments at Swindon and Cambourne, with the former peaking at over 800 units pa. Those figures demonstrate that the proposed build rate for the SUEs is achievable given the right resource levels and organisation.
- 3.52 The Calcutt Review of House Building Delivery (2007) concludes that there is a limit of 35-50 homes per year on sales from a single site, but that rate can be significantly increased on major sites by splitting them into smaller parcels for sale to other builders. That is what is proposed at Barwell/Earl Shilton. At the present time the economic conditions will clearly depress output. However, looking at the longer term I believe it is right to plan for a return to more 'normal' market conditions, and that historical levels of housing delivery will be achieved.
- 3.53 Evidence from the Buchanan Report 'Housebuilding Delivery on Strategic Sites' (2005) suggests that the rate of development from strategic sites is likely to be up to 200 units per annum, although larger sites have achieved higher rates. Given that the larger house-builders have demonstrated the capacity to achieve the projected build out rates on large sites in other locations as part of a consortium of developers, I take the view that a build-out rate of more than 400 units could be achieved on the 2 major sites in the CS. However, in view of the findings of the Calcutt Review and the Buchanan Report I take a more cautious view than the Council and In order to ensure that the trajectory is based on robust figures and

the CS is sound I propose to reduce the build-out figures to a peak of 400 units pa, which would represent a more achievable average (IPC3). Under that scenario the revised trajectory would deliver 9667 homes and would still exceed the EMRP housing target of 9000 units, but the completion of development in the SUEs would extend beyond the Plan period. Any increases above those figures would improve the delivery position.

- 3.54 Because the proposed peak building rates would be at the upper end of the likely range, it is essential that the Council monitors housing delivery closely over the period of the Plan through its AMR, and has a clear alternative strategy in place to address any significant shortfalls which occur. I am satisfied that the Council's PC139 will provide an appropriate fall-back position, and I endorse that position. In addition, I discuss a further change later in the report to enable the Council to respond to any other small-scale shortfalls in delivery which are identified through the AMR.
- 3.55 At present, the housing trajectory projects the first development in the SUEs in 2012/13, but that timescale could be affected by the programme for the Area Action Plan (AAP) which the Council proposes to prepare for the areas. The timeline for its production envisages adoption in June 2011. It assumes that work on the development master-plan will proceed in parallel with the emerging AAP, and will facilitate developers preparing planning applications ahead of the adoption. That would provide for the submission of detailed planning applications in the period February-August 2011, with the first tranche of 80 dwellings delivered in 2012/13.
- 3.56 The Buchanan Review concluded that there is an average lag time of 5 years between the submission of a planning application and the first year of build, but indicated that time-scale is different for sites allocated in the LDF. The working arrangements for the SUEs are being taken forward through the Earl Shilton and Barwell Forward Groups, which have been set up under the auspices of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), and which include local community and developer representatives. In addition, the land owners in the SUEs are substantially committed to the proposals, and much of the land is under the control of major house builders such as Taylor Wimpey, Persimmon, and Bloor Homes. Those arrangements provide a positive framework within which to achieve the proposed start date.
- 3.57 The programme for the AAP is ambitious. However, the timescale has been agreed with the consultants chosen by the Council to produce the Plan, and the Council has also obtained New Growth Point funding to provide a dedicated post to work on this project. In addition, discussions are on-going with developers/landowners to identify additional resources to assist in the preparation. If necessary, the Council proposes to release a small proportion of the SUEs for development in line with the emerging master-plan, to ensure the supply of the housing meets the requirements of the CS.

To reflect this position Policies 2 and 3 indicate that piecemeal development will not be permitted (PCs18 and 23).

- 3.58 The achievement of the AAP time-line will require significant resource commitment but, if that is forthcoming, the programme is achievable. On the basis of the information provided by the Council, I accept that the programme can be achieved without detriment to the delivery of the housing numbers set out in the trajectory, although close project management of the process will be essential to achieving the agreed end-date.

Rural Housing

- 3.59 The rural areas housing allocations are based on figures derived from the Rural Housing Numbers Methodology Statement 2008 (CD11/06). The allocations broadly reflect the amount of housing required to maintain population levels in the settlements at 2004 levels given likely demographic changes, adjusted to take account of transport sustainability, the range of services available, and environmental constraints. They provide additional housing in local communities and support the maintenance and enhancement of existing services in the KRCs and other rural settlements.
- 3.60 The overall housing allocation in the rural areas is 885 dwellings, representing just under 10% of all housing allocations for the borough until 2026. The appropriate level of housing in rural areas is very much dependent on particular local circumstances, and national guidance is therefore silent on numbers. Nevertheless, PPS7 does provide guidance in identifying that such development should focus on service centres, but that some housing is required in villages to meet identified local need. The Council's approach follows the hierarchy established by PPS7, and concentrates the majority of rural housing growth (745 dwellings) in the identified KRCs, with only 140 units allocated to other rural settlements. The overall population projections in CD11/06 broadly support those figures, and I see no in principle objection to them.
- 3.61 The Methodology paper goes on to adjust the housing requirements for each KRC by analysis of their sustainability and provision of services, together with an assessment of the existing housing and population mix and land availability data from the SHLAA. Whilst the rationale for the refinement is clear, the numerical basis for the changes is less so. Nevertheless, although a number of representations were made which proposed changes to the allocation in individual settlements, those were mainly promoting individual sites, and no more compelling rationale was advanced as an alternative method of allocating rural housing.
- 3.62 The need for continued development in rural communities was highlighted in the Taylor Report Living Working Countryside (CD5/02), and I concur with the view that some housing development is necessary in rural areas to 'maintain sustainable

and mixed rural communities'. I therefore accept the figures put forward by the Council represent a reasonable allocation of housing in line with both national and regional policy. The identification of specific sites is not a function of this Examination and will be progressed through the SAGDCDPD.

Alternative Housing Options

- 3.63 I discussed earlier the requirement in PPS12 that a strategy should be capable of dealing with changing circumstances, and should show what alternative strategies have been prepared to handle the uncertainty about deliverability. The submission CS does not provide an indication of an alternative way forward in the event that some of the new housing cannot be delivered. This issue is particularly relevant to the major development proposals at Barwell and Earl Shilton, where detailed master-planning has yet to be completed. Indicative land use budgets suggest that there is sufficient land available to provide the quantum of development planned, but the final capacity of the areas will be dependent on the outcome of the master-planning exercise. An alternative strategy is necessary in the event that difficulties arise with the capacity or programming of either of the SUEs. Without such flexibility the CS would not be sound.
- 3.64 PC139 sets out the alternative strategy which the Council proposes to pursue in the event that there were to be a significant shortfall in capacity or delay in delivering the proposed developments at Barwell and/or Earl Shilton. In that event the Council will revisit the Directions for Growth Report and undertake further consultation on the other available options with a view to bringing forward alternative development in a suitable location. I am satisfied that sufficient flexibility will be provided if the CS makes provision for that review, and I endorse the Council's proposed change.
- 3.65 There may also be situations where smaller-scale adjustments are needed to the strategy, and I propose a further amendment to PC139 to make provision for the Council to review sustainable sites identified in the SHLAA which are not initially allocated as part of the SAGDCDPD process, and bring forward additional sites, as necessary, in the event that a shortfall in meeting the housing targets set in the EMRP is identified through the AMR (IPC4).
- 3.66 There is a significant over-provision of potential housing sites identified in the SHLAA and under consideration as part of the SAGDCDPD, and the proposal to review those in the context of national guidance would provide an appropriate fall-back position for the Council. I am therefore satisfied that, with the proposed amendments, the CS would meet the requirement for flexibility in PPS12.

Housing densities

- 3.67 The submission CS is silent on the level of densities to be applied in the borough, although a footnote to the housing trajectory indicates that housing numbers are based on density minima of 30dpha in rural areas and 40dpha in urban areas. Since those figures vary from the national indicative minimum of 30dpha included in PPS3, it is necessary for the CS to specify the density policy. PCs179 and 180 address that need by including references to the density figures quoted above as an addition to Policy 16 and in paragraph 4.51. I concur with those proposed changes and, in addition, recommend the title of Policy 16 be amended to reflect the incorporation of densities in it (IPC5).

Previously-developed land

- 3.68 PPS3 sets a national target that at least 60% of new housing should be provided on previously-developed land (pdl), and requires local authorities to include a pdl target in their LDDs. In addition, the EMRP gives priority to making the best use of pdl and vacant and under-used buildings, setting a regional target of 60%. The submission draft CS does not specify any target for the re-use of pdl, although the Council indicated during the Examination that no specific figure needs to be included since it would seek to meet the national target.
- 3.69 The CS makes substantial provision for new housing on greenfield sites in the SUEs, and its implementation will require the identification of development sites which lie outside the current settlement boundaries in urban and rural areas. That calls into question the Council's ability to meet the national and regional target for 60% of additional dwellings to be provided on pdl.
- 3.70 At my request the Council revisited this matter during the Examination, and a detailed analysis of the sites available for development indicates that, because a significant level of housing will be in the SUEs and on sites currently outside settlement boundaries, the level of development on pdl is likely to be significantly below the national and regional targets. The Council indicates a revised target of 40% would be more achievable. I accept that local circumstances dictate the need for a departure from the national and regional targets for pdl, and to reflect this revised position I propose a further amendment to paragraph 4.2 and PC133 as put forward by the Council (IPC6).

Housing for Gypsies and Travellers

- 3.71 Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites requires the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) to identify the number of gypsy and traveller pitches required in each local planning authority area, based on data derived from a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The EMRP contains an

assessment based on the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland GTAA (2006-2016) (CD11/09), and identifies a serious shortage of authorised sites in the East Midlands. Policy 16 of the EMRP requires provision to be made in LDFs for the pitch requirements identified.

- 3.72 The calculated additional pitch requirement identified in the EMRP for 2007-2012 for Hinckley and Bosworth is for 26 residential pitches, plus 5 transit pitches and 2 plots for travelling show- people. The GTAA goes further and identifies a need for an additional 16 residential pitches in 2011-2016. The EMRP advises local authorities to plan on the basis of 3% compound growth per year for gypsies and travellers, and 1.5% compound growth per year for travelling showpeople for the years beyond 2012. The Council challenged the figures contained in the EMRP, but that challenge was unsuccessful. I shall therefore consider the CS policy in the context of the approved Regional Plan.
- 3.73 Policy 18 makes provision for 42 residential pitches together with up to 10 transit pitches and 3 family pitches for travelling showpeople for the period up to 2016, divided into needs prior to 2011 and for 2011-2016. Of those, it proposes that 6 pitches should be for social rent and managed by an RSL. The identification of specific sites will be undertaken as part of the SAGDCDPD process. The number of pitches specified in the policy accords with the guidance in the EMRP, and that is confirmed by the EMRA in its conformity letter. The Council proposes a number of changes to clarify the figures in paragraph 4.54 and in Policy 18 to bring them into line with the time period set in the EMRP (i.e. 2007-2012) (PCs185-190).
- 3.74 No provision is specified in the EMRP for the period beyond 2017, and the submission CS did not contain any projection of need beyond that date. However, PC190 identifies assumed growth rates for gypsies and travellers (3% p.a.) and for travelling showpeople (1.5%p.a.), in line with the EMRP, and indicates that a further GTAA will be undertaken to confirm needs beyond 2017. I endorse those changes to Policy 18.
- 3.75 Policy 18 includes a locational criterion indicating that sites should be within reasonable distance of local services and facilities. It suggests a distance of 3-5 miles would be appropriate. To my mind, such distances would run counter to the requirements of Government guidance in Designing Gypsy and Travellers Sites – A Good Practice Guide (2008), which indicates that where possible sites should be developed near to housing for the settled community, and should not generally be in locations that are inappropriate for ordinary residential dwellings. Following discussion at the Hearings, the Council has put forward a proposed change (PC191) to delete reference to a specific distance. I endorse that change.

- 3.76 I agree with the remaining criteria set out by the Council but, in order to make the CS sound I propose an additional criterion related to providing a safe environment for the residents, to reflect the guidance in paragraph 3.3 of the Good Practice Guide (IPC7).

Housing Mix and Design

- 3.77 Table 3 in the CS sets out the profile of new housing needed in the borough to meet the projected split of household types identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and that forms the basis for the housing mix set down in Policy 16. The Council proposed a series of changes (PCs74 and 75) following consultation on the submission document, and further changes are put forward following discussion at the Hearings (PCs 178-182). Those changes clarify a number of points in the policy, and introduce the Council's proposals for densities across the borough, as discussed earlier in the report.
- 3.78 The policy requires dwellings to meet a 'very good' rating against the Building for Life criteria. That requirement echoes the guidance in PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development, which indicates that planning authorities should have regard to such good practice advice. Setting that standard may have an impact on the viability of some developments, but I am content that the introduction of a viability test (PC181) will not preclude development progressing in circumstances where the cost of achieving the standard renders the scheme uneconomic.

- 3.79 I endorse the changes to Policy 16.

Sustainable Design and Technology

- 3.80 The government's policy towards tackling climate change is set out in PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (CD1/02(a)), which requires that development plans address the causes and potential impacts of climate change, and seek to mitigate them. It indicates that local authorities should promote resource and energy efficient buildings. Planning and Climate Change, the Supplement to PPS1, deals with this matter in more detail, and suggests that planning authorities should secure the highest viable resource and energy efficiency.
- 3.81 Policy 24 identifies requirements in relation to the government's Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) and the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM). The policy proposes target dates for meeting the CSH levels which are in advance of the government's proposals nationally. That approach does not conflict with guidance in the PPS1 Supplement, which provides that planning authorities may anticipate levels of building sustainability in advance of those set out nationally, but must be able to demonstrate clearly that local circumstances warrant that approach. In doing so, authorities must ensure that

their policy is evidence-based and viable, and is consistent with securing the expected supply and pace of housing shown in the Housing Trajectory.

- 3.82 The East Midlands Carbon Footprint report (CD6/10) identifies Hinckley and Bosworth as having the second highest domestic per capita CO₂ emissions in the East Midlands region, as well as a high per capita level of industrial and commercial emissions. Additionally, the Planning for Climate Change report commissioned by Councils in the sub-region (CD13/02) recommends accelerating the move towards lower carbon dwellings, and the CS reflects those recommendations. That report estimates that the energy requirements of Code Level 3 can be achieved without the use of renewable energy sources for less than a 7% increase in build costs, and that Code Level 4 can be achieved with an increase of up to 10% of build costs.
- 3.83 The Cost Analysis of the CSH (2008) by the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) gives an estimate of around £4K (about 4%) of build cost to achieve the energy efficiency measures for Code Level 3 for houses, and under £6K (6%) to comply with Level 3 in its entirety. The government target is to achieve that level by 2010 and, given the modest cost implications, the Council is justified in seeking to advance the achievement of that level from the date of adoption of the CS.
- 3.84 The CLG analysis also identifies the compliance costs associated with achieving Levels 4, 5 and 6 of the CSH. There is a step change in moving to each additional level, and estimates for houses range from 11-15% (for Level 4), and from 41-52% for level 6. Those represent significant increases in building costs, and the Council has not produced sufficient evidence of viability to satisfy me that such increases can be absorbed by the building industry in the borough without affecting the supply and pace of housing development shown in the housing trajectory. The inclusion of a viability test within the policy is not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Planning and Climate Change supplement. In order to make the CS sound I therefore propose to amend Policy 24 to bring the implementation of Code Levels 4 and 6 into line with the national timescales (IPC8).
- 3.85 Planning and Climate Change requires local authorities to focus on development area or site specific opportunities when addressing sustainable buildings. As drafted, the CS presents a borough-wide policy, applying to urban and rural areas alike, which does not comply with that advice. I therefore propose a further amendment to Policy 24 to limit its applicability to the main development areas in the borough (i.e. Hinckley, Burbage, and the Barwell/Earl Shilton SUEs). The national sustainability targets set out in Building a Greener Future will apply to other developments (IPC 8).

Development and Flood Risk

- 3.86 Paragraph 3.30 confirms that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out for the borough (CD13/12), and no major issues have been identified. The CS indicates that flood risk is not a major issue in the borough, but that flood mitigation measures will be incorporated into new development. The Council confirmed at the Examination that it will apply national policy as set out in Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25) and EMRP Policy 35 across the borough, and that specific flood risk issues in the major development areas will be addressed in the AAP for Barwell/Earl Shilton. Therefore I consider no additional policy statement is needed in the CS.

Conclusions

- 3.87 I am satisfied that, with the Council's Proposed Changes and the further changes which I recommend below, the housing proposals in the CS are appropriately justified, effective and consistent with national and regional policies.

Recommendations

The following changes are necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC3: Delete Appendix 2 of the CS and replace with the revised housing trajectory set out in Annex 4, with the following amendments:-

(i) The small site commitments set out in Row 3 of the revised housing trajectory be discounted by 10% (i.e. to 80 dwellings pa) for the period 2009/10 – 2013/14 to reflect the potential increase in lapsed planning permissions for small sites, and the Small Site Commitments shown in Table 1 be reduced to 400.

(ii) The peak build-out rates shown in Row 6 of the housing trajectory for the Barwell/Earl Shilton SUEs be reduced to 400 dwellings per annum for the period 2017/18 - 2021/22.

IPC4: Amend PC139 by adding the following at the end of the proposed new paragraph 4.12:-

‘In addition, any small-scale shortfalls in the housing provision identified through the AMR will be addressed by a review of sustainable sites identified in the SHLAA which are not prioritised through the SAGDCDPD’.

IPC5: Re-title Policy 16 ‘Housing Density, Mix and Design’.

IPC6: Insert the following after ‘previously developed land or through conversions’ and before ‘; this target will enable’ in paragraph 4.2 as amended by PC133:

‘. However, the Council’s analysis of development sites in the borough indicates that the EMRP target would not be achievable because of the level of development proposed in the SUEs and on sites currently outside settlement boundaries, and a target of 40% of dwellings on pdl is therefore proposed’

IPC7: Amend Policy 18 by adding the following criterion to the bullet points in the Policy;

‘appropriate to provide a safe and healthy environment for residents’

IPC8: Amend Policy 24 as follows:-

a) amend the timescales for the implementation of the CSH to read;

Minimum of Code Level 3 to 2013
Minimum of Code Level 4 from 2013 to 2016
Minimum of Code Level 6 from 2016

b) delete ‘the Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages’ from the first paragraph of Policy 24.

c) add after ‘Code level 6 from 2016 onwards’;

Residential developments in Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages will be expected to meet the sustainability targets set out in Building a Greener Future.

Issue 3 – Whether the proposals for affordable housing are justified and whether they can be demonstrated to be viable.

Affordable Housing Need

3.88 Policy 14 of the EMRP identifies a target of 26,500 affordable homes within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA). Local authorities are required to adopt appropriate targets in line with the most up to date Housing Market Assessments for their area. The CS specifies a target figure of 2090 affordable homes in Policy 15, and although that figure falls short of the requirement identified in the SHMA, it conforms to the requirement in the EMRP. I therefore agree with the Council that it is an appropriate target.

- 3.89 PPS3 defines affordable housing to include both social rented housing and intermediate housing. The Council confirmed that is the definition adopted in the CS, and has added the definitions to the Glossary at the end of the CS (PC 239).
- 3.90 The Council commissioned an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA) to test the proposals set out in Policy 15 of the CS. Following receipt of that assessment the Council revised Policy 15 as set out in Annex 5. The revised policy was subject to full consultation, and generally reflects the findings of the assessment. Subject to the discussion below I agree with the Council's proposed changes.

Affordable Housing Viability

- 3.91 The Council's AHVA recommended 2 options which the Council could pursue to achieve its affordability targets. Option 1 would require an overall proportion of 40% of all housing across the borough on qualifying sites to be affordable. That approach reflected the policy in the submission CS, and was considered to be a pragmatic approach relying on significant levels of subsidy for schemes in weaker market areas. The alternative option recommended was a range of targets across the borough to reflect the relative weakness of urban areas in achieving viable economic schemes including affordable housing.
- 3.92 The assessment of the options was based on the assumption that grant would not be available for the individual proposed developments and, given the criteria for grant-aid by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), I consider that to be the right basis for assessment. In the event that grant were available on specific schemes, Policy 15 makes provision for the Council to seek additionality in line with HCA guidance, and I concur with that approach.
- 3.93 Both options would provide affordable housing at levels well below the identified demand in the SHMA, and the latter option would reduce the overall delivery of affordable homes below that achievable under option 1. However, the Council indicated that either option would achieve the affordable housing target set in the EMRP. The Council adopted the second option identified in the AHVA in its revised Policy 15 with a requirement of 40% affordable housing in rural areas and 20% in the SUEs and other urban areas, where the market is weaker. Since those figures more closely reflect the likely achievable levels of affordable housing, I support that choice.
- 3.94 House prices in the viability study were calculated by analysing transactions from the Land Registry in specified sub-market areas over the years 2006-2008, and calculating an index of prices from the mid-year point of each year. The mid-year figure for 2008 was

then projected forward to give assumed house prices at mid-year 2009. In my view, that methodology provides a sound basis for the study in principle.

- 3.95 Notwithstanding my conclusions on the principles of the methodology, evidence was submitted to indicate that the house prices assumed in the AHVA were above transacted values in a number of settlements. Analysis of transactions in Groby during 2009 identified significant differences between those house prices and the average figures for outlying villages contained in the AHVA. Similarly, an independent technical assessment of house prices in the area identified variations across the sub-market areas, and indicated that the average transaction prices recorded in 2008/2009 were generally below the AHVA assumptions.
- 3.96 Both sets of data submitted were more limited than those in the AHVA, either in their spread over time or in geographical spread, and took no account of external factors such as the condition, size or location of individual properties. The examples given showed wide variations in price within small localised areas and, although they point to potential weaknesses in the viability study, they are not in my view sufficient in themselves to invalidate the assumptions made. The AHVA took 2 broad areas within the borough (urban areas/SUEs and rural areas), and provided a high-level guide to viability within those areas. The evidence indicates that there are sub-markets within those areas which are weaker than others, and in those cases the average prices adopted would require adjustment when carrying-out site specific appraisals on individual development schemes.
- 3.97 The Council indicated that it would be using a viability tool-kit to assess site-specific viability, and that it would take account of more up-to-date and localised data provided by developers when undertaking that exercise. That provision is contained within the policy, and to my mind that is an appropriate way forward which would provide the flexibility necessary to achieving realistic outcomes on affordable housing.
- 3.98 The transaction values assumed in the viability study also included a new-build premium on each type of property, from 5% on detached properties to 20% on flats. The data provided at the examination and in the independent assessment was based on transactions, many of which involved properties where no such premium would be appropriate. Consequently, the differences in house prices identified could be lower than shown by the raw data.
- 3.99 The technical assessment undertaken indicates that the AHVA assumptions about build costs are not unreasonable and generally exceed RICS Building Cost Information Service data for the area. The Council confirmed that the cost information reflected some additional costs for Housing Associations, which are already building at levels which meet the requirements of Level 3 of the Code for

Sustainable Homes. I am therefore satisfied that the cost assumptions in the AHVA are acceptable.

- 3.100 The assessment does not contain any general provision for increases in build costs or house prices, although Table 3.5 indicates that residual values in the SUEs would be substantially improved if assumptions of a 6% per annum increase in those elements were factored in to the calculations. Whilst a return to growth in house prices is to be anticipated, it is difficult to assess the timing and level of any changes in the current economic climate. I therefore concur with the methodology adopted in the study, but recommend the Council to consider a review of the policy as and when economic circumstances warrant it.
- 3.101 The AHVA includes an assumed rate of return for developers of 15% on gross development value (GDV) for private housing and 6% for affordable housing. However, there is an additional allowance of 5% for developers' overheads, which would provide an increased margin on costs. The technical assessment indicates that 15% was an acceptable level until mid-2007, although it is likely to be inadequate in the current economic climate, where funders require a profit of 20% GDV before financing developments. The rate of return will have an impact on viability, but over the length of the plan I take the view that profit levels will return to lower levels as the housing market recovers. I therefore conclude that the assumptions made in the AHVA, including the 5% allowance for developers' overheads, represent a reasonable assessment of the long-term requirements for developers' profit.
- 3.102 The viability assessment makes an allowance of £5k per unit for the cost of developers' contributions. The guidelines in the Statement of Requirements for Developer Contributions in Leicestershire show that the costs could be higher in some cases, although the costs associated with individual schemes will vary according to the level of need generated by the particular development. Some recent schemes have resulted in contributions in excess of £8k, although Circular 05/2005 indicates that planning obligations must meet the tests in the Circular and are unlikely to be required for all developments. Whilst the indications are that the figure included in the AHVA may be below the actual levels in some cases, the provision in the policy to negotiate the level of affordable housing on a site by site basis through the use of the viability toolkit will enable the actual costs to be built-in on individual schemes.
- 3.103 The AHVA provides limited information about existing and alternative land use values. In particular, Tables 3.6 and 3.7 provide data on residential and industrial values across the East Midlands, but that information is of limited value in providing a bench-mark for land in Hinckley and Bosworth. However, subsequent submissions indicated that industrial use values in the urban areas of the borough were in the region of £400k/ha, and that supported the view that a 20% target is viable in those areas.

In the rural areas the consultants recommended a bench-mark of about £1.5m/ha for existing residential land, and the AHVA showed residual values of between £1.2m and £1.8m at lower densities. The limited information available on bench-marking would support the view that the affordable housing targets of 40% and 20% are reasonable and achievable in many cases, although there may be specific sites where the land values would not support provision at that level. The provision in the policy for site by site negotiation using the viability tool-kit will enable those sites to be identified and considered on their merits.

- 3.104 The relevance of the AHVA would have been improved by the inclusion of sensitivity testing, which would have provided some indication of potential changes arising from future projected values and costs. In its current form the assessment provides a snapshot of the situation, but does not allow for any future improvements in the economic climate which might provide an opportunity to achieve higher levels of affordable housing. By setting targets related to the current viability it is possible that benefit of future improvements may be lost. However, that disadvantage could be addressed by a future review of the policy as the economic circumstances improve.

Affordable housing policy

- 3.105 Policy 15 meets the requirements in PPS3, and the Council's proposed changes to the policy and the accompanying paragraphs (PCs 231 – 238) address a number of requirements the EMRP. The addition of a target figure of 480 homes for rural affordable housing and the explicit link between Policy 15 and Policy 17 (Rural Needs) conforms to the advice in paragraph 3.1.14 of the EMRP. The Council has chosen to include the rural exceptions approach in Policy 17, but when read together I am satisfied that the 2 policies provide a suitable framework to address the need for affordable housing.
- 3.106 PPS3 provides that the national indicative minimum site size threshold for affordable housing is 15 dwellings, but indicates that local planning authorities can set lower thresholds where viable and practicable, including in rural areas. The AHVA does not make any specific recommendations on site size thresholds, but concludes that there is no viability constraint which would preclude the Council from setting thresholds below the national level.
- 3.107 The identified need for affordable housing in the SHMA substantially exceeds the target set in the EMRP, and any levels which are likely to be achieved given the relative weakness of the housing market. However, the Council has chosen to retain the threshold in urban areas and SUEs at the national indicative level. The Council estimates that a considerable proportion of new homes in urban areas will be developed on sites over 15 dwellings, and therefore

there is no significant benefit in reducing the threshold in those cases.

- 3.108 Evidence shows that applying the national threshold in rural areas would provide no significant level of affordable housing, because site sizes are generally well below that level. Analysis of past permissions shows that there has been no affordable housing provided under Section 106 agreements outside urban areas and KRCs since 2000, and that reducing the site size threshold to 4 dwellings would substantially increase the opportunities to capture the affordable housing potential in rural areas. The AHVA indicates that such an approach would be viable. In view of the identified need for rural affordable housing I consider that the Council's proposal to lower the site size threshold to 4 dwellings is justified and necessary.
- 3.109 There may be cases on small rural sites where it is not practical or feasible to require on-site provision of affordable housing. Those situations should be exceptions but, where they arise, the policy provides for the Council to consider accepting commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision.
- 3.110 The Council has adopted the definitions of affordable housing set out in Annex B of Delivering Affordable Housing, i.e. comprising only social rented housing and intermediate housing, and PC239 incorporates those definitions into the CS glossary.
- 3.111 PPS3 advises that affordable housing should include provision for the home to remain available at an affordable price for future eligible households or to recycle any subsidy for alternative provision. Policy 15 does not make specific provision for this requirement, but the definitions included in the glossary include it, and I am satisfied that is sufficient to meet the national guidance. However, the Council should ensure that all future agreements for the provision of affordable housing contain that provision.

Affordable housing in rural areas

- 3.112 Detailed assessment of housing need in the SHMA (CD11/01) identifies an affordable housing requirement of 40-50 dwellings per year across the rural areas of the borough, and indicates that the overall supply of housing to meet the needs of people earning less than £20k a year is small. It concludes that existing policies, using a hierarchy of settlements, have debarred the development of market housing and opportunities to secure affordable housing in many rural communities, and that successful completion of developments using the Rural Exception Site approach has been difficult to achieve.
- 3.113 There are 2 options through which to pursue rural affordable housing, either as a proportion of any market housing scheme, or through a local need/rural exceptions site policy. Both of those

options will make some contribution to the identified level of need in the borough. However, with a total allocation of 885 dwellings in rural areas, the market-based approach is likely to yield only a proportion of the homes required. Nevertheless, that is an important component of the supply, and should be pursued vigorously through Policy 15. I have dealt in more detail with this element of affordable housing above.

- 3.114 The Council also proposes to adopt the alternative approach through Policy 17 – Local Choice (now re-titled Rural Needs by PC184), which is based on the traditional ‘exceptions’ policy adopted by many local authorities, and largely reflects the ‘community-led affordable housing’ approach proposed in the Taylor Report. That study suggests a more pro-active approach to identifying sites, with early involvement of the community in identifying needs and sites, locally-based evidence of need through local needs surveys, clear controls over the future use of the housing to ensure it continues to meet local needs in perpetuity, and appropriate, viable and well-designed proposals.
- 3.115 The submission CS did not quantify the rural affordable housing target. The EMRP suggests that local authorities should set separate targets for rural affordable housing in their LDFs, and the SHMA indicates an annual requirement for rural affordable housing of 40-50 dwellings pa, which equates to some 640-800 units in the period 2010-2026. However, the Council has included a target of 480 homes in the revised version of Policy 15 (PC 232). That target is based on the rural housing numbers identified in the housing trajectory, which equates to 24 units per annum over the 20 years 2006-2026. I concur with the Council’s proposed target.
- 3.116 The Rural Needs policy covers a wider scope than purely housing, incorporating identified local need for other aspects such as employment and community facilities, and provides for development adjacent to settlements. Following discussion at the Examination the Council has proposed changes to the policy and the supporting text (PCs 183 and 184). The criteria for housing development under the policy require that the need must be identified locally, cannot be met within the settlement, is of a scale and design which respects the character of the settlement and level of need, and is subject to a legal agreement to ensure it is retained in perpetuity for local people. A further addition to the policy defines local need for housing.
- 3.117 As currently drafted the revised policy (PC184) restricts the occupation of employment sites permitted under the policy to people with a local connection. Such controls are impractical and are likely to inhibit significantly the development of employment schemes in rural areas. The restriction would also conflict with national policy in PPS7, which supports a wide range of economic activity in rural areas without placing any restriction on the

residency of future employees. I therefore propose to amend the policy to reflect the guidance in PPS7 more closely (IPC9).

- 3.118 The revised policy defines housing need by reference to the definition in the current PPS3. In order to ensure that the policy stands alone and provides clarity, I propose to incorporate the actual definitions within it (IPC10).
- 3.119 The EMRP suggests setting a framework within which specific sites could be allocated for affordable housing in rural areas through the LDF process. However, evidence presented to the Taylor Review indicates that approach has not proven to be successful in other situations, largely because it creates 'hope' value on the sites identified. I therefore do not propose any amendment to the CS in that respect.

Conclusions

- 3.120 Overall, I am satisfied that Policy 15 complies with the tests of soundness inasmuch as it is consistent with national policy, is supported by a proportionate and robust evidence base, and will provide a deliverable approach to the provision of affordable housing. I take the view that the assumptions in the AHVA provide a reasonable basis for high-level testing of the viability of the Council's affordable housing policy, although there will be local situations in which the level of provision will require more detailed analysis. However, the Council's policy makes adequate provision for site by site negotiations using the viability tool-kit which will be available. I support the Council's approach to the provision of rural affordable housing, subject to the proposed changes set out below.

Recommendations

The following changes are necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC9: Delete the phrase '/employment' from line 2 of bullet point 5 in the revised Policy 17.

IPC10: Delete (i) and (ii) in the definition of local need for housing in the revised Policy 17 and replace with:

(i) who are resident at the date of allocation in the village, parish or local area which the development is intended to serve;

(ii) who have an existing family or employment connection in the village, parish, or local area which the development is intended to serve.

Issue 4 - Whether the proposals for economic development provide a sound basis for employment in the borough and adequately address the needs of job creation and skills training.

Employment growth and land allocations

- 3.121 Industrial employment in the borough peaked in 1998 before declining steeply and then stabilising. Office and warehousing employment have, however, grown slightly over that period. Accessibility to the strategic road network via the A5 and M69 has led to a growth in distribution uses, mainly served by Logix Park in Hinckley and Bardon Business Park. Future supply is limited to a 20ha site at Nailstone Colliery, but that site has not proved attractive to the market.
- 3.122 The local manufacturing base has lost over 4000 jobs since 1995 and now represents about 22% of the local economy. There is also a concern about low-paid jobs, particularly in areas such as Barwell and Earl Shilton. The borough also suffers from a high level of out-commuting, with some 14,500 people commuting out of the borough.
- 3.123 The CS allocates 45ha of new employment sites up to 2026, to meet the projected population growth of 9,900 and the consequent growth in employment of 3,500 jobs forecast by Experian. Those figures were used as the basis for the Leicestershire and Leicester Employment Land Study (ELS) (the PACEC report (CD12/01)). That allocation is broken down into 6ha for office development (in or on the edge of Hinckley Town Centre), 4ha to meet the identified gap in the provision of industrial land, and 10ha to provide choice in the warehousing land supply. The balance constitutes an allocation of 25ha as part of the development pipeline, to be located within the Barwell and Earl Shilton SUEs.
- 3.124 There are conflicting data shown in Table 6.5 of the PACEC report, which indicate a fall of 1,900 in the population of working age in the borough over the CS period. Because of that there is some question over the validity of the employment forecast on which the CS allocations is based, and the figures are subject to some reservations. Nevertheless, the employment forecasts used in the PACEC report are based on up-to-date Experian forecasts produced in 2008 and I consider that they provide a credible basis for forward planning. I therefore propose to base my considerations on those figures.
- 3.125 The employment forecasts show growth of 1500 office-based jobs, which translates into a requirement for over 300,000sqm of floorspace. CD12/01 indicates that could be accommodated on as little as 6ha by adopting a high development density and requiring

fewer on-site car parking spaces. I accept that figure as the basis for provision of office floorspace in the CS.

- 3.126 The ELS identifies an overall need for 16ha of industrial land, but notes that 12.8ha are effectively available, leaving a requirement for about 4ha, and that figure is carried forward to the CS. I shall base my considerations on those figures.
- 3.127 The PACEC report recognises that the warehousing requirement could be met by the existing allocation of 20ha at Nailstone Colliery, but that site is not rail-connected nor well-related to the motorway network, and the report indicates that it may not meet market requirements. I concur with the view that alternative choices should be available in the warehousing land market.
- 3.128 The balance of the employment land recommended in the PACEC report is an allocation of 20-25ha as part of the proposed SUEs at Barwell and Earl Shilton. This is seen as part of the employment land pipeline, which is needed to enable the land market to function effectively. The pipeline requirement is identified in other studies undertaken (for example, the East Midlands Land Provision Study 2006 by Roger Tym & Partners), which identify a need for the planned supply of land to exceed the anticipated demand in order to provide flexibility in development opportunities. The precise allowance for the 'pipeline' is subject to a degree of subjectivity. Past studies suggest the need to plan for a pipeline of between 3-5 years, although some recommend a more generous allowance. The PACEC report assumes a six-year pipeline requirement, which translates into a provision of about 25ha based on a mean annual take-up rate in the borough of 4.3ha (CD12/01 Table 6.6), and I accept that as a reasonable basis for forward planning.
- 3.129 The proposed allocations at Barwell and Earl Shilton will provide local employment opportunities for residents of the SUEs and are intended to provide for zero-carbon development after 2019. Given the time-lines for the development of the SUEs they will come on stream towards the end of the CS period, and their development is likely to extend beyond 2026. I take the view that a more rigorous approach could have been taken to identifying the quantum of land required to support the developments at Barwell/Earl Shilton. However, I am satisfied that significant employment allocations are necessary to provide local jobs and minimise commuting from the SUEs, and that they will make a significant contribution to the sustainability of the proposed developments. For those reasons I support them as a necessary component of the CS.
- 3.130 The CS needs to be clearer about the function and sustainability of the allocations in Barwell and Earl Shilton. To that end I propose amendments to Policies 2 and 3 to specify that those allocations should primarily support local employment opportunities, including starter and grow-on units, and should aim to achieve zero-carbon

development (IPC9). Those changes will ensure that the strategy is the most appropriate, and that the CS is sound.

- 3.131 Policies 2 and 3 of the CS provide no guidance on the range of employment uses which would be appropriate at Barwell and Earl Shilton. Although Policy 1 is specific about the allocation of office floorspace in Hinckley Town Centre there is a danger that the allocations in the SUEs could result in pressure for office development in those locations. That outcome would be contrary to national guidance in Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres (PPS6) and in the emerging Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Prosperous Economies (Consultation Draft PPS4), and would conflict with the spatial strategy of concentration set out in Policy 3 of the EMRP. Consequently, in order to make the policies sound, I propose further amendments to Policies 2 and 3 of the CS to clarify that the employment allocations in the SUEs are to provide for industrial and warehousing developments (IPC11).
- 3.132 The PACEC report (CD12/01) identifies 2 employment sub-markets in the borough, a road-based distribution market linked to the M69 and a local business-based market. The CS reflects the concentration strategy in the EMRP by locating most of the employment growth in the Hinckley SRC. However, the CS also seeks to ensure the provision of local employment opportunities by supporting the enhancement of employment sites in the KRCs (Policy 7) and small scale employment uses in other rural settlements (Policies 12 and 13). The proposed distribution of employment floorspace conforms to the strategy set out in the EMRP.
- 3.133 The submission CS originally identified locations in Burbage for redevelopment of existing industrial land and an extension to Logix Park in Policy 4. However, PPS12 advises that it is not generally appropriate to make site-specific allocations in the CS since those can date quickly. The Council has confirmed that it is not intended to allocate sites for development in the CS, and it has submitted PC 147A which removes references to the specific locations. I endorse that change.
- 3.134 The Hinckley town centre AAP identifies 10 Strategic Development Areas which will be sufficient to accommodate the required level of office floorspace. In addition, detailed site allocations for the proposed employment development in Barwell and Earl Shilton will be brought forward as part of the AAP which the Council proposes to prepare. Overall, I am satisfied that the economic regeneration elements of the CS are deliverable, particularly since the Council has resolved to take Compulsory Purchase powers, if necessary, to bring forward sites in Hinckley town centre.

Learning and Skills Training

- 3.135 Spatial Objective 1 seeks to attract modern creative industries to the borough, and Policy 1 specifies the Council's support for those businesses within Hinckley town centre. The Council is working in partnership with the North Warwickshire and Hinckley College to establish creative industries in Hinckley, and work is well-advanced on the conversion of the listed Goddard Building in the town centre to form a creative innovation centre. A new college campus, specialising in courses on training for the arts and creative industries will open on an adjoining site.
- 3.136 The Council is working with a number of training bodies, including the Leicestershire and Leicester City Learning Partnership, the Employment, Skills and Productivity Partnership, and the National Skills Academy for Manufacturing, to provide opportunities for learning and skills development. However, the CS is silent on this aspect of economic regeneration, and I consider that it would be appropriate to include reference to this work in order to provide an additional spatial dimension to the document and to make it sound. I therefore propose an addition to paragraph 4.7 of the CS to reflect the work being carried out on skills training (IPC12).

Conclusions

- 3.137 The proposed allocations will concentrate the majority of employment growth within the Hinckley SRC, and provide more sustainable job opportunities for residents in that area. The pipeline allocation of 25ha will provide for choice in the development of new sites, and will support development in the SUEs with local employment opportunities.

Recommendations

The following changes are necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC11: Amend Policies 2 and 3 as follows:

Policy 2

Add after 'green space provision' in the first bullet point 'The employment allocations are to provide for industrial and warehousing developments. They should primarily support local employment opportunities, including starter and grow-on units, and should aim to achieve zero-carbon development. The...'

Delete 'These'

Policy 3

Add after 'green space provision' in the second bullet point 'The employment allocations are to provide for industrial and warehousing developments. They should primarily support local employment opportunities, including starter and grow-on units, and should aim to achieve zero-carbon development. The...'

Delete 'These'

IPC12: Add the following at the end of paragraph 4.7:

The Council is working with a number of partners on programmes to improve skill levels within the borough. Programmes include Train to Gain, Pre-Employment Training, and the National Voluntary Training Pathfinder, and are run by partners including the North Warwickshire and Hinckley College, and the Leicestershire and Leicester City Learning Partnership.

Issue 5 – Whether the transport proposals are consistent with national and regional policies to reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

Transportation Measures

- 3.138 The key transportation issues facing the Council are managing the substantial growth in the Hinckley SRC and the housing development proposed in the rural areas, whilst ensuring that the developments do not undermine the sustainability of the CS. The allocation of 4500 houses to Barwell and Earl Shilton will necessitate substantial improvements in non-car modes of transport to minimise growth in car traffic resulting from the additional population and the increased reliance on Hinckley town centre for comparison shopping, leisure and education.
- 3.139 Policy 5 of the submission CS proposed a range of transport improvements which incorporated new and improved bus, cycle and pedestrian links between Hinckley and the adjoining settlements, together with road improvements to the A47/A5 'Longshoot' junction, the Hinckley Northern Perimeter Road (HNPR), the A447 Ashby Road, and the A47 east of Ashby Road and the Earl Shilton Bypass. However, concerns were expressed by the Highways Agency (HA) and the Government Office (GOEM) about the adequacy of the evidence base, and the balance between increases in highway capacity and more sustainable transport options.

- 3.140 More details of the transportation proposals were submitted as part of the post-publication Proposed Changes (PCs 97-101). Subsequently, arising from consideration at the Examination, the Council undertook further discussions with the HA and the Highway Authority and produced a further refinement of the proposals, with the aim of clarifying the necessity for road capacity improvements and the potential for addressing the requirements through the introduction of sustainable transport measures (Annex 2 Appendix 2). These proposals are supported in principle by the HA and the Highway Authority. I shall confine my considerations to that most recent submission.
- 3.141 The evidence base for the Council's submissions derives mainly from the Ptolemy model used by the County Council for the EMRP studies, and a more focussed analysis of transport implications for Barwell and Earl Shilton. These have been refined over time by more precise use of the Ptolemy model. The most current series of tests were run in April 2009, based on a rebalanced package of measures, and including tests to evaluate rail service improvements and 'Smarter Choice' measures. The Council proposes to continue work to refine further the detail of the measures, using the more detailed Paramics traffic model now being built.
A5/A47 'Longshoot' Junction
- 3.142 The housing proposals at the SUEs will have a detrimental impact on congestion at the 'Longshoot' junction (CD14/04), although the precise impact cannot be identified until the Paramics model is available. It is likely that a quantum of development in the SUEs can be delivered in advance of the proposed improvements, but changes will be required to accommodate any substantial development. An element of funding will be sought from developer contributions related to the main housing schemes. Housing growth in Nuneaton and Bedworth is also likely to impact on this junction, and will provide other opportunities to seek contributory funding.
- 3.143 The proposed improvement to the junction is not primarily aimed at providing increased capacity, but is intended to enable the introduction of additional public transport priority measures. It would involve capital expenditure estimated at between £19.3m and £22.5m, depending on the timing of its implementation, but there is currently no financial commitment to the scheme. It is not included in the East Midlands Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) and, although it is under consideration in the current RFA Review, there is no assurance that it will be funded in the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, the scheme is supported by HA, Leicestershire and Warwickshire County Councils, and a number of local authorities, and I therefore consider that there is a reasonable prospect that it will be implemented at some stage.
- 3.144 There are a range of public sector funding streams which might be available to contribute to the junction improvement, including the

RFA, Local Network Management funding, and New Growth Point Initiative funding, all of which could be available in conjunction with developer contributions. In the future the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy might also provide a source of funding. Consequently, whilst no specific funding has yet been identified for the scheme, I am satisfied that there are opportunities available to achieve the required improvements.

- 3.145 In the event that full funding is not available or there are delays in carrying out the works, the HA indicated that it can introduce other measures to restrain traffic and to limit the impacts of development, and I am therefore comfortable with the assurances given by the Council, the HA, and the Highway Authority in respect of this proposal. However, the Council will need to monitor the progress of this scheme closely, and bring forward alternative proposals for housing if the anticipated housing targets for the SUEs cannot be delivered because of junction limitations at 'Longshoot'.

Sustainable Transport Package

- 3.146 The transport package also includes proposals for improvements on other parts of the highway network. The original proposals indicated the partial dualling of the HNPR, the widening of the A447 from the Barwell SUE to its junction with the A47, the dualling of the western end of the Earl Shilton by-pass, and minor works to other junctions. Following discussions at the Examination a revised package of measures was developed, which looked at reduced highway improvements, including junction improvements to the HNPR and the Earl Shilton by-pass as an alternative to dualling. In addition, the revised package looked at increased bus frequencies, rail service improvements, and the introduction of 'smart measures' which seek to influence travel choice through advice, information, and incentives. The delivery of the rail service improvements is complicated, and their deliverability is unclear. For that reason they are not included in the Council's preferred option, although their implementation would provide additional sustainability benefits.
- 3.147 The Ptolemy Test of Revised Transport Measures in Hinckley (CD14/06(d)) indicates that the revised package, without the rail improvements but including the 'smart' measures, would lead to a fall of up to 4% in the modal share of journeys to and from Hinckley by car, and a fall of up to 5% in the number of trips to and from Hinckley by car in 2026, when compared with the situation which would occur by 2016 if there were no transport interventions. The proportion of journeys by bus would rise by up to 2%, and the number of trips by bus would increase by up to 24%. On a similar basis, the total vehicle kilometres travelled in Hinckley would fall by 6% by 2026, when compared with the situation which would arise in 2016 without transport interventions. The figures indicate that there would be a relative improvement in sustainable travel as a result of the current package of measures.

- 3.148 The revised package of transport measures provides a more clearly-defined and balanced approach to meeting the transport requirements of the SUEs. However, the full extent of the capacity improvements needed is not yet clear, and cannot be finalised until the more detailed assessments are available through the Paramics model. It is important that the final package should reflect national policy in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (PPG13) (CD1/02(J)) to reduce the need to travel, especially by car, and address the regional objectives in EMRP Policy 43 to reduce traffic growth, support sustainable development, and to improve air quality. I therefore propose that the Council adopts the revised package of transport improvements as indicative at this stage (IPC13).
- 3.149 In order to reflect national and regional guidance the final package of proposals in the AAP should be based on the outcomes identified by the Ptolemy model, and should reflect the priority to achieve significant improvements in bus services between Hinckley and Barwell/Earl Shilton, concentrating on bus priority measures along the A447, which currently carries the majority of bus traffic into Hinckley. Schemes along the A47 should be limited to those necessary to provide for improved bus services, rather than increasing the capacity of the corridor and attracting more car movements. Measures to improve pedestrian and cycle access to Hinckley should also be a fundamental part of the SUE proposals.
- 3.150 In order to reflect the above changes more closely, I propose revisions to Policy 5 which would stress the sustainable nature of the proposals, and that final details of the improvements will be brought forward as part of the Barwell/Earl Shilton AAP (IPC14). Those changes are shown in Annex 6.
- 3.151 Policy 5 also expresses support for the creation of a new link between the Earl Shilton by-pass and the M69. This proposal appears to be an aspiration which is unsupported by any substantive evidence of need or achievability. Consequently, its inclusion in the CS would be unsound, and I propose to delete the reference to it from the policy as set out in Annex 6 (IPC14).

Transport in rural areas

- 3.152 The main areas of development are concentrated in the urban areas which comprise the Hinckley SRC, but the CS makes provision for significant development in the rural areas of the borough. Housing allocations to KRCs and other rural settlements total some 885 dwellings, and the CS supports the development of additional local employment uses within those areas. The sustainability of those development proposals depends very substantially on the maintenance and enhancement of rural transport alternatives to the car.

- 3.153 To promote the sustainability of the additional development the CS sets out a range of rural transport proposals in Policy 14. Although many of the elements set out in the policy are commendable, they are largely statements of support for aspirational objectives, with little indication of who will be responsible for their implementation, how they will be funded, and whether they can be achieved. There is no specific provision within the IP for any of the proposed improvements, although the Plan indicates that possible funding sources would be Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding, New Growth Point Initiative funding, or developer contributions. I would have welcomed more evidence of consultations with the providers of the services and more clarity on the implementation of the measures.
- 3.154 The limited scale of development in rural areas is unlikely to yield significant developer contributions towards the rural transport proposals, and there is no indication in the CS of the level of commitment from the County Council. However, the Leicestershire Local Transport Plan (CD7/01) includes a Quality Bus Partnership covering the borough, and indicates that the County Council currently spends over £3m a year supporting bus services county-wide. The County now has an hourly daytime bus service network providing a service within an 800m walk from home for 95% of the population, and increasing access to work, shopping and other opportunities. The County Council does not intend to extend that level of access, but is seeking to improve access at other times of the day.
- 3.155 The LTP also outlines proposals to improve other complementary public transport services such as community mini-buses and rural dial-a-ride schemes. Those are already in existence to complement the hourly bus network, and will be reassessed and revised in the future to improve efficiency and access opportunities.
- 3.156 The commitments in the LTP are the fundamental building blocks to establishing a sustainable rural transport system, and they will provide rural communities with a real choice of transport modes. Consequently, I am satisfied that the funding and mechanisms are in place to implement those aspects of the Council's Rural Areas transport proposals.
- 3.157 The Council undertakes to deliver safe cycle paths as identified in its Rural Parishes Cycling Network Plan (CD14/02), and that commitment is reflected in the IP, where a general sum of over £3m is suggested for expenditure on cycle routes over the Plan period. Funding would be by developer contributions, LTP funding, and New Growth Point Initiative funding. Although funding is not secured for specific schemes at present, there are opportunities within those funding sources to achieve a more comprehensive network which will support more sustainable travel in the rural areas.

3.158 Notwithstanding the aspirational nature of Policy 14, I am satisfied overall that the existing hourly bus services network provides a good basis for non-car modes of travel in the rural areas, and that there will be funding sources available over the period of the CS to implement significant improvements in that and other sustainable modes of transport.

Conclusions

3.159 The final package of proposals for transport improvements in the SRC provides a more balanced and sustainable set of measures which will contribute to the increased integration of the 4 settlements. I have concerns that there is no committed funding to the package as a whole, and particularly to the A5/A47 Longshoot junction improvements. Nevertheless, paragraph 4.10 of PPS12 recognises that there may be funding uncertainties when the CS is prepared, and requires in those cases that there is a reasonable prospect of provision. I am satisfied that, with the in principle commitments given by the HA and the Highway Authority and the support of other local authorities in the area, there is sufficient prospect of the implementation of the proposals in this case. In the event that this is not forthcoming within the timescales anticipated, some development can proceed in the SUEs without the improvements, and the HA indicates that there are a range of other measures which can be introduced to limit the growth of traffic.

Recommendations

The following changes are necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC13: Adopt the revised package of sustainable transport proposals shown in Annex 2 Appendix 2 for transport improvements in the Hinckley SRC.

IPC14: Amend Policy 5 as set out in Annex 6 of this report.

Issue 6 – Whether the proposals for Green Infrastructure, leisure and recreation are achievable and in conformity with national and regional policy.

Green Infrastructure

3.160 Green Infrastructure (GI) is described in the EMRP as ‘the networks of multi-functional greenspace which sit within, and contribute to, the type of high quality natural and built environment required to deliver sustainable communities’. Policy 28 of the Regional Plan requires local authorities to work with other stakeholders to ensure

the delivery, protection and enhancement of Environmental Infrastructure across the region and, in particular, to develop GI plans, increase access to greenspace, and identify delivery and funding mechanisms for the creation and future management of GI.

- 3.161 The EMRP also sets out a sub-regional strategy for GI in Policy Three Cities SRS 5, which requires local authorities to co-ordinate the provision of enhanced and new GI. Strategic priorities include the National Forest, a proposed Charnwood Forest Regional Park, and Green Wedges.
- 3.162 The Council's GI strategy is a key element of the CS. Policy 20 proposes increases and enhancements to a number of existing open areas, rail and river corridors, and the creation of multi-functional movement corridors, together with proposals for the protection of existing GWs, the greening of Hinckley town centre and the creation of strategic footpath routes and recreational opportunities within the proposed Barwell/Earl Shilton SUEs. Many of the other policies in the CS contain proposals related to the GI network, and the IP contains a range of proposals which support the concept.
- 3.163 The Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth (CD13/01), sets out a network of green spaces and natural elements that connect the places where people live. The strategy identifies a range of implementation measures, including Local Area Agreements and Local Public Service Agreements, community and voluntary sector engagement, existing programmes such as the National Forest, planning contributions, and general funding sources such as New Growth Point Initiatives and Lottery funding.
- 3.164 The Council has allocated funding to elements of the GI strategy, with £3.5m committed to improvements in greenspaces for the period 2005-2010, and by the appointment of a dedicated Project Officer for the delivery of greenspace improvements. As a result, there has been substantial improvement to parks and open spaces in several communities. However, many other projects are included in the IP for which no funding has yet been identified.
- 3.165 The IP identifies GI strategic interventions as separate elements in the schedule and allocates them to the time period 2008-2015. However, none of the interventions are identified individually or costed in the IP, and no funding has yet been allocated to them. Although funding sources are identified I am concerned that the proposals in many cases are likely to be complex and costly, and that they are insufficiently advanced for many of them to achieve completion in the time-scale in the IP. I note that, in some cases there will be opportunities to provide funding through developer contributions, but that source may not be appropriate in other instances, and may need to be supplemented from other funding regimes.

3.166 I have no doubt about the commitment of the Council to implementing its GI strategy, and the inclusion of a substantial sum for improvement to greenspaces and playspaces in its existing Capital Programme represents a significant start to the programme. However, much of the programme, particularly the projects identified in Policy 20 must be seen, at this stage, as aspirations. I am concerned that there appears to be little detail available on the content of the works or their implementation. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the Council will progress the implementation of the strategy through the range of funding sources identified, although it is likely that the time-scales identified are over-optimistic. In that context, whilst there are weaknesses in the delivery mechanisms, I propose no changes to Policy 20. I deal in more detail with the IP later in the report.

Special Areas

3.167 The borough contains part of the National Forest and part of the proposed Charnwood Forest Regional Park. The EMRP identifies the National Forest as an area where opportunities should be taken to increase woodland cover (Policy 30), and both the National Forest and the Charnwood Forest are identified in Policy Three Cities SRS 5 as strategic priorities in the provision of GI. The Council has proposed several changes to Policy 22, mainly to clarify the current status of Charnwood Forest. Subject to those changes the policies are in general conformity with the regional guidance, and I propose no further amendments.

Green Wedges

3.168 The CS identifies 2 GWs - at Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage, and at Rothley Brook Meadows - covered by Policies 6 and 9 respectively. The latter provides separation between Groby, Ratby, Kirby Muxloe and the suburbs of Leicester. They each provide a valuable function in retaining the identities of the individual settlements. Policy Three Cities SRS 5 of the EMRP identifies them as a strategic GI priority in the sub-region.

3.169 The Council proposed post-publication changes to the policies (PCs 38-40 and PCs 52-53), to clarify the range of appropriate uses and to remove reference to landscape character. Those changes brought the text and policies more into line with the guidance in PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, which advises that Councils should not maintain local landscape designations.

3.170 Other changes are proposed following discussion at the Hearings (PCs 147-154 and PCs 161-163), which further clarify the appropriate uses within the GWs, and indicate that their boundaries will be reviewed as part of the SAGDCDPD process. That commitment complies with the requirement in the EMRP for a review of GW boundaries as part of the LDF process. I am satisfied

that, with the changes made by the Council, the GW policies comply with national and regional guidance.

- 3.171 The Council proposes the creation of a 'sports hub' within the Hinckley GW, based on existing clubs active within the area at present. This concept is aspirational at this stage, and no significant funding has been identified, other than for the replacement of the Hinckley Leisure Centre. However, it would involve a mix of open and built facilities and, to reflect that, PC154 proposes the amendment of criterion (b) in the GW policies to provide for recreation as a whole, rather than only outdoor recreation. In the light of the Council's intentions for the area, I endorse that change.
- 3.172 I discussed earlier my concern that the CS is both over-long and repetitive. The policies on GWs provide a demonstration of that. Policies 6 and 9 are, in all material ways, identical in their intentions and their wording. Although they cover different geographical areas I can see no reason why they could not have been combined into a single policy, thereby reducing the length of the document and increasing its accessibility to users. However, it is not my role to improve the Plan, and I therefore make no recommendations in that respect.

Green Space and Play Provision

- 3.173 Policy 19 sets out quantity, quality and accessibility standards for greenspace and play provision. National standards are provided by Natural England through its Accessible Natural Greenspace standards (ANGSt), which address the spatial distribution of natural greenspace and its accessibility. The Council has taken a similar approach to the definition of accessible open space, but has adopted a more locally-relevant hierarchy. The standards adopted have been based on the results of local consultation and the identified needs of the community, and reflect the approach taken in the national standards.
- 3.174 The mixed urban and rural nature of the borough is such that accessibility needs are likely to vary across the area. The Council has therefore proposed a post-hearing change (PC192) to indicate that the standards may be difficult to achieve in rural areas. That change recognises the practical difficulties of having a single standard for areas which have differing needs and opportunities, and provides an acceptable clarification on the implementation of the standards.
- 3.175 The CS also sets out quantity and quality standards for greenspace and playspace. The quantitative standards are based on local research through the borough's Green Space Strategy (CD13/03), and reflect the approach taken in most authorities. The quality standards reflect a scoring system developed by the Parks and Countryside Service and based on an assessment of 13 individual

elements such as the cleanliness, lighting, seating, paths and access, etc. Although those are referred to in the Green Space Strategy they are not defined within the CS, and there is no indication of how measurement is to occur. Whilst those are important elements of the open space provision they are difficult to measure and their importance is mainly in achieving the objectives of the Parks and Countryside Service. I am not convinced that they are adequately justified or soundly-based, and I therefore propose to delete the reference to the measurement of quality from the policy (IPC15).

Conclusions

3.176 Subject to the changes proposed I am satisfied that the GI proposals, the GW policies, and the greenspace and play provision standards provide a suitable base for future provision in the borough in line with national and regional policy.

Recommendation

The following change is necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC15: Delete from Policy 19:-

Quality

All existing allocated and new public green spaces to achieve a quality score of 65% as defined by the Hinckley & Bosworth Green Space Strategy.

Issue 7 - Whether the Infrastructure Plan is achievable, and is supported by appropriate commitment from those agencies responsible for its implementation.

3.177 The CS contains a very detailed and extensive IP. The proposals within it are diverse and wide-ranging, covering matters which vary from the major transport improvements needed to support the development of the SUEs (costed at £29m – £39m) to a range of local improvements to greenspace, playspace and allotment provision in the individual villages (costed from £5K upwards). In many respects it is an aspirational 'wish list', identifying all of the projects and improvements which the Council would like to see implemented over the period of the CS. However, many of the proposals are desirable or optional, rather than essential to the delivery of the Strategy.

3.178 A number of the projects identified in the IP are underway or have been completed since the CS was initially drafted, whilst others are funded and programmed. However, in many other cases they are

neither funded nor programmed, although potential phasing and funding sources are identified. PPS12 recognises that there will be uncertainty in the budgeting and planning processes which mean that less information is available than would be ideal. In such cases it is important that the CS makes provision for such uncertainty, and there must be a reasonable prospect of provision.

- 3.179 PPS12 advises that a CS should be supported by evidence of what infrastructure is needed to enable the development proposed to proceed, and should identify who will provide it and when. However, it does not require that the IP should be a formal part of the CS. The inclusion of a very detailed IP within the CS document could give rise to difficulties in reviewing and amending its contents, requiring any review to go through the formal processes of consultation and Examination associated with a DPD. As a consequence the CS would not be an effective document, and would be unsound. I therefore recommend the deletion of the IP contained in the submission CS (IPC16).
- 3.180 At my request the Council has disaggregated the table of infrastructure requirements and categorised every project according to whether it is essential to the delivery of the CS, desirable to achieve the benefits associated with the CS, or optional to improve the quality of life of residents and those working in the borough. That classification enables a clearer focus to be given to those elements which are most essential to the implementation of the CS.
- 3.181 Notwithstanding my proposal to delete the IP set out in the submission CS, there are some key elements within the IP which are critical to the implementation of the CS. They are set out in Annex 7 and include the transport improvements associated with the SRC, the health and education proposals in the SUEs, the strategic Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions set out in Policy 20, and the proposals for sustainable rural transport. Because of their critical nature for the delivery, and therefore the soundness of the CS, I propose that a table summarising those items be included within Chapter 5 of the CS in place of the schedule in the submission document (IPC16).
- 3.182 In order to ensure that the CS is deliverable, and therefore sound, I have asked the Council to draft additions to the text of Chapter 5 of the CS, to summarise the essential items of infrastructure and how it intends them to be delivered. That revision is attached as Annex 8 to this report, and I propose that it be included in the revised Chapter 5 of the CS (IPC16).
- 3.183 Within a document as detailed as that submitted by the Council there is a significant degree of uncertainty as to timing, funding and implementation, particularly for the smaller schemes programmed in the latter stages of the Plan. In those circumstances revisions are likely to be necessary over time, even though the changes may not be fundamental to the delivery of the CS. In order to facilitate

those revisions the Council may wish to consider alternative options for publishing and up-dating the disaggregated IP. That would enable the Council to review and amend it independently of the CS, and take on board the smaller scale changes which do not undermine the fundamental delivery of the strategy. That approach would also contribute towards eventual consideration of any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) if and when that proposal is implemented.

Conclusions

3.184 National guidance requires that the CS be supported by evidence of infrastructure need and its provision, but does not specify that information should be included within the CS. The changes I have proposed to the presentation of that information will ensure that only the key components which are essential to the implementation of the CS form part of it. Those changes will ensure that the Infrastructure Plan is compliant with the national guidance and enable the Council to keep it under review.

Recommendation

The following change is necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC16: Delete the schedule of Infrastructure Required from Chapter 5 of the CS and replace it with the Schedule of Key Infrastructure in Annex 7, together with the revised text of Chapter 5 set out in Annex 8.

Issue 8 – Whether the CS provides satisfactorily for the delivery of development and monitoring its effectiveness.

3.185 PPS12 requires a CS to have clear arrangements for monitoring and reporting results as part of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). At the Examination I identified significant weaknesses in the Council's proposals for monitoring, in particular the decision to amalgamate targets and output indicators into a single measure. I also had specific concerns about the adequacy of some of the targets and indicators suggested.

3.186 In response to my concerns the Council has redrafted its Monitoring and Implementation Framework to resolve the problems identified. The revised framework separates the targets and indicators more clearly, and provides greater detail in many areas. Those changes substantially address the issues discussed at the Hearing, and will provide a much better basis for monitoring the progress of the CS and its constituent proposals. The revised framework is shown in

Annex 9, and I propose that it replace the submission draft framework in Chapter 6 (IPC17).

3.187 A number of minor amendments are needed to the revised Monitoring Framework, to reflect national guidance and to make the CS sound. Under Objective 10, I propose the reinstatement of the target to maintain and enhance areas of biodiversity importance, which has been omitted from the revised draft. Under Objective 12, I propose changes to the timescales attached to the Code for Sustainable Homes to reflect the changes made in this report to Policy 24. Additionally, under Objective 13, I propose to reinstate the original objective to reduce the proportion of people travelling to work by car by 2026 (IPCs18 and 19).

Conclusions

3.188 With the changes proposed, I am satisfied that the proposals in the Monitoring Framework will provide a suitable basis for assessing progress on the delivery of the CS, and for making any necessary changes to achieve the targets identified.

Recommendations

The following changes are necessary in order to make the CS sound:

IPC17: Delete the Monitoring Framework in the submission CS and replace it with the revised Monitoring Framework set out in Annex 9, subject to the amendments in IPCs 18 and 19.

IPC18: Reinstate the following targets;

under Objective 10:

‘To maintain and enhance areas of biodiversity importance’.

Under Objective 13:

‘To reduce the proportion of people travelling to work by car by 2026’.

IPC19: Amend the target under Objective 12 for meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes to read;

Minimum of Code Level 3 to 2013

Minimum of Code Level 4 from 2013 to 2016

Minimum of Code Level 6 from 2016

4 Overall Conclusions

- 4.1 I conclude that with the Proposed Changes put forward by the Council, together with the amendments I recommend, the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy satisfies the requirements of s20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the tests of soundness in PPS12. I attach a summary of my Proposed Changes at Annex 12.

Raymond Michael
INSPECTOR

Annex 1: Council's Schedule of Proposed Minor Post-Publication Changes

Proposed minor post publication changes to the Hinckley & Bosworth Core Strategy (January 2009)				
Ref	Section/ Policy	Page/ Paragraph	Proposed Change	Reason for Change
1	Introduction	pg 4, para 1.5	Reword last sentence to read 'The components of the LDF are illustrated in Figure 1'	Clarify wording in response to representation.
2	Introduction	pg 5, para 1.8	Line 7, remove 'and' from between 'existing' and 'population'	Correction of grammatical error.
3	Issues Facing the Borough	pg 14, para 3.22	2nd sentence, replace 'medium' with 'median'	Correction of grammatical error
4	Spatial Objective 7	pg 19, 1st line.	Add 'integrated with local public transport' to the end of the 1st sentence.	To clarify objective
5	Spatial Objective 13	pg 19	reword to read...high reliance on car travel...'	Correction of grammatical error
6	Key Diagram		Show key sustainable transport corridors (10 minute local service) on the Key Diagram (along A47 to Leicester and to HNPR employment and down Leicester road into Hinckley and to railway station).	Better illustration of transport policies
7	Key Diagram	pg 22	Amend map to show Green Wedge continuing to the edge of Barwell & Earl Shilton (ie to fill the gap)	Correction of mapping error
8	Strategic GI Plans	pg 22a	Add 'shading is indicative'	To clarify that the GI boundaries are indicative, not absolute
9	Southern GI Zone, Western GI Zone, North Eastern GI Zone	pg 22a	Upsize maps to A4 size and renumber document.	In response to representation.

10	Hinckley	pg 23, para 4.13	1st sentence replace 'compliment' with 'complement'.	Correction of grammatical error
11	Policy 01	pg 23, bullet point 2	Reword bullet point to read 'Ensure there is a range of employment opportunities within Hinckley'	Rewording to ensure no replication of existing local plan policy
12	Policy 01	pg 24, 2nd bullet point	Add '(net)' after '21,100 sq.m and after 5,300 sq.m	Clarify policy wording
13	Policy 01	pg 23, 3rd bullet point	reword to read '...within or adjoining the Hinckley Town Centre Area Action Plan Boundary'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
14	Policy 01	pg 25, 1st bullet point	reword to read...through sympathetic reuse of existing buildings unless it can be demonstrated that this is not achievable'.	Clarification of policy wording and intent
15	Barwell & Earl Shilton	pg 25, para 4.15	1st sentence reword to read '...exemplars of sustainable design....'	Correction of grammatical error
16	Policy 02	pg 26, bullet point 3	Reword bullet point to read 'Ensure there is a range of employment opportunities within Earl Shilton'	Rewording to ensure no replication of existing local plan policy
17	Policy 02	pg 26, 5th bullet point	delete '(subject to a completed sequential test)'	Sequential test completed
18	Policy 02	pg 26, 1st bullet point	Delete 'and no development of the urban extension will be permitted until the Area Action Plan is adopted' from the last sentence and add 'No piecemeal developments will be permitted.'	Allow flexibility
19	Policy 02	pg 26, 1st bullet point	Delete 'from one location' from the 2nd sentence.	Allow flexibility
20	Policy 02	pg 26, 1st bullet point	1st sentence reword to read '....south of Earl Shilton including 2000 environmentally sustainable homes , 10 ha of employment....'	Correction of omission
21	Policy 02	pg 26, 1st bullet point	reword to read '...feasibility of providing some or all of the energy needs of the sustainable urban extension by sustainable on site power generation will be investigated and if viable, implemented as part of the development....'	Clarification of policy wording and intent

22	Policy 02	pg 27, 1st bullet point	Delete '/' from 'Newland/s'	Correction of grammatical error.
23	Policy 02	pg 27, 2nd bullet point	add a space between 'Hinckley-Barwell' so that Barwell doesn't split	Correction of formatting error
24	Policy 02	pg 27, 5th bullet point	reword to read '...through sympathetic reuse of existing buildings unless it can be demonstrated that this is not achievable'.	Clarification of policy wording and intent
25	Policy 03	pg 28, bullet point 1	Reword bullet point to read 'Ensure there is a range of employment opportunities within Barwell'	Rewording to ensure no replication of existing local plan policy
26	Policy 03	pg 28, 3rd bullet point	delete '(subject to a completed sequential test)'	Sequential test completed
27	Policy 03	pg 27, 2nd bullet point	Delete 'and no development of the urban extension will be permitted until the Area Action Plan is adopted' from the last sentence and add 'No piecemeal developments will be permitted.'	Allow flexibility
28	Policy 03	pg 27, 2nd bullet point	Delete 'from one location' from the 2nd sentence.	Allow flexibility
29	Policy 03	pg 27, 2nd bullet point	reword to read '...feasibility of providing some or all of the energy needs of the sustainable urban extension by sustainable on site power generation will be investigated and if viable, implemented as part of the development....'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
30	Policy 03	pg 28, 6th bullet point	Ensure Barwell is not split	Correction of formatting error
31	Policy 03	pg 28, bullet point 7, 2nd sentence	Delete 'pitches'	Factual correction in response to representations
32	Policy 03	pg 28, 12th bullet point	reword to read... 'through sympathetic reuse of existing buildings unless it can be demonstrated that this is not achievable'.	Clarification of policy wording and intent

33	Policy 04	pg 29, bullet point 3	Reword first sentence to read 'Ensure there is a range of employment opportunities within Burbage and in close proximity to Hinckley'	Rewording to ensure no replication of existing local plan policy
34	Policy 04	pg 29, 3rd bullet point	Reword second sentence to read 'The redevelopment of the Factory West of Rugby Road and rear of Johnsons Factory, Burbage will be supported provided an equivalent amount of replacement employment is provided (in addition to the new employment allocation above) as part of the extension to Logix Park and the following improvements....'	Clarification of policy wording to enable the most appropriate type of employment to be provided responding to market needs.
35	Policy 05	pg 31, 1st sentence	Reword to read...' The following transport interventions (as detailed in the Hinckley Core Strategy Transport Review, 2007)...are required....'	Provide more detail as to the transport mitigation measures required in response to the HA representation.
36	Policy 05	pg 32, 1st paragraph	Reword to read 'Developers will be required to contribute towards the implementation of these initiatives through developer contributions where appropriate .'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
37	Policy 05	pg 31, 3rd bullet point	Include (HNPR) after text	Correction of omission
38	Hinckley/Barwell/ Earl Shilton Green Wedge	pg 33, para 4.24	Delete first sentence and reword start of second sentence to read 'The green wedge between Hinckley, Barwell & Earl Shilton protects the'	Clarification of wording to ensure no conflict with PPS 7
39	Policy 06	pg 33	Add (f) Use for nature conservation	Clarification of policy wording to reflect intent in para 4.24.
40	Policy 06	pg 33	Add (d) should retain the visual appearance of the area	clarification of policy wording to reflect intent in para 4.34
41	Policy 07	pg 35, bullet point 3	Reword bullet point to read 'Ensure there is a range of employment opportunities within the Key Rural Centres. To support this, the enhancement of allocated employment sites in the Key Rural Centres will be supported, as will the development of employment uses including home working within the settlement boundary'	Rewording to ensure no replication of existing local plan policy

42	Policy 07	pg 35, 5th bullet point	Reword to read 'Resist the loss of local shops and facilities in Key Rural Centres unless it is demonstrated that the business or facilities can no longer operate viably. Initiatives to establish local stores and facilities will be supported.'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
43	Policy 08	pg 36, bullet point 2	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
44	Policy 08	pg 37 bullet point 2	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
45	Policy 08	pg 38, bullet point 2	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
46	Policy 08	pg 39, bullet point 2	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
47	Policy 08	pg 37, 8th bullet point	Reword to read' Implement the strategic green infrastructure network detailed in Policy 20. To achieve this, the following strategic interventions relating to Groby will be required: Tourism Support (promotion of Groby as a 'gateway village to the National Forest); Transport Corridor Mitigation Measures; and Markfield to Groby Public Access.'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
48	Policy 08	pg 37, 12th bullet point	reword to read 'Work with existing businesses to seek a reduction in on-street employee parking in the centre of the village'.	Clarification of policy wording and intent
49	Policy 08	pg 38, 9th bullet point	reword to read 'Implement the strategic green infrastructure network detailed in Policy 20. To achieve this, the following strategic interventions relating to Ratby will be required: Ratby to Desford Multifunctional Corridor; Tourism Support (promotion of Ratby as a 'gateway village' to the National Forest); Transport Corridor Disturbance Mitigation; and the Rothley Brook Corridor Management.	Clarification of policy wording and intent
50	Policy 08	pg 39, 12th bullet point	Replace reference to the 'Co-op' to 'local supermarket'	Clarification of policy wording

51	Policy 08	pg 40, 1st bullet point	Capital C for 'Close'	Correction of gramatical error.
52	Rothley Brook Meadow Green Wedge	pg 40, para 4.34	Delete first sentence and reword start of second sentence to read 'The Rothley Brook Meadow Green wedge protects the' Also add to the end of the last sentence of pargraph 4.34 "... and its value as a functional floodplain."	Clarification of wording to ensure no conflict with PPS 7 and to reflect its value as a floodplain
53	Policy 09	pg 40-41	Add to the list of acceptable uses "(f) Use for nature conservation" . Renumber criteria from (f), (g), (h) to (a), (b), (c) and add to the list of criteria "(d) retain and enhance function as a floodplain and infiltration basin." and (e) should retain the visual appearance of the area	Correction of numbering and clarification of policy wording to reflect intent in para 4.34
54	Policy 10	pg 41, bullet point 3	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
55	Policy 10	pg 41	Remove 'to' from the heading	Correction of grammatical error
56	Policy 11	pg 45, 11th bullet point	reword to read '...as supported by the Hinckley & Bosworth Cultural Facilities Audit.'	Correction of grammatical error.
57	Policy 11	pg 43, bullet point 2	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
58	Policy 11	pg 44, bullet point 5	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
59	Policy 11	pg 45, bullet point 5	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
60	Policy 11	pg 46, bullet point 2	Delete bullet point	Replication of existing local plan policy
61	Policy 11	pg 45, 1st bullet point	Add 'Trust' after 'Bosworth Water' and capitalise 'w' in 'Water'	Factual correction in response to representations
62	Policy 11	pg 46, 8th bullet point	reword to read 'Encourage tourism by enabling development of tourist accommodation and improving links between the Ashby Canal and the village'	Clarification of policy wording
63	Policy 11	pg 46, 10th bullet point	replace 'links' with 'connections'	Clarification of policy wording

64	Rural Villages	pg 47, para 4.39	2nd line reword ' A primary school, community and/or leisure facilities and bus services are considered....'	Clarification of wording
65	Policy 12	pg 48, bullet point 2; pg 49, bullet point 9; pg 50, bullet point 10	Delete whole bullet point starting 'Protect allocated employment...'	Replication of existing local plan policy
66	Policy 12	pg 47, 4th bullet point	Reword to read 'Resist the loss of local shops and facilities in rural villages unless it is demonstrated that the business or facilities can no longer operate viably. Initiatives to establish local stores and facilities will be supported.'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
67	Policy 12	48, Stanton under Bardon	Make all references to Stanton Under Bardon consistent- all with capital 'U'	Correction of grammatical error.
68	Policy 12	49, 2nd bullet point	Reword to read 'Support proposals to provide a local village shop'.	Clarification of wording
69	Policy 13	pg 51, 4th bullet point	Reword to read 'Resist the loss of local shops and facilities in rural hamlets unless it is demonstrated that the business or facilities can no longer operate viably. Initiatives to establish local stores and facilities will be supported.'	Clarification of policy wording and intent
70	Policy 14	53, 1st bullet point	Reword to read '...at Desford & Bagworth, in case, in the longer term...'	Clarification of wording
71	Policy 14	pg 53, last paragraph	Delete 'the implementation of'	Correction of grammatical error.
72	Housing	pg 54, para 4.45	Add a new sentence to read. 'For clarity,'urban areas' are defined as the settlements of Burbage, Hinckley, Barwell and Earl Shilton. All other settlements are defined as 'rural areas'.	Clarify implementation of Policy 15.

73	Policy 15	pg 54, last sentence	Reword to read 'In areas where there is already....the council may agree to accept commuted sums in lieu of on-site affordable housing'	Clarification of policy wording
74	Policy 16	pg 56, para 1	Remove 'tenures' from first sentence.	To remove conflict with policy 15.
75	Policy 16	pg 56, 1st paragraph	At the end of the first sentence add 'and other local evidence, such as a housing needs survey or parish plan'.	Ensure the policy is locally specific
76	Policy 18	pg 57, title	Reword title to read 'Providing for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople'	Clarify title.
77	Policy 19	pg 58, 'Quality'	Add 'as defined by the Hinckley & Bosworth Green Space Strategy' after 65%.	To provide clarity on the definition of the quality score.
78	Policy 19	pg 58. Quantity	Add 'a minimum of' to each of the quantity standards. Also add at the end of the Quantity section 'In areas with populations under 1000 people, a pro-rata approach will be used.'	Clarification of policy wording
79	Green Infrastructure	pg 58, para 4.55	Reword sentence to read ' This network...supports native species, maintains natural and ecological processes, protects and enhances the historic environment and landscape character , sustains air and water resources...	Rewording to reflect the acknowledged importance of the historic environment in the Borough.
80	Green Infrastructure	pg 58, para 4.56. last sentence.	add 'and enhancement' so it reads...to enable wildlife migration and protection and enhancement of biodiversity'.	Clarification of text in response to representation
81	Policy 20	pg 62, 2nd bullet point	3rd sentence. Replace 'compliment' with 'complement'	Correction of grammatical error
82	Policy 20	pg 59, 1st para	Council should have capital C	Correction of grammatical error.
83	Policy 20	pg 59, bullet point 1	Woods should have capital W	Correction of grammatical error.
84	Policy 20	pg 59, bullet point 2	centre should have capital C	Correction of grammatical error.

85	Policy 20	pg 60, bullet point 4	Wedge should have capital W	Correction of grammatical error.
86	Policy 20	pg 61, bullet point 3	management should have capital M	Correction of grammatical error.
87	Policy 20	pg 61, 4th bullet point	corridor should have capital C	Correction of grammatical error.
88	Policy 20	pg 62, 2nd bullet point	corridor should have capital C	Correction of grammatical error.
89	Policy 22	pg 65	Add an additional bullet point to the policy to read 'protect and enhance the area's cultural heritage'	To reflect the acknowledged importance of the historic environment in the Borough.
90	Policy 24	pg 66	Reword to read 'The council will require all development (as detailed below)...'	Clarification of policy wording
91	Policy 24	pg 66	The Code/BREAM level to be met will be set at the time of determination of detailed planning permission or reserved matters unless other legislation/guidance requires a higher level at the time of construction	Clarification of policy wording
92	Infrastructure Plan	72, 8th row	Remove 2nd reference to 'Develop Barwell Park'.	Duplication
93	Infrastructure Plan	72, 2nd row	Renovate Masefield Close, Barwell'- amend 'cost' to £45,000'; amend 'phasing' to 2009; amend 'possible funding sources' to Developer Contributions.	Factual correction in response to representations
94	Infrastructure Plan	72, 4th row	Improvements to the Common, Barwell'- amend 'phasing' to 2009; amend 'possible funding sources' to read Developer Contributions.	Factual correction in response to representations
95	Infrastructure Plan	pg 82, 5th row	Improvements to high school indoor sports facilities....'- remove Parish Precept from 'Possible Funding Sources'	Factual correction in response to representations
96	Infrastructure Plan	pg 82, 5th row	Improvements to high school indoor sports facilities....'- insert 'Trust' after 'Bosworth Water'	Factual correction in response to representations

97	Infrastructure Plan	pg 70, 12 row, 1st column	<p>Transport improvements to support SUE- add the following bullet points 1. Diversion of length of Hinckley Northern Perimeter Road and of A47 in Nuneaton and new junction on A5 as part of a modified Dodwells roundabout; 2. Links to existing urban area for buses (particularly the railway station), walking, cycling and local traffic; 3. Improve Hinckley Northern Perimeter Road (HNPR)- Dualling of HNPR between Outlands Drive and Ashby Road including substantial improvements at HNPR/Wykin Road and HNPR/Stoke Road junctions; 4. Improvements on linkages into town centre, including alterations to signal operation at Leicester Road/ New Buildings Junction; 5. New public transport linkages from new developments to Barwell and Earl Shilton and improved public transport linkages between Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley town centre and HNPR employment areas (to provide 10 minute local service and real time information at interconnecting bus stop links for Hinckley and Leicester);</p>	<p>Provide more detail as to the transport mitigation measures required in response to the HA representation.</p>
98	Infrastructure Plan	pg 70, 12 row, 1st column	<p>Continued from above...6. New pedestrian and cycle linkages from the urban extensions into Barwell and Earl Shilton; 7. Traffic calming measures in Barwell & Earl Shilton, traffic calming and traffic management measures along The Common and routes through Earl Shilton/ Barwell; 8. Improvements to A447 Ashby Road- widening of A447 Ashby Road to 4 lanes from urban extension site access to A47. Scope for new A447 link road at southern end to east or west of Ashby Road connecting Ashby Road into new junction on A47; 9. Improvements to A47 east of Ashby Road and Earl Shilton Bypass. Substantial improvements at A47 junctions with Ashby Road, The Common and Station Road. Dualling of western section of Earl Shilton Bypass between Station Road and Carrs Lane.</p>	

99	Infrastructure Plan	pg 71, 12 row, 2nd column	Add costings ' 1. £12.6 m; 2. £1.2m; 3. £6.5m; 4. £0.2m; 5. £0.9m; 6. £0.1m; 7. £0.3m; 8. £3.5; 9. £3.2	Provide more detail as to the transport mitigation measures required in response to the HA representation.
100	Infrastructure Plan	pg 71, 12 row, 3rd column	Add timings ' 1. 2011- 2016; 2.2011- 2016 ; 3. 2017-2021; 4. 2011- 2016; 5. 2011- 2016; 6. 2011- 2016; 7. 2011- 2016; 8. 2017-2021; 9. 2022- 2026	Provide more detail as to the transport mitigation measures required in response to the HA representation.
101	Infrastructure Plan	pg 71, 12 row, 2nd column	Amend total cost to read '£28, 500,000	Correction of error
102	Infrastructure Plan	pg 73, row 3 & 5	Delete both rows	Factual correction in response to representations
103	Infrastructure Plan	pg 68, row 5, 2nd column	Add 'Total cost estimate £13,000,000	Update of costs
104	Infrastructure Plan	pg 68, row 5, 5th column	Add 'Developer Contributions'	Update of information
105	Appendix 1	pg 96, External, Economy	Delete 'National Coalfields Reclamation Programme' and add 'East Midlands Employment Lane Priorities 2006	Update of information
106	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Rural	Add 'East Midlands' to 'Rural Action Plan' . Delete '(EMDA) 2000' and replace with '2007- 2013'	Update of information
107	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Environment	Regional Environment Strategy- replace '2003' with '2002'	Correction of error
108	Appendix 1	pg 97, Environment	Add ' Creating a Green and Prosperous Future- a Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan' and 'An Action Plan for the Stepping Stones Project'	Correction of omission

109	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Environment	Add 'Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan'	Correction of omission
110	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Transport	Leicestershire Local Transport Plan- replace '2001- 2006' with '2006- 2011'	Correction of error
111	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Transport	Add 'Leicestershire Rights of Way Improvement Plan'	Correction of omission
112	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Transport	Delete 'Mulit Modal Studies'	Update of information
113	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Transport	Replace 'State of Freight Study 2002' with 'East Midlands Regional Freight Strategy 2005'	Update of information
114	Appendix 1	pg 97, External, Social/ Cultural	Add new bullet point ' Census 2001 Parish Profiles'	Correction of omission
115	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Strategic	HBBC Capital Strategy- replace 'Strategy' with 'Programme'	Correction of grammatical error
116	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Strategic	Add new bullet point 'Report on Consultation with the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Communities on the Hinckley & Bosworth Community Plan and Local Development Framework (2006)'	Correction of omission
117	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Strategic	Add new bullet point 'Consultation on the Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council's Strategic Aims and Regeneration Options: Report on Consultation with Hard to Reach Groups (2008)'	Correction of omission
118	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Housing	Add new bullet point 'Rural Housing Numbers Methodology Statement (2008)'	Correction of omission

119	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Housing	Add new bullet point 'Hinckley & Bosworth Rural Summit: Conference Summary Notes (2006)	Correction of omission
120	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Housing	Add new bullet point 'Housing Trajectory Assumptions	Update of information
121	Appendix 1	pg 98, Internal, Economy	Delete 'Annual Employment and Residential Land Availability Monitor (06/07)	Duplication
122	Appendix 1	pg 99, Internal, Environment	Add new bullet point 'HBBC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2007)'	Correction of omission
123	Appendix 1	pg 99, Internal, Social/ Cultural	Add new bullet point 'Understanding the Rural Areas of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council: Summary of existing information and results of meetings with Parish Council Representatives (2008)	Correction of omission
124	Appendix 1	pg 99, Internal, Social/ Cultural	Add new bullet point 'Crime and Disorder Partnership for Hinckley & Bosworth Community Safety Plan 2008- 2011'	Correction of omission
125	Appendix 1	pg 99, Internal/ Town Centre	Delete 'RLA & ELA monitors	Duplication
126	Sustainability Appraisal	pg 26, para 5.2.9, 2nd para	Replace 'Newbold Vernon' with 'Market Bosworth'	Factual correction in response to representations

Annex 2: Council's Schedule of Proposed Minor Post-Hearing Changes

Proposed changes post-hearing to the Hinckley & Bosworth Core Strategy (June 2009)

Ref	Section/ Policy	Page/ Para	Proposed change	Reason for change
127	2. Policy Context	Pg 7, para 2.4	Replace para 2.4 with: 'The East Midlands Regional Plan contains the Regional Transport Strategy and was published in March 2009 and revises the Regional Plan adopted in March 2005. The Regional Plan provides a framework for development and investment up to 2026 and is part of the statutory development plan for the East Midlands region. It sets out a spatial strategy to promote sustainable development within the region in both urban and rural areas. It defines the designation of Principal Urban Areas (PUA) and Sub-Regional Centres (SRC), and outlines priorities for their development. The Strategy also contains policies in respect of the Region's 5 Sub-areas, Hinckley and Bosworth falls within the 3 cities sub-area and Hinckley is identified as a Sub-Regional Centre. It includes housing provision figures for Hinckley and Bosworth and targets for affordable housing and development on brownfield land, and for the provision of accommodation for gypsies and travellers .The Regional Plan emphasises urban concentration with a focus on the regeneration of existing urban areas whilst also recognising that the development needs of rural areas needs to be met to	The paragraph has been updated in light of the Regional Plan becoming adopted

			provide an appropriate range of housing; diversify incomes; enhance natural and cultural resources; and broaden the economy. The Core Strategy must be in conformity with the East Midlands Regional Plan’.	
128	3. Issues, Vision and Objectives	Pg 9, para 3.1, 4 th sentence	Delete ‘Draft’ in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore ‘Draft’ has been deleted accordingly.
129	3. Issues, Vision and Objectives	Pg 14, para 3.24, 1 st sentence	Delete ‘Draft’ in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore ‘Draft’ has been deleted accordingly.
130	3. Issues, Vision and Objectives	Pg 15, para 3.28	Insert new sentences at end of paragraph ‘In addition the Council has embarked on a programme of conservation area appraisals which it aims to complete across the Borough by 2013. The conservation area appraisals will highlight where listed buildings are considered to be at risk.’	The insertion of these sentences identifies how the Council aims to enhance the built environment and townscape character of the Borough, and they provide a link to the monitoring framework for Spatial Objective 11.
131	3. Issues, Vision and Objectives	Pg 18, SO 5: Housing for everyone	Delete ‘Draft’ in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore ‘Draft’ has been deleted accordingly.
132	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 20, para 4.2	Amend 1 st sentence to read ‘In particular, the East Midlands Regional Plan requires 9,000 homes to be built in Hinckley and Bosworth between 2006-2026. In determining the distribution development, the East Midlands Regional Plan seeks to...’	This paragraph has been amended to reflect the adoption of the Regional Plan, in particular, Policy 13a of the Regional Plan.

133	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 20, para 4.2	Insert new sentence ‘...development needs of rural areas. Policy 3 of the East Midlands Regional Plan identifies a target of 60% of additional dwellings to be developed on previously developed land or through conversions; this target will enable the efficient use of land within the Borough and is monitored as a core indicator through the Annual Monitoring Report.’	The insertion of this sentence highlights the Council’s spatial strategy towards PDL.
134	4. The Spatial Strategy	Page 20, Table 1	Amend table: See Appendix 1 to the Schedule of changes.	Amendments are to be made to reflect the adoption of the RSS and updated housing supply figures.
135	4. The Spatial Strategy	Page 20, para 4.4	Amend sentence to ‘...a shortfall of 5,008 dwellings on the East Midlands Regional Plan requirement of 9,000 dwellings.’	Amendments are to be made to reflect the adoption of the RSS and updated housing supply figures.
136	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 20, para 4.5, 1 st sentence	Delete ‘Draft’ in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore ‘Draft’ has been deleted accordingly.
137	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 20, para 4.5	Insert additional sentence to the end of the paragraph ‘To accommodate the housing requirements set out within the urban and rural areas in policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11 and 12 it may be necessary to review settlement boundaries to identify land to meet the housing provision. The Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD will identify sufficient land to meet the Core Strategy requirements. This will be achieved firstly by looking at brownfield/greenfield sites within settlement boundaries followed by land adjacent to settlement boundaries. Once allocated for housing, these sites will fall within the revised settlement boundary which	To provide further clarity in relation to the allocation of land to meet the housing requirements and approach to be taken to review settlement boundaries.

			will be amended as necessary. When the settlement boundaries have been amended these housing allocations will be included within the 5 year supply of housing land as they will be deemed deliverable and developable.’	
138	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 21, para 4.8, last sentence	Amend to ‘...in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD.’	Since the publication of the Core Strategy the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD has been amalgamated into one document.
139	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 21 New Para’s	<p>4.10 PPS12 paragraph 4.46 requires Councils to set out a contingency strategy to handle changing circumstances which can occur over the lifetime of the Core Strategy for providing future housing growth.</p> <p>4.11 In building its evidence base to support the future context of development within the Borough the Council prepared a Directions of Growth Report (September 2007). This report assessed a series of growth options surrounding the Hinckley Sub Regional Centre (including Barwell, Burbage and Earl Shilton). The report concluded that the most appropriate location for mixed use urban extensions were located on land to the south of Earl Shilton and West of Barwell.</p> <p>4.12 Should these options fail to deliver the housing requirements outlined in the Core Strategy the Council will utilise the findings of the Direction for Growth Report in taking forward an alternative strategy in order to meet the housing requirements of the EMRP.</p>	Alternative Strategy required by PPS3 Para 4.46.

			<p>The Council shall review the Directions for Growth Report in order to identify a preferred option. A consultation exercise will then be undertaken on this alternative option if the urban extensions at Barwell and/or Earl Shilton fail to deliver the necessary housing requirements.</p> <p>4.13 An AAP will include triggers for co-ordinating the future growth of the SUE's and provide a mechanism for assessing the delivery of housing growth, which will be monitored through the Councils AMR. The AMR will include an up to date assessment on progress of housing delivery through the Housing Trajectory and the 5 year housing land supply. In addition the provision of infrastructure relating to the release of future growth will be monitored through an annual review of the Infrastructure Plan provided in Section 5 of this Core Strategy.</p>	
140	4. The Spatial Strategy	Pg 23, para 4.11, 1 st sentence	Delete 'Draft' in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore 'Draft' has been deleted accordingly.
141	Policy 1	Pg 24, 12 th Bullet	Reword to ...and Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge will be implemented'.	The reference to Earl Shilton and Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.

142	Policy 1	Pg 24	Create additional bullet point below bullet point 9 to read ‘Support the development of new leisure facilities and sporting hub on land off the A47 in the vicinity of Hinckley United Football Stadium supported by sustainable public transport links including enhanced walking and cycling connections from Barwell, Earl Shilton Hinckley and Burbage.’	This bullet is to be inserted as it provides greater clarity as to the position of the facility as the A47 runs through Earl Shilton and into Hinckley.
143	Policy 2	Pg 26, bullet 5	Add ‘Burbage’ to last sentence to read ‘...connections from Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley and Burbage’.	The new leisure facilities and sporting hub will also serve Burbage residents as part of the urban areas and this should be reflected to enable sustainable transport links.
144	Policy 2	Pg 27 10 th Bullet	Reword to ...and the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge will be implemented’.	The reference to Earl Shilton and Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.
145	Policy 3	Pg 28, Bullet 5	Add ‘Burbage’ to last sentence to read ‘...connections from Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley and Burbage’.	The new leisure facilities and sporting hub will also serve Burbage residents as part of the urban areas and this should be reflected to enable sustainable transport links.
146	Policy 3	Pg 28, 10 th Bullet	Reword to ...and the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge will be implemented’.	The reference to Burbage and Earl Shilton is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.

147A	Policy 4	Pg 29 3 rd bullet point	Replace bullet point 3 with 'Ensure there is a range of employment opportunities within Burbage and in close proximity to Hinckley.'	Remove site specific references.
147	Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton Green Wedge	Pg 33, Title	Insert reference to Burbage in title – Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge	The reference to Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.
148	Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton Green Wedge	Pg 33, Para 4.24	Update proposed minor change (ref 38) to read 'The green wedge between Hinckley, Barwell, Earl Shilton and Burbage protects the...'	The reference to Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.
149	Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton Green Wedge	Pg 33, Para 4.24	Insert following wording as last sentence to paragraph 4.24 'A review of the boundary of the green wedge will take place through the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD.'	Added to provide further clarification in relation to how the green wedge boundaries will be reviewed.
150	Policy 6	Pg 33, Title	Amend title to read 'Policy 6 Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge'	The reference to Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.
151	Policy 6	Pg 33, 1 st sentence	Reword to 'Within the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge uses will be...'	The reference to Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.

152	Policy 6	Pg33, 2 nd para	Amend wording to delete 'open and undeveloped character' and insert 'function'.	The original wording alludes to a landscape designation, this is not the purpose of the green wedge and amendment reflects the role of the green wedge.
153	Policy 6	Pg 33, 3 rd para, criteria a	Delete criteria (a); amend criteria (b) and (c) to read criteria (a) and (b) accordingly.	The original wording alludes to a landscape designation, this is not the purpose of the green wedge and amendment reflects this
154	Policy 6	Pg 33, criteria b	Delete 'outdoor' from criteria b	The word 'outdoor' has been removed to allow greater flexibility in terms of the type of recreation acceptable in the green wedge.
155	Key Rural Centres relating to Leicester	Pg 35, para 4.33, 2 nd sent.	Delete 'Draft' in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore 'Draft' has been deleted accordingly.
156	Policy 8 – Desford	Page 36, First bullet	Delete the wording - "people living and working in"	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
157	Policy 8 – Groby	Page 37, First bullet	Delete the wording - "people living and working in"	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
158	Policy 8 – Ratby	Page 38, First bullet	Delete the wording - "people living and working in"	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to

				those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
159	Policy 8 – Ratby	Pg 38, bullet 5	Delete bullet 5 ‘Protect the open...’	Through discussion during session 5 of the examination it was acknowledged that this bullet conflicts with PPS7 and therefore it is to be removed.
160	Policy 8 – Markfield	Page 39, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
161	Rothley Brook Meadow Green Wedge	Pg 40, para 4.34	Insert following wording as last sentence to paragraph 4.34 ‘A review of the boundary of the green wedge will take place through the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD.’	Added to provide further clarification in relation to how the green wedge boundaries will be reviewed.
162	Policy 9	Pg 40, 2 nd para	Amend wording to delete ‘open and undeveloped character’ and insert ‘function’.	The original wording alludes to a landscape designation, this is not the purpose of the green wedge and amendment reflects the role of the green wedge.
163	Policy 9	Pg 40, criteria b	Delete ‘outdoor’ from criteria b	‘outdoor’ has been removed to allow greater flexibility in terms of the type of recreation acceptable in the green wedge.
164	Policy 10 – Bagworth and Thornton	Page 41, Second bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.

165	Policy 11 – Barlestone	Page 43, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
166	Policy 11 – Market Bosworth	Page 44, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
167	Policy 11 – Newbold Verdon	Page 45, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
168	Policy 11	Page 45	Amend bullet point 2 on page 45 to read; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the provision of a new car park at Dixie Grammar School which can be utilised by the general public outside term time. 	Clarification that the general public can use (outside term times) the new car park which is to be constructed by Dixie Grammar School.
169	Policy 11 – Stoke Golding	Page 46, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.

170	Policy 12 – Higham on the Hill	Page 48, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
171	Policy 12 – Stanton Under Bardon	Page 48, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
172	Policy 12 – Sheepy Magna	Page 49, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
173	Policy 12 – Nailstone	Page 49, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
174	Policy 12 – Twycross	Page 49, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.

175	Policy 12 – Congerstone	Page 50, First bullet	Delete the wording - “people living and working in”	It is considered that in its current form, this policy could be misconstrued to imply that new housing will only be made available to those that either live or work in the village. This would be an inappropriate restriction to place on market housing.
176	Housing	Table 2 Pg 55	Add; Source Strategic Housing Market Assessment Page 6-188, Figure 6-21	Clarification of source.
177	Housing	Table 3 Pg 55	Add; Source Strategic Housing Market Assessment Page 6-194, Figure 6-30	Clarification of source.
178	Housing	Para 4.51	Add to end of paragraph 4.51; And aim to address the special needs identified within the up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the needs of an aging population as identified within the Study into Older Peoples Housing Needs and Aspirations.	To ensure identified shortages for certain housing needs are met, utilising up to date studies and assessments.
179		Page 55, Para 4.51	Add to end of paragraph “This policy also includes guidance on the required density of new developments across the Borough. Due to the varied nature of the settlements within Hinckley and Bosworth it is not considered appropriate to apply the national indicative minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare Borough wide.”	To clarify the Borough Council’s approach to minimum densities in new developments.
180	Policy 16	Page 56	Add following the second paragraph: ‘Proposals for new residential development will be required to meet a minimum net density of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 40 dwellings per hectare within and adjoining Hinckley, Burbage, Barwell and Earl Shilton. 	To clarify the Borough Council’s approach to minimum densities in new developments.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 30 dwellings per hectare within and adjoining the Key Rural Centres, Rural Villages and Rural Hamlets. <p>In exceptional circumstances, where individual site characteristics dictate and are justified, a lower density may be acceptable.</p>	
181	Policy 16	Pg 56, last para	Reword policy to delete 'possible' and replace with 'viable'. The policy will read '...demonstrated that this is not viable on the particular site'.	To clarify that if it isn't viable to meet a 'very good' rating against building for Life then it will not be required.
182	Policy 16	Pg 56 first para	The Council requires a mix of housing types and tenures to be provided on all sites of 10 or more dwellings, taking into account the type of provision that is likely to be required, by utilising Table 3 as a starting point for housing mix , and the specific needs of each submarket informed by the most up to date Housing Market Assessment, Study into Older Peoples Housing Needs and Aspirations, and other local evidence, such as a housing needs survey or parish plan.	<p>Re-instate the word tenure as the policy relates to open market housing.</p> <p>Reference Table 3 within Policy 16, as a starting point for housing mix.</p> <p>Add reference documents to meet identified shortages of housing for an aging population.</p>
183	Housing	Pg 56 para 4.53	Redraft final sentence of para 4.53 to read; The local needs and rural exceptions policy detailed below allows local communities the flexibility to provide for these local needs. Further details will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.	Reword to include reference to SPD

184	Policy 17	Pg 56	<p>Reword to read; Policy 17: Rural Needs</p> <p>In Key Rural Centres, Rural Villages and Rural Hamlets, small scale developments that meet a 'local need' either through Local Choice or a Rural Exceptions Site for housing, employment or community facilities adjacent to the settlement boundary will be permitted provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'local need' has been clearly identified in an up to date Needs Survey or Parish Plan, the format of which has been agreed by the Borough Council. • The need cannot be met within the settlement boundary of the village. • The development is of a scale and design which fully respects the character of the settlement concerned and the level of need identified. • For a Rural Exceptions Site, the development will be small scale (usually 10 dwellings or less), and the development will be exclusively for the provision of affordable housing, either social rented or intermediate housing. 	<p>Reword to include reference to rural exceptions site and to reflect comments made within the EiP.</p>
-----	-----------	-------	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A legal agreement is entered into to ensure that all housing/employment provided will be for the exclusive occupation, in perpetuity, of people with a local connection and that any affordable housing provided as part of this policy is provided in perpetuity. No more than 80% share of any affordable housing will be permitted to be sold. <p>A local need for housing is defined as people:</p> <p>(i) who satisfy the local connection criteria, as set out in PPS3 (paragraph 30); and</p> <p>(ii) For affordable housing, people in housing need, as set out in PPS3 (Annex B).</p>	
185	Providing for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Pg 57, para 4.54, 4 th sent.	Amend sentence to ‘...up to 10 transit caravans that equates to 5 transit pitches (to 2011).’	Provide additional clarification.
186	Policy 18	Pg 57, 1 st para, 1 st sentence	Amend sentence to ‘...up to 10 transit caravans that equates to 5 transit pitches (to 2011).’	Provide additional clarification.
187	Providing for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Page 57, Title	Change page title to ‘Providing for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople’	This section includes details on the accommodation needs of travelling showpeople, however, this is not reflected within the title.

188	Providing for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Page 57, Para 4.54	Reword 4 th sentence to 'For Hinckley & Bosworth this assessment has indicated a need for an additional 42 residential pitches (26 up to 2011, 16 from 2011-2016), capacity for up to 10 transit caravans (to 2011), and up to 3 Showpeople family pitches (2 up to 2011, 1 from 2011-2016). The adopted East Midlands Regional Plan (March 2009) incorporated the pitch requirements within the plan, although it had amended the dates by which these should be provided (2007-2012 and 2012-2017). The Borough Council has updated the dates for the provision of these sites accordingly.'	To clarify the level of transit provision required by the Borough Council. Clarification on the dates of the Council's provision has also been made.
189	Policy 18	Page 57, Policy Title	Change title of policy to 'Policy 18: Provision of Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople'	This policy includes the requirement to provide sites for travelling showpeople, however, this is not reflected in the title.
190	Policy 18	Page 57, First paragraph of policy	Change first sentence to read: 'The council will allocate land for 42 residential pitches (26 up to 2012, 16 from 2012-2017), capacity for up to 10 transit caravans (to 2012), and up to 3 Showpeople family pitches (2 up to 2012, 1 from 2012-2017). Beyond 2017 to the end of the plan period an assumed on-going increase of 3% compound growth per annum for household formation for gypsies and travellers. For travelling showpeople a growth rate of 1.5% is assumed for the period 2017 to 2026. A Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment will be undertaken to confirm the need beyond 2017.'	To clarify the level of transit provision required by the Borough Council. To align the dates for provision with the adopted East Midlands Regional Plan. Estimate of need beyond 2017.

191	Policy 18	Page 57, Bullet point 3 of Policy	Delete '(3-5 miles)'	It is felt that including this range of distances could lead readers to believe that any potential gypsy and traveller sites must be between these distances from an existing settlement in order to be deemed acceptable.
192	Policy 19	Page 58	Insert new paragraph under Accessibility Section to read 'Standards need to be assessed according to their geographical context and in rural areas and smaller settlements with lower populations these standards may be difficult to achieve. In such cases access to provision in larger neighbouring settlements should be identified and accessibility improved where practical'.	During discussion in Session 7 of the examination it identified that there needs to be recognition that accessibility standards need to be varied between urban and rural areas.
193	Policy 20	Pg 59, 9 th Bullet	Reword to 'Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge – maintain...'	The reference to Earl Shilton and Burbage is to be included as geographically the green wedge also abuts the built form of the settlement. This change will aid clarification for users as to the location of the Green wedge.
194	Charnwood Forest	Pg 64, para 4.62, 2 nd sentence	Delete 'Draft' in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore 'Draft' has been deleted accordingly.
195	Charnwood Forest	Pg 65	Insert new Para 4.67 'The remit of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park will be set out within the Site Allocations & Generic Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. A more detailed document regarding the Regional Park is being prepared jointly by Hinckley &	In order to show the joined up approach and demonstrate how the portfolio of documents will fit together, this new paragraph has been inserted. In addition it also covers the as yet undecided boundary or indicative area of the regional park and

			Bosworth Borough Council, North West Leicestershire District Council, Charnwood Borough Council and Leicestershire County Council.’	how it will be further detailed in the future.
196	Policy 22	Pg 65, final bullet point	Amend the final bullet set out in the proposed minor changes post publication of the Core Strategy, reference 89 to delete the word ‘protect’ and replace with ‘manage’	The wording is to be amended as the policy should be used as a management tool rather than being too restrictive.
197	Policy 22	Pg 65	Amend Policy Title to read; ‘Policy 22: Charnwood Forest’	Correction, to make clear that Policy 22 does not prejudice the designation of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park
198	Policy 22	Pg 65 1 st line	Amend first sentence of policy to read; ‘Within Charnwood Forest, proposals will be supported that:.....’	Correction, to make clear that Policy 22 does not prejudice the designation of the Charnwood Forest Regional Park.
199	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 67, para 5.1, 3 rd sentence	Add after “developer contributions” (the Council will include a Policy on Developer Contributions in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD),	Clarification on where the policy will lie in the LDF.
200	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 68, line 2	Amend phasing timescale to read; ‘2011-2012’	Update
201	Infrastructure Plan	Pg68, line 3	Delete from Cost; £15,000 committed Delete from funding source; ‘(£15,000 committed)’	Update
202	Infrastructure Plan	Pg68, line 6	Delete Line	Completed
203	Infrastructure Plan	Pg68, line 7	Delete Line	Completed
204	Infrastructure Plan	Pg68, line 8	Delete Line	Completed
205	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 69, line 2	Delete Line	Completed

206	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 69, line 3	Amend phasing timescale to read; '2010-2012' Add 'NGPI' to funding sources.	Update
207	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 69, line 5	Reword to read; 'Provide equipped play provision within the town to meet the demand of town centre residential development and local communities'	Clarification
208	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 69, last line	Delete 'Parish' from list of parties responsible for delivery	Correction
209	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 70, line 1	Add 'LCC' to Responsibility for delivery.	Correction
210	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 70, line 4	Delete Line	Completed
211	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 70, line 5	Add a zero to Cost so it reads; '£100,000	Clarification
212	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 71, line 7	Delete line 7 'New Community House'	Completed
213	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 71 , line 4	Insert Transport Improvements as detailed in Appendix 2 attached.	Clarification
214	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 72, line 6	Reword to read; 'Improve access to areas of natural green space'.	Correction
215	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 72 Line 8	Delete line 8 'Develop Barwell Park....'	Repetition
216	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 74, Line 1	Delete line 1 'Provision of a new equipped.....'	Completed
217	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 76, line 5	Amend to read; 'Improvements to Leicestershire County Council all weather Pitches'	Correction
218	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 77, line 2	Delete words; 'Develop Ferndale Drive as a neighbourhood park providing facilities for children of all ages.'	Correction

219	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 77, line 5	Delete line 5 'Improvements to the quality of the Ferndale Park Outdoor Facilities.'	Completed
220	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 78, line 6	Delete line; 'Improvements to quality of Markfield community centre and sports'	Completed
221	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 79, line 3	Replace £900,000 with £300,000 Add '(£64,000 committed)' to Cost	Correction, further detail available.
222	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 79, line 3	Add LCC to organisations responsible for delivery.	Correction
223	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 79, line 3	Amend phasing to read; 2010/2011	Correction
224	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 79, line 3	Add Parish Precepts to the list of funding sources.	Correction
225	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 79, add line	To read; Infrastructure Required: 'Provision of a Children's Centre and additional units to provide extra services at the Bagworth Community Centre Site'. Cost: £400,000 (£300,000 committed) Phasing: 2010/2011 Responsibility for Delivery: Parish Council, LCC Possible funding sources: Lottery Funding, Developer Contributions, HBBC Capital Funding, Parish Precept	Update. Item will be 'Desirable'.
226	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 82, line 6	Amend final item under Market Bosworth to read; 'New car park for Dixie Grammar School, to be utilised outside term time by the general public.'	For clarification, that the general public can utilise the Grammar schools car park at times outside term time.
	Infrastructure Plan	Pg82, final line	Delete 'initiative funding'	Correction
228	Infrastructure Plan	Pg 85, line 2	Delete line reading; 'Protect and improve the provision.....'	Completed
229	Appendix 2	Pg 100	Insert note at the bottom of the table that reads: 'Note: Once sites are allocated for housing development	To provide clarity relating to how sites will be brought forward in the future.

			within the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD these sites will be identified as 'Developable sites within settlement boundaries without planning permission'. The housing trajectory will be revised accordingly to reflect this'.	
230	Glossary	Pg 104, Sub-Regnl Centre, 1 st sent.	Delete 'Draft'' in relation to the East Midlands Regional Plan.	The East Midlands Regional Plan is now adopted and therefore 'Draft' has been deleted accordingly.

Proposed changes post examination to the Hinckley & Bosworth Core Strategy (October 2009)

Ref	Section/ Policy	Page/ Para	Proposed change	Reason for change
231	Policy 15	Page 54 1 st sentence of Policy 15	Delete 'rural' from 1 st sentence of Policy 15.	'mixed, sustainable communities' should relate to urban and rural areas.
232	Policy 15	Page 54 1 st paragraph of Policy 15	Redraft Policy 15 1 st paragraph to read; 'To support the provision of mixed, sustainable communities, a minimum of 2090 affordable homes will be provided in the Borough from 2006 to 2026. At least 480 dwellings will contribute to this target in rural areas, including rural exception sites brought forward via Policy 17 Rural Needs. To achieve this target, the Council will expect a proportion of affordable housing to be provided on eligible sites.	To clarify that the targets given are minimums, and to set a separate rural housing target, and finally to provide a link between Policy 15 and Policy 17 Rural Needs. See Table 'Affordable Housing Targets from Revised Housing Trajectory' for calculation of 2090 target and also the rural target of 480.

233	Policy 15	Page 54 target table	Add * after each % target within the table	To provide a link to the note below the table, see PC 234
234	Policy 15	Page 54 below table.	Add the following note below the target table within Policy 15; *These targets are based on the assumption of nil grant, in cases where grant is available additionality will be sought in line with Homes and Communities Agency guidance.	To clarify that the targets specified are based on nil grant and the Council will be seeking additionality if grant is secured.
235	Policy 15	Page 54 3 rd paragraph	Add words 'and local circumstances' to third paragraph of Policy 15, so it now reads '....revised to reflect changes in the housing market and local circumstances.'	To clarify that "local circumstances" could impact on the housing target as well as the housing market.
236	New paragraph 4.47	Page 54	Remove the following sentence and table from Policy 15 'The mix of dwellings on sites will be based on the following provision: Mix Table' and create a new paragraph 4.47 to read as follows; ' 4.47 The mix of dwellings on sites will be based on the following Borough wide guidelines which will be subject to review over the plan period;' Insert 'mix table'	To clarify that the mix is a Borough wide guide which will be reviewed during the period of the plan, to reflect the timescales of the data the table has been removed from the Policy, but remains within the CS to satisfy the requirements of PPS3
237	Table at paragraph 4.47	Page 54 paragraph 4.47 Table	Insert source of the table relating to mix of dwellings;	Clarification of source.

238	Paragraphs 4.47 – 4.74	Page 54 – 66 paragraphs 4.47 – 4.74	Amend paragraph number following addition of paragraph.	Document formatting.
239	Glossary	Page 101-105	<p>Add the following definitions to the glossary of terms;</p> <p>Affordable housing is: ‘Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should: – Meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. – Include provision for the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or, if these restrictions are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision’.</p> <p>Social rented housing is: ‘Rented housing owned and managed by local authorities and registered social landlords, for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. The proposals set out in the Three Year Review of Rent Restructuring (July 2004) were implemented as policy in April 2006. It may also include rented housing owned or managed by</p>	For clarification.

		<p>other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Housing Corporation as a condition of grant.'</p> <p>Intermediate affordable housing is: 'Housing at prices and rents above those of social rent, but below market price or rents, and which meet the criteria set out above. These can include shared equity products (eg HomeBuy), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent.'</p>	
--	--	--	--

Annex 2 Appendix 1

Amendment to Table 1 – Current housing supply. Page 20

Table 1 – Current housing supply

Number of houses to be provided 2006-2026	9000
Existing Supply	
Completions (2006-2009)	1310
Large site commitments	1480
Small site commitments	438
Urban housing sites: Developable sites within settlement boundaries*	764
Total supply	3992
Number of houses we still need to find land for	5008

*please note, these figures are based on density minima (30dph in rural areas and 40dph in urban areas). In many cases, higher densities will be able to be achieved, therefore increasing the supply of housing from this source

Annex 2 Appendix 2Infrastructure Plan Amendments – Transport Improvements - page 71

Infrastructure Required	Cost	Phasing	Responsibility for delivery	Possible funding sources including existing commitments
Transport improvements to support SUE	£29m – £39m (£9.8m – £16.8m local schemes only)	2011- 2026	Highways Agency/ Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding, Regional Funding Allocations, Community Infrastructure Fund
1. Improvements to A5/A47 'Longshoot' junction, which may include a diversion of a length of the A47 and modifications to the Dodwells roundabout	£19.3m £22.5m (see note 1)	2011/2012 2016/2017	Highways Agency	New Growth Points Initiative Funding, Regional Funding Allocations/DaSTS, Community Infrastructure Fund, HA Local Network Management funding, LTP funding, Developer Contributions.
2.Links to existing urban area for buses (particularly the railway station), walking, cycling and local traffic	£1.2m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
3. Improvements to the A47 Earl Shilton Bypass and Hinckley Northern Perimeter Road (HNPR) - - this will include at least junction improvements, including bus priority measures as required but may also include some widening of the route	£5m - £10m (see note 2)	2017-2021 (See note 3)	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding, Regional Funding Allocations, Community Infrastructure Fund
4. Improvements on linkages into town centre, including alterations to signal operation at Leicester Road/ New Buildings Junction	£0.2m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding

Infrastructure Required	Cost	Phasing	Responsibility for delivery	Possible funding sources including existing commitments
5. New public transport linkages from new developments to Barwell and Earl Shilton and improved public transport linkages between Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley town centre and HNPR employment areas (to provide 10 minute local service and real time information at interconnecting bus stop links for Hinckley and Leicester)	£1.0m (see note 4)	2011- 2016 (See note 3)	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
6. New pedestrian and cycle linkages from the urban extensions into Barwell and Earl Shilton	£0.1m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
7. Traffic calming measures in Barwell & Earl Shilton, traffic calming and traffic management measures along The Common and routes through Earl Shilton/ Barwell	£0.3m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
8. Improvements to A447 Ashby Road to facilitate introduction of bus priority measures	£2m to £4m	2017-2021 (See note 3)	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding

Explanatory notes:

- (1) Range estimates for delivery 2011/12: £14.9m to £23.7m. 2016/17: £17.5m to £27.5m. Mid-range estimates are shown.
- (2) Lower figure assumes 5 junctions at £1m each – upper figure includes an allowance for widening.
- (3) Subject to detailed Paramics analysis, elements of this work are likely to be required earlier to enable site access and as required to provide bus priority measures.
- (4) This figure represents the likely maximum gross cost (it makes no allowance for fare box income) of providing the level of bus services required to support the housing growth and to help to deliver the model shift benefits identified in the Ptolemy Series c tests. Detailed understanding of the exact cost will come through the Area Action Plan and master-planning process, as it becomes clearer as to how the housing will be developed (e.g. built rate, timing of other supporting facilities), as the supporting ‘smarter choice’ measures are developed in more detail and the pattern of bus services operating in the area at that time. The figure should also be sufficient to provide for evening and Sunday services to ensure that a full range of access to work, education, training, medical, shopping and leisure can be provided.

Annex 3 Local Plan Policies to be replaced by Core Strategy Policies

This schedule explains which policies in the adopted Hinckley & Bosworth Local Plan (2001) will be replaced by policies in the Core Strategy, once it is adopted.

Existing Local Plan Policy	Replacement Policy in the Core Strategy
NE03- Green Wedges*	Policy 6 - Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton Green Wedge; Policy 9 -Rothley Brook Meadows Green Wedge
NE19- Charnwood Forest*	Policy 22 - Charnwood Forest
NE21- The Principles of Development within the National Forest*	Policy 21 - National Forest
NE22- Criteria for the Consideration of Development Proposals within the National Forest*	Policy 21 - National Forest
REC21- Tourist Accommodation	Policy 23 - Tourism Development
REC26- New Visitor Attractions	Policy 23 - Tourism Development
RES02- The Provision of Affordable Housing	Policy 15 - Affordable Housing
RES03- Provision of Affordable Housing on Sites not Specifically Allocated for Residential Purposes	Policy 15 - Affordable Housing
RES04- Affordable Housing in Small Villages	Policy 17 - Local Choice
RES13- Gypsy Caravan Sites	Policy 18 - Provision of Gypsy & Traveller Sites
T3(in part)- New Development and Public Transport	Policy 5 – Transport Infrastructure Policy 7 – Key Rural Centres Policy 14 - Rural Areas: Transport
T9(in part)- Facilities for Cyclists and Pedestrians	Policy 1 – Development in Hinckley Policy 2 – Development in Earl Shilton Policy 3 – Development in Barwell Policy 4 – Development in Burbage Policy 5 – Transport Infrastructure Policy 8 – Key Rural Centres Relating to Leicester Policy 10 – Key Rural Centres within the National Forest Policy 11 – Key Rural Centres Stand Alone Policy 12 – Rural Villages Policy 14 – Rural Areas: Transport.

*Please note, reference to Policy NE03, NE19, NE21, NE22 in the adopted proposals map will be replaced by reference to the relevant Core Strategy Policy detailed above once the Core Strategy is adopted.

For the avoidance of doubt, adopted saved Local Plan policies not listed above, along with the current Proposals Map, will continue to remain 'saved' as part of the Development Plan until they are replaced by policies in future DPDs.

Annex 4: Council's Revised Housing Trajectory

Housing Trajectory RSS Figures (including large and small site commitments, large and small site allowance per SHLAA)

Row No.		2006/ 2007	2007/ 2008	2008/ 2009	2009/ 2010	2010/ 2011	2011/ 2012	2012/ 2013	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017/ 2018	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021	2021/ 2022	2022/ 2023	2023/ 2024	2024/ 2025	2025/ 2026	Totals
1	Past completions	438	398	474																		1310
2	Projected net additional dwellings per annum (Large site commitments)				348	380	495	136	85	36												1480
3	Small Site Commitments				88	88	88	88	86													438
4	Developable sites within settlement boundaries without planning permission*						108	43	112	89	90	80	30	40	44	20	48	60				764
5	Settlement amendments (greenfield) and brownfield sites in urban areas **									68	68	68	68	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	808
6	Sustainable urban extensions (Barwell: 2500; Earl Shilton: 2000)								80	160	160	160	476	476	476	476	476	370	370	370	370	4500
7	Rural areas (brownfield sites and sites outside existing settlement boundaries)**									66	66	66	66	66	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	785
	Provision	438	398	474	436	468	691	347	363	419	384	374	640	649	652	628	656	562	502	502	502	10085
	Cumulative provision	438	836	1310	1746	2214	2905	3252	3615	4034	4418	4792	5432	6081	6733	7361	8017	8579	9081	9583	10085	
	RSS Requirement	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	450	
	Cumulative Requirement "	450	900	1350	1800	2250	2700	3150	3600	4050	4500	4950	5400	5850	6300	6750	7200	7650	8100	8550	9000	
	Shortfall/ Over-provision	-12	-52	24	-14	18	241	-103	-87	-31	-66	-76	190	199	202	178	206	112	52	52	52	
	Cumulative Shortfall/ Overprovision	-12	-64	-40	-54	-36	205	102	15	-16	-82	-158	32	231	433	611	817	929	981	1033	1085	

*First five years are deliverable and developable sites, based on density minima of 30 dph in rural areas and 40 dph in urban areas.

** Prior to greenfield sites being developed the council will seek to bring forward brownfield sites currently identified as undevelopable in the SHLAA. This will be undertaken as part of the site allocations DPD.

Annex 5: Revised Policy 15

Housing

4.46 Providing enough housing of the right type and of a high quality design is a key aim of both national and regional policy. A Leicester & Leicestershire Housing Market Assessment has been undertaken which provides information on how the housing market in Leicestershire, and equally importantly, sub markets within it, operate. The findings of this study have been used to inform the policies outlined below.

Policy 15: Affordable Housing

To support the provision of mixed, sustainable communities, a minimum of 2090 affordable homes will be provided in the Borough from 2006 to 2026. At least 480 dwellings will contribute to this target in rural areas, including rural exception sites brought forward via Policy 17 Rural Needs. To achieve this target, the Council will expect a proportion of affordable housing to be provided on eligible sites.

The starting point for the level and target for affordable housing in the Borough is as follows:

	Site size	Target affordable housing on site
Urban (Hinckley, Barwell, Earl Shilton and Burbage but not SUEs)	15 dwellings or more, or 0.5 ha or more	20%*
Sustainable Urban Extensions Barwell & Earl Shilton	15 dwellings or more, or 0.5 ha or more	20%*
Rural areas (all sites not in the above categories)	4 dwellings or more, or 0.13 ha or more	40%*

*These targets are based on the assumption of nil grant, in cases where grant is available additionality will be sought in line with Homes and Communities Agency guidance.

For all sites, the tenure split will be 75% social rented and 25% intermediate housing. The target will be monitored regularly and may be revised to reflect changes in the housing market and local circumstances. To ensure these figures remain current they will be updated through an Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

These figures may be negotiated on a site by site basis taking into account: identified local need (based on Hinckley & Bosworth Council's housing register and any recent housing needs surveys if applicable), existing provision, characteristics of the site and viability. In areas where there is already a high proportion of affordable housing, the Council may agree to accept commuted sums in lieu of on-site affordable housing.

4.47 The mix of dwellings on sites will be based on the following Borough wide guidelines which will be subject to review over the plan period;

Type	1 bed general needs	2 bed general needs	3 bed general needs	4+ bed general needs	1bed older people	2 bed older people	Sheltered /supported
Rented	4%	25%	39%	1%	0	25%	5%
Intermediate	6%	36%	56%	3%	0	0	0

* figures may not sum due to rounding.

4.48 To ensure the right type of housing is built, an understanding of future household requirements is needed. Using CLG trend based population projections the Leicester & Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment has estimated the household types likely to be living in the borough in 2016. These projections suggest that at 2016, the following proportions of households will exist:

Table 2: Projected household type 2016

Married couple	Cohabiting couple	Lone parent	Multiperson households	One person households
47%	13%	5%	4%	30%

(Source: SHMA page 6-188 figure 6.21)

4.49 By making assumptions about the type of housing acceptable to these different household types, this can then be translated into estimates of the types and sizes of stock required and compared against the existing stock profile in the borough. Based on this information, an estimate of the type of provision that may be needed up to 2016 can be made.

Table 3: Profile of new housing needed to meet household type projections

Medium and larger family units*	Multiperson homes	Small and medium sized units **
32%	4%	64%

* two and three bed houses and larger = medium to larger family units

** one and 2 bed flats, 2 bed houses and 2 bed bungalows = smaller and medium

(Source: SHMA page 6-194 figure 6.30)

4.50 The implication is that providing more smaller and medium sized housing for people who are currently underoccupying their homes could help to create more balanced markets in the future, but only if it also meets the aspirations and expectations of households who are already in family houses. The SHMA provides evidence that it would be incorrect to assume that most single person households will live in smaller flats or apartments. If households with equity and economic bargaining power choose not to move into types and sizes of housing that might ostensibly appear more suitable for them because the housing on offer is not attractive to them, then larger and family housing will be required to compensate for the increased consumption of housing.

4.51 Smaller units often appear more viable for site development, and the expectation of greater densities of smaller units has had the effect of pushing up land prices. This is likely to store up problems for the future, by limiting the space available for family households to grow. This will then increase demand for larger family houses.

4.52 Therefore, the overall policy aim is to achieve a mix of house types and tenures within each submarket to reflect current and future requirements, modified, where appropriate, for local circumstances.

Annex 6: Revised Policy 5

Policy 5: Transport Infrastructure in the Sub-regional centre

The following transport interventions are proposed to support the additional development in and around the Hinckley sub-regional centre, particularly the urban extensions at Barwell and Earl Shilton, to promote sustainable development within the area.

- Improvements to the A47/A5 'Longshoot' junction to provide for additional public transport priority measures;
- Links to existing urban area for buses (particularly the railway station), walking, cycling, and local traffic. Cycle routes to be implemented are identified in the H&B Council's Hinckley Cycle Network Plan. Priority will be given to those strategic routes which connect the Hinckley, Burbage, Barwell and Earl Shilton urban areas;
- Improvements to the A47 (HNPR and Earl Shilton by-pass) and A447 to facilitate improved public transport movement along those corridors;
- New public transport linkages from proposed developments to Barwell and Earl Shilton, and improved public transport linkages between Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley town centre and HNPR employment areas;
- New pedestrian and cycle linkages from proposed developments into Barwell and Earl Shilton;
- Traffic calming measures in Barwell and Earl Shilton, e.g. along The Common and routes through Earl Shilton/Barwell;
- Improvements to the provision and management of car parking and public transport to support the increased use of Hinckley town centre.

Details of proposed schemes will be brought forward in the Barwell/Earl Shilton AAP and the Hinckley TC AAP.

Developers will be required to contribute towards the implementation of these initiatives through developer contributions where they meet the tests set out in national guidance. New development that would prejudice their implementation will not be permitted.

In addition, to the measures identified above, the Council will

- Support the use of the canal system for cyclists, walkers and other leisure uses. Where appropriate, developers will be expected to provide developer contributions to improve path surfacing.
- Support canal freight loading and unloading points along the Ashby Canal to encourage the use of canal based transport for business.
- Support the reopening of the Elmesthorpe passenger railway station to serve Earl Shilton and Barwell.

Annex 7: Key Infrastructure (for inclusion in Chapter 5 of Core Strategy)

Infrastructure Plan – Key Infrastructure to the delivery of the Core Strategy

Infrastructure Required	Cost	Phasing	Responsibility for delivery	Possible funding sources including existing commitments
Hinckley				
New medical centre for Hinckley Health Centre practice ^{^^}	£1,750,000	2011- 2012	Primary Care Trust (PCT)	PCT, Developer contributions, New Growth Points Initiative funding
Green Infrastructure strategic interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2016	HBBC/ landowners/ Tourism Partnership/ LCC	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Earl Shilton				
Infrastructure required to support the Earl Shilton Sustainable Urban Extension**	TBC (New primary school approx £9,000,000)	2011- 2026	Developers, infrastructure providers, HBBC, LCC	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, infrastructure provider funding, HBBC Capital Programme
Green Infrastructure strategic interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/Parish Council/landowners/ Tourism Partnership/LCC	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Transport improvements to support SUE	£29m - £39m (£9.8m - £16.8m local schemes only) See Transportation Table below for breakdown of improvements.	2011- 2026	Highways Agency/ Highways Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding, Regional Funding Allocations, Community Infrastructure Fund

Barwell				
Infrastructure required to support the Barwell Sustainable Urban Extension**	TBC (New primary school approx £9,000,000)	2011- 2026	Developers, infrastructure providers, HBBC	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, infrastructure provider funding, HBBC Capital Programme
New Barwell Surgery to address existing capacity issues and meet need of new residents in the sustainable urban extension^^	£2,000,000 £1,500,000 committed	2010/2011	PCT	PCT (£1,500,000 committed), Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative funding
Strategic Green Infrastructure Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/ Partnership/LCC Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Transport improvements to support SUE	£29m - £39m (£9.8m - £16.8m local schemes only) See above in relation to Earl Shilton	2011- 2026	Highways Agency/ Highways Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding, Regional Funding Allocations, Community Infrastructure Fund
Burbage				
Provision of extended GP surgery premises for existing primary care providers in Burbage^^	£750,000	2009/2010	PCT	PCT, Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative funding
Strategic Green Infrastructure Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/Parish Council/landowners/ Partnership/LCC Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Desford				
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/Parish Council/landowners/ Partnership/LCC Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme

Groby					
Improvement of GP facilities^^	£1,000,000	2010/11	PCT		PCT, Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative funding
Green Infrastructure strategic interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ /landowners/ Partnership/LCC	Parish Council Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Ratby					
Improvements to GP facilities in Ratby and expand range of services available in the village^^	£1,000,000	2010/11	PCT		PCT, Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative funding
Green Infrastructure strategic interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ /landowners/ Partnership/LCC	Parish Council Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Markfield					
Green Infrastructure strategic interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ landowners/ Partnership/LCC	Parish Council/ Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Bagworth & Thornton					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ /landowners/ Partnership/LCC	Parish Council Tourism	Developer Contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Barlestone					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ /landowners/ Partnership/LCC	Parish Council Tourism	Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Market Bosworth					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ /landowners/ Partnership/LCC	Parish Council Tourism	Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme

Newbold Verdon					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/Tourism Partnership/LCC		Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Stoke Golding					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/Tourism Partnership/LCC		Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Stanton Under Bardon					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/Tourism Partnership/LCC		Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Twycross					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/Tourism Partnership/LCC		Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Congerstone					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/Tourism Partnership/LCC		Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Rural General					
Green Infrastructure Strategic Interventions (as per Policy 20)	TBC	2008- 2015	HBBC/ Parish Council /landowners/ Tourism Partnership/LCC		Developer contributions, New Growth Point Initiative Funding, Land Fill Tax Credit and Aggregates Levy, Lottery Funding, Woodland Grant Scheme
Cycling routes	£3,120,000	2009- 2026	LCC		Developer Contributions, LTP funding, New Growth Point Initiative Funding.
Transport improvements	TBC	2009 onwards	LCC/ Parish Council		LCC, Developer contributions.

Please note, all costs are estimates and are subject to change. The Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Capital Programme was approved by Council on 26 February 2008. The Capital Programme is reviewed annually.

**To be provided through the Earl Shilton & Barwell Sustainable Urban Extension AAP

^^ The inclusion of GP surgery developments in this Infrastructure Plan is not confirmation of PCT support of those specific project. The PCT is currently working on its Primary Care Strategy, 5 Year Strategic Plan and the Community Health Services Review which, when considered in the context of related strategies and polices will identify the PCT's investment priorities. The costings provided by the PCT for potential surgery premises developments are based on typical costs and sizes of GP premises which may change when details of specific developments are known.

Transport Improvements to support SUEs (see above)

Infrastructure Required	Cost	Phasing	Responsibility for delivery	Possible funding sources including existing commitments
Transport improvements to support SUE (As detailed above)	£29m – £39m (£9.8m – £16.8m local schemes only)	2011- 2026	Highways Agency/ Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding, Regional Funding Allocations, Community Infrastructure Fund
1. Improvements to A5/A47 'Longshoot' junction, which may include a diversion of a length of the A47 and modifications to the Dodwells roundabout	£19.3m £22.5m (see note 1)	2011/2012 2016/2017	Highways Agency	New Growth Points Initiative Funding, Regional Funding Allocations/DaSTS, Community Infrastructure Fund, HA Local Network Management funding, LTP funding, Developer Contributions.
2. Links to existing urban area for buses (particularly the railway station), walking, cycling and local traffic	£1.2m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
3. Improvements to the A47 Earl Shilton Bypass and Hinckley Northern Perimeter Road (HNPR) - - this will include at least junction improvements, including bus priority measures as required	£5m - £10m (see note 2)	2017-2021 (See note 3)	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding, Regional Funding Allocations, Community Infrastructure Fund

but may also include some widening of the route				
4. Improvements on linkages into town centre, including alterations to signal operation at Leicester Road/ New Buildings Junction	£0.2m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
5. New public transport linkages from new developments to Barwell and Earl Shilton and improved public transport linkages between Barwell, Earl Shilton, Hinckley town centre and HNPR employment areas (to provide 10 minute local service and real time information at interconnecting bus stop links for Hinckley and Leicester)	£1.0m (see note 4)	2011- 2016 (See note 3)	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
6. New pedestrian and cycle linkages from the urban extensions into Barwell and Earl Shilton	£0.1m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
7. Traffic calming measures in Barwell & Earl Shilton, traffic calming and traffic management measures along The Common and routes through Earl Shilton/ Barwell	£0.3m	2011- 2016	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding
8. Improvements to A447 Ashby Road to facilitate introduction of bus priority measures	£2m to £4m	2017-2021 (See note 3)	Highway Authority	Developer Contributions, New Growth Points Initiative Funding, LTP Funding

Explanatory notes:

- (1) Range estimates for delivery 2011/12: £14.9m to £23.7m. 2016/17: £17.5m to £27.5m. Mid-range estimates are shown.
- (2) Lower figure assumes 5 junctions at £1m each – upper figure includes an allowance for widening.
- (3) Subject to detailed Paramics analysis, elements of this work are likely to be required earlier to enable site access and as required to provide bus priority measures.
- (4) This figure represents the likely maximum gross cost (it makes no allowance for fare box income) of providing the level of bus services required to support the housing growth and to help to deliver the model shift benefits identified in the Ptolemy Series c tests. Detailed understanding of the exact cost will come through the Area Action Plan and masterplanning process, as it becomes clearer as to how the housing will be developed (e.g. built rate, timing of other supporting facilities), as the supporting 'smarter choice' measures are developed in more detail and the pattern of bus services operating in the area at that time. The figure should also be sufficient to provide for evening and Sunday services to ensure that a full range of access to work, education, training, medical, shopping and leisure can be provided.

Annex 8: Revised Chapter 5

5 Infrastructure Plan

- 5.1 The spatial strategy & policies outlined above set out how the borough will develop up to 2026 to ensure the overall vision and objectives of the Core Strategy are achieved. A key component of achieving this vision and objectives is to ensure the necessary physical, social and green infrastructure is provided to support both new and existing communities. This will be achieved through a variety of measures including developer contributions (the Council will include a Policy on Developer Contributions in the Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies DPD), Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council funding, New Growth Point Initiative Funding and other general funding streams. The Council is also considering introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy. To underpin this, a Leicester & Leicestershire Growth Infrastructure Plan is currently being finalised.
- 5.2 Outlined below, and within the following schedule, is a summary of the essential elements of infrastructure required to deliver the Core Strategy, including approximate cost, phasing and possible funding sources. A separate SPD will be prepared by the Council which will deal with the Core Strategy Infrastructure and implementation.
- 5.3 The Borough Council has worked with the County Highways Authority and the Highways Agency to develop the most appropriate package of transport measures to support housing growth and ensure sustainability and climate change benefits are delivered in practice. An indicative series of transport improvements to support the SUE's are detailed in the following schedule. In summary the improvements include;
- works to the A5/A47 the Long Shoot junction;
 - links to existing urban areas for buses, pedestrians, cyclists and for local traffic;
 - Junction improvements, bus priority measures and possible widening of the A47 Earl Shilton Bypass and the Hinckley Northern Perimeter Road (HNPR).
 - Improved linkages into the Town Centre involving alterations to signal operations at selected junctions.
 - New public transport linkages.
 - New pedestrian and cycle linkages.
 - A combination of traffic calming and traffic management measures on key routes.

- The introduction of bus priority measures on the A447 Ashby Road which will require road improvements.

For the above improvements to be implemented, the following possible funding sources have been identified:-

- Developer contributions
- New Growth Point Initiative Funding
- LTP Funding
- Regional Funding Allocations/DaSTS
- Community Infrastructure Fund
- HA Local Network Management Funding

In the event that funding for the Long Shoot junction improvements are delayed or funding cannot be secured then demand management measures will be utilised. These measures are being explored through use of the Paramics model which is currently being developed, e.g. the Highways Authority can manage the flow of traffic onto the A5 by using traffic signals to hold traffic within developments, thereby preserving the safe operation of the A5.

5.4 A package of health care facilities has been prepared in conjunction with the PCT to support the planned growth in the main urban area. For example, within Hinckley the two community hospitals will be consolidated onto one site, including a GP practice and the existing GP practice currently located in Hinckley Health Centre will be relocated. Within the Barwell SUE a new GP practice will be developed to meet existing need and to accommodate the future population growth. The existing surgery in Burbage has PCT approval to extend as it is in greatest need. Funding sources for these proposed improvements will be from the PCT as part of their strategic plans, from which £1,500,000 has already been committed for the new Barwell surgery. However, other alternative funding sources will include developer contributions and New Growth Points Initiative funding.

5.5 As part of the planned Sustainable Urban Extensions new education facilities will be required to meet the growth within both locations. A new primary school within the heart of the community at Earl Shilton and Barwell is envisaged. The LEA expects to see developer contributions covering the full cost of providing the required education facilities in each SUE, in line with their Statement of Requirement for Developer Contributions in Leicestershire.

The Borough Council have identified the following alternative funding sources in addition to developer contributions:-

- New Growth Point Initiative Funding
- Infrastructure Provider Funding
- Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council Capital Programme

The planned provision of the education facilities will be determined via the Area Action Plan phasing programme.

5.6 Within Policy 20, Green Infrastructure, a number of strategic interventions were identified throughout the Borough via the “Green Infrastructure Strategy for Hinckley & Bosworth” (October 2008). The strategy highlights potential funding sources for the Strategic Interventions, these being; New Growth Point Initiative, Landfill tax credit and aggregate levy, lottery funding (e.g. Heritage Lottery Fund, BIG Lottery Fund and Natural England Lottery Fund), Woodland Grant Scheme and developer contributions via planning conditions, obligations and tariffs.

5.7 In rural areas it is essential that rural transport and cycling provision is supported and improved where possible in order to meet the Council’s vision for these locations. Policy 14 highlights the schemes which will be supported by the Council to achieve this vision. It is envisaged that these improvements will be delivered over the plan period. The funding options include:-

- Developer Contributions
- LTP Funding
- New Growth Point Initiative Funding
- Leicestershire County Council

The Council will also seek to work with external parties and access funding schemes to aid its role as an enabler in supporting scheme delivery.

Annex 9: Revised Monitoring Framework

Monitoring Framework (Proposed Changes Post Examination)

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
1. Strong & Diverse Economy	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23	Provision of 33,742 sqm of additional office floorspace by 2026 in Hinckley	Total amount of additional employment floorspace – by type	AMR: Core Output Indicator BD1
		Development of 4 ha of additional B2 land by 2026 within/adjacent to Hinckley	Total amount of additional B2 land	Completed Land Gains (ha) - East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Economy
		Development of 10 ha of additional B8 land by 2026 within/adjacent to Hinckley	Total amount of additional B8 land	Completed Land Gains (ha) - East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Economy
		Development of 15 ha employment land in the Barwell sustainable urban extension	Total amount of additional employment land	Completed Land Gains (ha) - East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Economy
		Development of 10 ha employment land in the Earl Shilton sustainable urban extension	Total amount of additional employment land	Completed Land Gains (ha) - East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Economy
		To balance any justified loss of designated 'A' employment sites for other uses with additional provision	Total amount of designated 'A' employment sites within the Borough Hinckley and Bosworth	Hinckley & Bosworth Residential Land Availability Monitoring Statement
		To increase the percentage of VAT registered businesses in Hinckley & Bosworth	Percentage of small businesses in an area showing employment growth	Leicestershire LAA (NI 172)
		To increase the percentage of the working age population qualified to at least Level 2 or higher Public Service Agreement 2	Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to at least Level 2 or higher	Leicestershire LAA (NI 163)
		To increase the percentage of the working age population qualified to at least Level 4 or higher Public Service Agreement 2	Proportion of population aged 19-64 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to at least Level 4 or higher	Leicestershire LAA (NI 165)
		To retain an overall employment rate of 81% or better (based on 2008/09 rate)	Overall Employment rate (working-age)	HBBC Corporate Plan Monitoring (NI 151)

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
2. Regeneration of Urban Centres	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4	Development of approximately 21,100 sqm (net) of new comparison sector sales floorspace, and approximately 5,300 sqm (net) additional convenience retail floorspace in Hinckley town centre	Total amount of comparison sector sales and convenience retail floorspace in Hinckley Town Centre	East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Economy Hinckley & Bosworth Town Centre Monitor
		To increase footfall levels within Hinckley town centre and Earl Shilton & Barwell local centres	Actual Footfall Levels within Hinckley town centre and Earl Shilton and Barwell local centres	Hinckley & Bosworth Town Centre Monitor
		To reduce the percentage of vacant shops within Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Barwell local centres	Actual percentage of vacant shops within Hinckley, Earl Shilton, Barwell local centres	Hinckley & Bosworth Town Centre Monitor
3. Strong & Vibrant Rural Communities	Policy 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 20	No loss of existing services in the Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages (Policies 7, 8, 10, 11)	Number of identified existing services in the Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages	AMR: Local Indicator
		To provide local services within Bagworth (Policy 10)	Number of identified existing services in the Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages	AMR: Local Indicator
4. Social Inclusion	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4	To reduce the ranking in the index of multiple deprivation for Hinckley & Bosworth's most deprived wards (Hinckley Trinity West, Earl Shilton East, Hinckley Westfield Junior School, Barwell East, Burbage North West)	The rank in the index of multiple deprivation for Hinckley & Bosworth's most deprived wards (Hinckley Trinity West, Earl Shilton East, Hinckley Westfield Junior School, Barwell East, Burbage North West)	AMR: Local Indicator (Indices of Deprivation CLG)
5. Housing for Everyone	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18	Achievement of Adopted East Midlands Regional Plan housing requirement of 9,000 dwellings by 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H1: Plan period and housing targets • H2b: Net additional dwellings – for the reporting year • H2c: Net additional dwellings – in future years • H2d – Managed delivery target 	AMR: Core Output Indicator (H1, H2b, H2c, H2d)

		To provide [2090]* affordable homes by 2026 in line with housing trajectory targets	Gross affordable housing completions	AMR: Core Output Indicator (H5)
--	--	---	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

* Figure subject to outcome of additional consultation on affordable housing viability issue

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
6. Infrastructure Provision	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20	To deliver the infrastructure outlined in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Plan in line with the indicative phasing	Infrastructure requirements provided	Revised Infrastructure Plan (Annual Basis)

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
7. Healthier Active Communities	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22	To achieve the following green space & play provision standards per 1000 population: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipped children's play space: 0.15 ha • Casual/informal play space: 0.7 ha • Outdoor sports provision: 1.6 ha • Accessible Natural Green Space: 2 ha 	Amount of green space & play provision attained	AMR: Local Indicator Green Space Strategy
		All existing allocated and new green spaces to achieve a quality score of 65% (as defined by the Hinckley & Bosworth Green Space Strategy) by 2010.	Amount of existing allocated and new green spaces achieving a quality score of 65%	AMR: Local Indicator Green Space Strategy
		All new households to be within:** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 km of an open space of at least 10 ha which provides general facilities for recreational activity within a landscaped setting • 600 metres of an open space between 1 and 10 ha which provide general facilities for recreational activity within a landscaped setting • 400 metres of an open space of between 0.2-1 ha which provides facilities within a localised area, catering for the specific informal needs of the local community 	Percentage of new households that meet the open space accessibility standards	AMR: Local Indicator Green Space Strategy

** Standards need to be assessed according to their geographical context and in rural areas and smaller settlements with lower populations these standards may be difficult to achieve. In such cases access to provision in larger neighbouring settlements should be identified and accessibility improved where practical

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
8. Stronger, Safer Communities	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13	To achieve a year on year increase of 5% by 2011 of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area	% of people believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area	Leicestershire LAA (NI 1)

		To achieve a year on year increase of 5% by 2011 of people who feel that they belong to their neighbourhood	% of people feel that they belong to their neighbourhood	Leicestershire LAA (NI 2)
		To achieve a year on year increase of 5% by 2011 of people feel they can influence decisions about their locality	% of people feel they can influence decisions about their locality	Leicestershire LAA (NI 4)
		To achieve an annual 3% reduction in assault with injury crime rate Public Service Agreement 25	Assault with injury crime rate	Leicestershire LAA (NI 20)
		To achieve 56% satisfaction by 2012 (from a baseline of 48%) with the way the police and local council dealt with anti-social behaviour Home Office Department Strategic Objectives	Satisfaction with the way the police and local council dealt with anti-social behaviour	Leicestershire LAA (NI 24)

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
9. Identity, Distinctiveness & Quality of Design	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16	All residential developments of 10 or more dwellings meet a 'very good' rating against the Building for Life criteria	Housing Quality – Building For Life Assessments	AMR: Core Output Indicator (H6)

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
10. Natural Environment & Cultural Assets	Policy 19, 20, 21, 22	To deliver the green infrastructure network by 2026	Products delivered under the green infrastructure network	AMR: Local Indicator Green Infrastructure Study
			Total area (ha) of BAP habitat, Local Wildlife Site, and SSSI lost or significantly damaged if planning permission was implemented	AMR: Core Indicator (E2)

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
11. Built Environment and Townscape Character	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 13	All conservation areas to have up to date published conservation appraisals by 2013	Percentage of conservation areas that have an up-to-date published Conservation Area Appraisal	Conservation Areas - East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Environment
		To decrease the number of Grade II listed buildings at risk	Number of Grade II listed buildings on the local 'buildings at risk' register	Grade II listed buildings at risk - East Midlands Regional Monitoring Returns: Environment

Objective	Policy	Target	Output Indicator	Source
12. Climate Change & Resource Efficiency	Policy 24	All residential developments to meet the following Code for Sustainable Homes levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2010 – Code Level 3 • 2010-13 – Code Level 4 • 2013-2016 – Code Level 5 • 2016 – Code Level 6 	New homes meeting the identified Code for Sustainable Homes levels	AMR: Local Indicator
		Public buildings to meet a minimum of BREEAM (or equivalent) assessment rating of 'very good' from 2009-2016	Public buildings meeting the minimum of BREEAM (or equivalent) assessment rating of 'very good' from 2009-2016	AMR: Local Indicator
		Public buildings to meet a minimum of BREEAM (or equivalent) assessment rating of 'excellent' from 2016 onwards	Public buildings meeting the minimum of BREEAM (or equivalent) assessment rating of 'excellent' from 2016 onwards	AMR: Local Indicator
		To increase the amount of renewable energy generation by installed capacity and type	Renewable energy regeneration	AMR: Core Indicator (E3)
		4% per annum CO2 reduction against baseline from Local Authority operations by 2010/11	CO2 reduction from local authority operations	Leicestershire LAA (NI 185)
		To increase the percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting	HBBC Corporate Plan Monitoring (NI 192)
13. Transportation and need to travel	Policy 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Delivery of transport interchange at Hinckley rail station by 2016	Delivery of transport interchange at Hinckley rail station	AMR: Local Indicator
		Implementation of the Hinckley & Rural Parishes cycle network plan by 2026	Implementation of the Hinckley & Rural Parishes cycle network plan	AMR: Local Indicator
			Percentage of people travelling to work by car	AMR: Local Indicator

Annex 10

Summary of Inspector's Proposed Changes necessary to make the CS sound.

Inspector's Proposed Change 1 (IPC1): Include the schedule of replaced policies set out in Annex 3 as Appendix 3 of the CS.

IPC2: Delete references in Policies 7, 12 and 13 to 'Policy 17: Local Choice', and replace with 'Policy 17: Local Needs'.

IPC3: Delete Appendix 2 of the CS and replace with the revised housing trajectory set out in Annex 4, with the following amendments:-

(i) The small site commitments set out in Row 3 of the revised housing trajectory be discounted by 10% (i.e. to 80 dwellings pa) for the period 2009/10 – 2013/14 to reflect the potential increase in lapsed planning permissions for small sites, and the Small Site Commitments shown in Table 1 be reduced to 400.

(ii) The peak build-out rates shown in Row 6 of the housing trajectory for the Barwell/Earl Shilton SUEs be reduced to 400 dwellings per annum for the period 2017/18 - 2021/22.

IPC4: Amend PC139 by adding the following at the end of the proposed new paragraph 4.12:-

'In addition, any small-scale shortfalls in the housing provision identified through the AMR will be addressed by a review of sustainable sites identified in the SHLAA which are not prioritised through the SAGDCDPD'.

IPC5: Re-title Policy 16 'Housing Density, Mix and Design'.

IPC6: Insert the following after 'previously developed land or through conversions' and before '; this target will enable' in paragraph 4.2 as amended by PC133:

' . However, the Council's analysis of development sites in the borough indicates that the EMRP target would not be achievable because of the level of development proposed in the SUEs and on sites currently outside settlement boundaries, and a target of 40% of dwellings on pdl is therefore proposed'

IPC7: Amend Policy 18 by adding the following criterion to the bullet points in the Policy;

‘appropriate to provide a safe and healthy environment for residents’

IPC8: Amend Policy 24 as follows:-

a) amend the timescales for the implementation of the CSH to read;

Minimum of Code Level 3 to 2013
Minimum of Code Level 4 from 2013 to 2016
Minimum of Code Level 6 from 2016

b) delete ‘the Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages’ from the first paragraph of Policy 24.

c) add after ‘Code level 6 from 2016 onwards’;

Residential developments in Key Rural Centres and Rural Villages will be expected to meet the sustainability targets set out in Building a Greener Future.

IPC9: Delete the phrase ‘/employment’ from line 2 of bullet point 5 in the revised Policy 17.

IPC10: Delete (i) and (ii) in the definition of local need for housing in Policy 17 and replace with:

(i) who are resident at the date of allocation in the village, parish or local area which the development is intended to serve;

(ii) who have an existing family or employment connection in the village, parish, or local area which the development is intended to serve.

IPC11: Amend Policies 2 and 3 as follows:

Policy 2

Add after ‘green space provision’ in the first bullet point ‘The employment allocations are to provide for industrial and warehousing developments. They should primarily support local employment opportunities, including starter and grow-on units, and should aim to achieve zero-carbon development. The...’

Delete ‘These’

Policy 3

Add after ‘green space provision’ in the second bullet point ‘The employment allocations are to provide for industrial and

warehousing developments. They should primarily support local employment opportunities, including starter and grow-on units, and should aim to achieve zero-carbon development. The...’

Delete ‘These’

IPC12: Add the following at the end of paragraph 4.7:

The Council is working with a number of partners on programmes to improve skill levels within the borough. Programmes include Train to Gain, Pre-Employment Training, and the National Voluntary Training Pathfinder, and are run by partners including the North Warwickshire and Hinckley College, and the Leicestershire and Leicester City Learning Partnership.

IPC13: Adopt the revised package of sustainable transport proposals shown in Annex 2 Appendix 2 for transport improvements in the Hinckley SRC.

IPC14: Amend Policy 5 as set out in Annex 6 of this report.

IPC15: Delete from Policy 19:-

Quality

All existing allocated and new public green spaces to achieve a quality score of 65% as defined by the Hinckley & Bosworth Green Space Strategy.

IPC16: Delete the schedule of Infrastructure Required from Chapter 5 of the CS and replace it with the Schedule of Key Infrastructure in Annex 7, together with the revised text of Chapter 5 set out in Annex 8.

IPC17: Delete the Monitoring Framework in the submission CS and replace it with the revised Monitoring Framework set out in Annex 9, subject to the amendments in IPCs 18 and 19.

IPC18: The following targets be reinstated:-

under Objective 10;

‘To maintain and enhance areas of biodiversity importance’

under Objective 13;

‘To reduce the proportion of people travelling to work by car by 2026’

IPC19: Amend the target under Objective 12 for meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes to read:

Minimum of Code Level 3 to 2013

Minimum of Code Level 4 from 2013 to 2016

Minimum of Code Level 6 from 2016