

Appendix 1

Local Plan policies to be superseded

| Core Strategy Policy | Saved Local Plan Policy superseded |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Policy 1 - Locating new development | No policies identified |
| Policy 2 - Design of New Development | No policies identified |
| Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension | No policies identified |
| Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site | No policies identified |
| Policy 5 - Settlement hierarchy | No policies identified |
| Policy 6 - Affordable housing | R4, R5 |
| Policy 7 - Mix of housing | No policies identified |
| Policy 8 - Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers | R7 (non-saved policy) |
| Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure | T4 |
| Policy 10 - Services and Facilities to support growth | IM1 |
| Policy 11 - Developer contributions | IM1 |
| Policy 12 – Retailing | S12 |
| Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure (GI) | No policies identified |
| Policy 14 - Play and Open Spaces | R13, R14 |

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Policy 15 - Green Wedges | No policies identified |
| Policy 16 - Bio-diversity and geo-diversity | CE19 |
| Policy 17 - Cultural Environment | CE6, CE9, CE10, CE11 |
| Policy 18 - Energy Efficiency and the Design of New development | No policies identified |
| Policy 19 - Location of renewable energy facilities | No policies identified |
| Policy 20 - Flooding and Climate Change related hazards | CF5 |
| Policy 21 – Waste | No policies identified |

Appendix 2

Glossary

Glossary of Terms

Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA)

An assessment of the implications of affordable housing on the viability of development schemes. The AHVA broadly indicates the amount of affordable housing that could be provided without undermining viability.

Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)

A report that reviews the actual plan process compared to the targets and milestones for Local Development Document preparation set out in the Local Development Scheme. The AMR will also review the impact of policies contained in the Local Development Framework.

Blaby Local Strategic Partnership (BLSP)

A community partnership consisting of a number of forums with representatives from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors – tasked with preparing the Sustainable Community Strategy – amongst other things. The LSP is called 'Blaby Together'.

Brownfield (Previously Developed Land)

There are various definitions of previously-developed land in use. For the purposes of this Core Strategy previously developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure as defined in PPG3

Core Strategy (CS)

A key component of the LDF that sets out the vision, spatial strategy and objectives and Core policies for the District. The CS is a key document and all other Local Development Documents should be in general conformity with the Core Strategy.

Development Plan Document (DPD)

A Local Development Document that carries Development Plan status and is subject to procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination. This document will contain policies against which planning applications will be considered.

Examination

An examination of a Local Development Framework document held in public by an Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate. The examination gives an opportunity for interested parties to put forward their views.

Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM)

GOEM represents central government in the East Midlands Region. GOEM works to develop government programmes and initiatives at a regional and local level, by working in partnership with relevant organisations to meet local needs.

Housing Market Area

A geographical area based on areas of broadly similar housing based characteristics. Blaby falls within the Housing Market Area of Leicester and Leicestershire.

Intermediate Housing

Housing that is neither Market Housing or Social rented, but is available at a rent / cost falling between the two. Intermediate housing could comprise shared ownership accommodation for example.

Leicestershire and Leicester Urban Area

See Principal Urban Area

Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Structure Plan (LLRSP)

One saved policy of the LLRSP remains – relating to delivery of brownfield land.

Local Development Document (LDD)

A document that sets out the development plan policies and supporting guidance for the area. There are three types of Local Development Documents: Development Plan Documents, Supplementary Planning Documents and the Statement of Community Involvement.

Local Development Framework (LDF)

The Local Development Framework sets out, in the form of a 'portfolio', the Local Development Documents which collectively deliver the spatial planning strategy for the area.

Local Development Scheme (LDS)

The Local Development Scheme is a document which sets out the Local Planning Authority's programme for the production of Local Development Documents.

Local Planning Authority (LPA)

The Local Planning Authority, in this case Blaby District Council, undertakes the town planning function at the local level (except minerals and waste planning which is undertaken at a County Council level).

Planning Inspectorate (PINS)

The Planning Inspectorate is an agency of the Department of Communities and Local Government whose role it is to independently consider Planning and Environmental matters. It is responsible for the examination of the Development Plan Documents including the CS.

Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

Government statements of national planning policy which will guide the content of the Local Development Framework. Planning Policy Statements are replacing Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs).

Principal Urban Area

The Leicester and Leicestershire Urban Area is defined in the Regional Plan. The area comprises the built-up areas of Leicester Forest East, Glen Parva, Braunstone, Kirby Muxloe and Glenfield within the District of Blaby. See also Principle Urban Area of Leicester.

Proposals Map

This will illustrate, on an Ordnance Survey Base Map, designations and proposals contained in the Development Plan Documents and Saved Policies.

Regional Spatial Strategy / Regional Plan (RSS)

A statutory document providing a spatial framework which will guide the social, economic and environmental future of the region. The East Midlands Regional Plan was issued in March 2009 All Development Plan Documents must be in general conformity with the RSS.

Rural Centres

Villages in rural areas which, because of their size and range of services, are considered appropriate to accommodate limited growth.

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

A statement enabling communities to know when they will be involved in the preparation of Local Development Documents. It will outline how the Local Planning Authority plan to engage communities in the preparation of Local Development Documents. The document will also cover how communities can become involved in the determination of planning applications.

The Blaby District SCI was submitted to the Secretary of State in October 2005.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

A process for assessing environmental implications of the plans and policies in the LDF to ensure that all decisions are made with the objective of securing sustainable development.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

An assessment of housing supply potential within the District of Blaby. The SHLAA was finalised in March 2009 and will be updated as part of the AMR process.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

An assessment of housing need and demand based on a Housing Market Area. The SHMA often defines the type of housing (including size, tenure and affordability) that are required to meet local needs.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

Sustainability Appraisal involves an assessment of the social, economic and environmental implications of the plans and policies in the LDF to ensure that all decisions are made with the objective of sustainable development in mind. The SA incorporates the requirements of the SEA.

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

A Local Development Document that does not carry Development Plan status but elaborates on the policies and proposals in Development Plan Document's.

Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)

Document produced by Blaby Together (The Local Strategic Partnership) to enhance the life of residents and businesses within the District by a series of priorities towards environmental, economic and social issues.

Urban Capacity Study (UCS)

A study which assesses the amount of future residential development ,from a range of sources, which is capable of being accommodated within the urban area.

Appendix 3

Alignment of the Core Strategy and the Leicestershire Local Area Agreement (LAA 2)

| LAA Indicator | Spatial Relevance? | LAA Improvement | | | Core Strategy Policy |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|---|
| | | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | |
| <u>Improved Life Chances for Vulnerable People and Places</u> | | | | | |
| NI 63 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 142 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 145 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 152 Working age people on out of work benefits PSA 8 | Yes | -0.3% | -0.4% | -0.4% | Policy 1 – Locating New Development Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 – Strategic Employment Site |
| NI 18 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 19 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 155 Number of affordable homes delivered (gross) | Yes | 490 | 490 | 490 | Policy 1 – Locating New Development Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 6 – Affordable Housing |
| NI 117 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 87 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 99 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 100 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 101 | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicator – Free School Meals | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicator – SEN Pupils | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicator – Care Leavers | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 135 | No | | -- | | -- |
| <u>Stronger, More Cohesive Communities</u> | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|---------|--------|---------|---|
| NI 1 | Yes | -- | -- | 5% | Policy 7 – Mix of Housing Policy 8 – Accommodation for Gypsies & Travellers |
| NI 2 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 4 | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicator – Quality Parish Councils | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 6 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 110 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 139 | No | | -- | | -- |
| <u>A Safe and Attractive Place to Live and Work</u> | | | | | |
| NI 20 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 24 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 195 | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicator – Green Infrastructure | Yes | ? | ? | ? | Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 13 – Green Infrastructure Policy 14 – Play & Open Spaces Policy 15 – Green Wedges Policy 1 – Locating New Development |
| Local Indicator – Employment Land | Yes | ? | ? | ? | Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 – Strategic Employment Site Policy 1 – Locating New Development |
| NI 154 Net Additional Homes | Yes | 2587 pa | 2587pa | 2586 pa | Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 5 – Settlement Hierarchy |

| | | | | | Policy 6 – Affordable Housing |
|--|-----|----------|----------|----------|--|
| <u>A More Effective Response to Climate Change</u> | | | | | |
| NI 185 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 188 Adapting to Climate Change | Yes | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Policy 20 – Flooding & Climate Change Related Hazards Policy 21 – Waste |
| NI 192 Household Waste Recycled and Composted | Yes | 46.9% | 48.6% | 50.25% | |
| NI 167 Congestion | Yes | 4.28mins | 4.32mins | 4.33mins | Policy 1 – Locating New Development Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 – Strategic Employment Site Policy 9 – Transport Infrastructure |
| <u>A Prosperous, Innovative and Dynamic Economy</u> | | | | | |
| NI 172 | Yes | ? | ? | ? | Policy 1 – Locating New Development Policy 3 – Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 – Strategic Employment Site |
| NI 163 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 165 | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicator – Learning Diplomas | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 72 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 73 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 74 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 75 | No | | -- | | -- |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|--------|--------|--------|---|
| NI 83 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 92 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 93 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 94 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 95 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 96 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 97 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 98 | No | | -- | | -- |
| <u>A Healthier Leicestershire</u> | | | | | |
| NI 155 | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicators – Drug Users | No | | -- | | -- |
| Local Indicators – Road Casualties | Yes | 279 | 265 | 251 | Policy 9 – Transport Infrastructure |
| NI 121 | No | | -- | | -- |
| NI 50 | No | | -- | | Policy 14 – Play & Open Spaces |
| NI 8 Adult Participation in Sport | Yes | 23.63% | 24.96% | 26.30% | Policy 14 – Play & Open Spaces |
| NI 57 Children and Young People’s Participation in High Quality PE & Sport | Yes | ? | ? | ? | Policy 9 – Transport Infrastructure Policy 13 – Green Infrastructure Policy 14 – Play & Open Spaces |
| NI 56 Obesity Among Primary School Age Children in Year 6 | Yes | 14.94% | 14.9% | 14.8% | -- -- |
| NI 123 | No | | -- | | |
| NI 112 | No | | -- | | |
| <u>More Effective and Efficient Service Delivery</u> | | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Local Indicator – Access to Services NI 179 | No No | -- -- | -- -- |
|--|----------|----------|----------|

Appendix 4

List of studies / evidence base reports

- Housing Needs and Market Study (July 2005);
- Employment Land and Premises Study (March 2006);
- Urban Capacity Study (May 2006);
- Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (April 2007) (study commissioned jointly between all Authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area);
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2007) (study commissioned jointly between BDC, Hinckley and Bosworth BC and Oadby and Wigston BC);
- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (May 2008);
- Planning for Climate Change (Renewable Energy Study) (May 2008) (study commissioned jointly between all Authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area – except Charnwood BC and Leicester City);
- Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (September 2008)(study commissioned jointly between all Authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area);
- Village Services fact file (October 2008);
- Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area Employment Land Study (October 2008) (study commissioned jointly between all Authorities within the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area);
- Blaby Retail Study (December 2008);
- Phase 1 Vegetation and Habitat Survey (December 2008) (study commissioned jointly between BDC and Harborough DC);
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (March 2009) (prepared to a template agreed between all Leicestershire Authorities).
- Assessment of Highways and Transportation Implications (June 2009);
- Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (July 2009) (study commissioned jointly between BDC, Leicester City Council, Oadby and Wigston BC, North West Leicestershire BC and Harborough DC)
- Strategic Green Wedge review (July 2009)
- Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 study – Play and Open spaces (June 2009)

Appendix 5
Infrastructure Plan

Infrastructure Plan

The spatial strategy and policies outlined above set out how the District will develop up to 2026 to ensure the overall vision and objectives of the Core Strategy are achieved. A key component of achieving the vision and objectives is the delivery of necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to ensure that sustainable communities are created. In order to ensure that this role is fulfilled, the infrastructure plan below identifies the major infrastructure required to deliver the strategy, who will provide it, where and when.

The summary table below identifies as far as possible, infrastructure needs and costs, phasing, funding sources and responsibilities for delivery. The budgeting process of different agencies means that varying amounts of information are available. Where it is stated that a scheme is not yet funded, potential funding agencies are identified.

An integrated approach has been taken through work with local investors from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors.

| Priority | Infrastructure Required | Cost (£) | Funds Committed | Phasing | Delivery Agency | Possible funding sources |
|---|---|----------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Sustainable Urban Extension / Sustainable Employment Site (Policy 3 & 4) | | | | | | |
| Essential | Improve link between Enderby and A47; either upgrade Beggars Lane or provide a new route on alternative alignment | £5.5m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | Enderby Relief Road | £2.7m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | Strategic traffic link to the A563 Lubbethorpe Way | £8.7m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | Bus corridor to City via A563, including bus lanes on link from area to A563 | £1.6m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | Improvements (both for general traffic and public transport) to A47 corridor, including Desford Crossroads | £3.3m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | Establish local bus linkages to Junction 21/Enderby area | £3.7m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----|--|--|
| Essential | Increase Capacity at Meynells Gorse park and ride site | £5m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer, Leicester City Council | Developer, Leicester City Council |
| Essential | Linkages to Leicester Forest East for public transport, walking, cycling and local traffic, including possible bus only link to A47 | £3.8m + £3.3m for bus only link | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | 2-3 Primary Schools (Approx 2ha each) | £15.7m | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council, Developer | Leicestershire County Council, Developer |
| Essential | Secondary School (Approx 10ha) | £22.4m | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council, Developer | Leicestershire County Council, Developer |
| Essential | Bus based public transport solutions | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Public Transport Operators, Leicestershire County Council, Developer | Leicestershire County Council, Developer |
| Essential | SUE Health Centre (build only) | £1.2m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer, PCT, Health Practices | Developer & PCT |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Essential | Police | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire Constabulary, Developer | Leicestershire Constabulary, Developer |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, NGP |
| Essential | Community Centre | £3m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Priority | Infrastructure Required | Cost (£) | Funds Committed | Phasing | Delivery Agency | Possible funding sources |
| Essential | Childrens Centre | £1m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Essential | Youth Centre | £0.5m | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Settlement Hierarchy (Policy 5) | | | | | | |
| Blaby | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer/PCT | Developer/PCT |
| Essential | Transport | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----|----------------------|-----|-------------------------------|--|
| Essential | Education | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Countesthorpe | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer/PCT | Developer/PCT |
| Essential | Transport | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Education | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Narborough | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer/PCT | Developer/PCT |
| Essential | Transport | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Education | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|-----|----------------------|-----|-------------------------------|--|
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Stoney Stanton | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer/PCT | Developer/PCT |
| Essential | Transport | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Education | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |

| Priority | Infrastructure Required | Cost (£) | Funds Committed | Phasing | Delivery Agency | Possible funding sources |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Whetstone | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer/PCT | Developer/PCT |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-----------------------|---------|-------------------------------|--|
| Essential | Transport | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Education | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Other Settlements Accommodating Development | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer/PCT | Developer/PCT |
| Essential | Transport | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Education | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Transport (Policy 9) | | | | | | |
| Essential | Enderby Park and Ride | £7.8m | Full amount committed | 2009/10 | Leicestershire County Council | Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City Council, Developer Contributions |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|---|---|
| Desirable | Junction 21 Narborough Road South (environmental improvements) | £1.5m | Full amount committed | 2010/11 | Leicestershire County Council | LCC (£1.5 committed) |
| Desirable | ASDA and Everards Roundabout Junction Improvements - minor improvements to road markings and signing | TBC | No funding committed | Post 2011 | Leicestershire County Council | Leicestershire County Council |
| Desirable | Glenfield Park & Ride and A50 Quality Bus Corridor | £24.5m | No funding committed | Post 2012 | Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City | EMRA - Regional Funding Allocation, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City Council |
| Desirable | Sharnford Bypass | £6.8m | No funding committed | Post 2014 | Leicestershire County Council | EMRA - Regional Funding Allocation, Leicestershire County Council, Leicester City Council |
| Essential | SUE/SES (see above) | see above | see above | see above | see above | see above |
| Services and Facilities to support growth (Policy 10) | | | | | | |
| Essential | Health (see above) | see above | see above | see above | see above | see above |
| Essential | Transport (see above) | see above | see above | see above | see above | see above |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Essential | Education (see above) | see above | see above | see above | see above | see above |
| Essential | utilities (water, sewage, gas, electricity, telecommunications) | TBC | Privately funded | TBC | Utility Provider, Developer | Developer, Utility providers |
| Essential | For SUE (see above) | see above | see above | see above | see above | see above |
| Priority | Infrastructure Required | Cost (£) | Funds Committed | Phasing | Delivery Agency | Possible funding sources |
| Retailing and Blaby Town Centre (Policy 12) | | | | | | |
| Desirable | Environmental Enhancements and Public Realm Works | TBC | £50k | TBC | Blaby District Council | Blaby District Council (50k committed), Developer Contributions, Leicestershire County Council |
| Green Infrastructure (Policy 13) | | | | | | |
| Essential | Green Infrastructure/Play and Open Space | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Blaby District Council, Developer | Developer, NGP |
| Essential | For SUE (see above) | see above | see above | see above | see above | see above |
| Green Wedges (Policy 15) | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|----------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|--|
| Desirable | Improve access to Green Wedges where possible | TBC | No funding committed | TBC | Blaby District Council, Developer | Blaby District Council, Leicestershire County Council, Developer, Stepping Stones, NGP |
| Flooding and Climate Change related hazards (Policy 20) | | | | | | |
| Essential | Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) | Varying | No funding committed | TBC | Developer | Developer |
| Waste (Policy TBC) | | | | | | |
| Essential | Recycling and Household Waste Sites | £0.25m | No funding committed | TBC | Leicestershire County Council | Developer, Leicestershire County Council |

Appendix 6

Alternative options dismissed

| Policy | Options considered / dismissed | Reasons for dismissing options |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Policy 1 - Locating new development</p> <p>(Options considered through Issues and Options / Alternative Options stages of the Core Strategy)</p> | <p>1. Distribute more development to the settlements outside the PUA and less within and adjacent to the PUA</p> | <p>This approach was not considered to be in conformity with the Regional plan which promotes Urban Concentration and a strong focus on the PUA. A document that promoted such a distribution would be unlikely to be found sound.</p> |
| | <p>2. Distribute development more evenly amongst villages</p> | <p>This approach was not considered to be in conformity with the Regional plan which promotes Urban Concentration and a strong focus on the PUA. A document that promoted such a distribution would be unlikely to be found sound.</p> <p>The distribution of housing has been largely informed by the presence of, or accessibility to services and facilities (including access to frequent and direct public transport). The principle of locating most development in the PUA allows easier access to services and facilities.</p> |
| | <p>3. Distribute more development within and adjacent to the PUA.</p> | <p>This would not meet the needs of other settlements.</p> |
| | <p>4. Seek to maximise growth on Brownfield and other sites in the Urban Areas.</p> | <p>The Urban Capacity Study and SHLAA indicates that there is insufficient capacity on brownfield sites (c.200 dwellings) to meet the overall requirements for housing identified in the Regional Plan.</p> |
| <p>Policy 2 - Design of New Development</p> | <p>1. Not to have a design policy.</p> | <p>This approach was considered inappropriate given the CABE evidence that design quality in the East Midlands was of the poorest in the UK.</p> <p>To not have a design policy would weaken the Council's case in refusing applications for poor quality development – undermining one of the key objectives of</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | both the CS and SCS. |
| <p>Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension</p> | <p>3 SUE options were considered. An analysis of the benefits and dis-benefits of the 3 options is set out in appendix A.</p> <p>No additional options, which would meet the requirements of a SUE were identified through the consultation process. Land at Bloods Hill Kirby Muxloe was promoted but did not meet size requirements and land west of Enderby was remote from the PUA and had no certainty of deliverability.</p> | <p>The decision to promote Site C (land west of the M1, south of Leicester Forest East) as the SUE was chosen because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The promoters of the SUE have a vision which best matches the District Council’s vision for the Core Strategy; • The site is capable of delivering the quantity of housing required in the PUA along with supporting infrastructure; • The greater housing capacity and therefore greater resident population, will improve the prospects of meeting thresholds for the provision of key services and facilities in particular a secondary school, on site; • The site is sufficiently large to have the flexibility to respond to changing housing requirements that may emerge through future versions of the Regional Plan; • The site is deliverable within the plan period as it is in the control of one landowner who is willing to develop the land; • The first completions could be delivered relatively early in the plan period (2013 / 14) thereby helping to meet the shortfall in the District’s 5 year land supply. • The site lies close to the proposed Strategic Employment Site and other major employment areas including Grove Park, Meridian Business Park, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>Carlton Park and The Warrens Industrial Estate which offer considerable employment opportunities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site lies close to retail (Fosse Park) and Leisure (Meridian) facilities; • The site has the potential to provide Public Transport solutions that would encourage residents to make journeys other than by car (particularly to Leicester City Centre) – this is based on research that indicates that settlements of equivalent distance have populations with a greater propensity to use public transport. • Development of the site can be achieved without threatening the identity of individual settlements, including LFE, Enderby and Braunstone Town and, • It has close proximity to Park and Ride facilities at Meynell’s Gorse and Enderby providing good public transport links with Leicester. • It has close proximity to the Area of search for a renewable energy facility thereby offering the potential to establish a link. |
| <p>Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 SES options were considered. No additional options, which would meet the requirements of a SES, were identified through the consultation process. An analysis of the benefits and dis-benefits of the 3 options is set out in appendix B. | <p>The decision to promote Site B as the SES was chosen because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is deliverable within the plan period as it is in the control of one landowner who is willing to develop the land. This is the same landowner as SUE site C, thereby allowing synergy between the 2 strategic |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has good access to the strategic road network; • The site lies close to the proposed SUE and other areas of population in the PUA and large villages; • It provides an extension to an already established employment area; • The proposal would help to deliver the Enderby bypass - resulting in transport benefits; • The site is not within a Green Wedge or other sensitive transport designation; |
| <p>Policy 5 - Settlement hierarchy</p> | <p>A number of permutations for distributing housing amongst settlements were considered but dismissed. The key options are:</p> | |
| | <p>1. Increase levels of development in the PUA settlements.</p> | <p>The preferred option allocates 5,250 houses within and adjacent to the PUA. This is 250 houses more than the minimum required by the Regional Plan and is consistent with the policy of Urban concentration. The option to increase this further was dismissed as it was considered that this would undermine opportunities to meet development needs (including affordable housing) in some of the villages outside of the PUA.</p> <p>The settlements identified as larger and medium villages in the hierarchy are those capable of supporting additional growth – by reason of their choice of services</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>and facilities (including public transport) and strong functional relationship with Leicester.</p> <p>The Regional Plan promotes a policy of ‘urban concentration’. However, it also recognises the contribution that settlements outside of the PUAs can make. Allowing 2,350 houses outside of the PUA (2006 – 2026) is considered a satisfactory balance.</p> |
| | <p>2. Reduce levels of development in the PUA.</p> | <p>This option was dismissed as it was considered that this would undermine opportunities to focus development on the more sustainable towns and villages of the PUA. It would also reduce the size of the SUE and its ability to sustain facilities and services which would require a certain scale of population.</p> <p>The PUA settlements have more options (including greater access to and propensity to use public transport).</p> <p>To reduce the quantity of development in the PUA below 5,000 houses would not be in conformity with the Regional Plan.</p> |
| | <p>3. Increased levels of development at Blaby.</p> | <p>This was examined given Blaby’s status as the only town centre in the District with a good range of services and facilities. Blaby also has a good functional relationship with Leicester (including public transport provision). Notwithstanding this, Blaby is constrained to the north, south and west by flood plain and strategically important areas of Green Wedge – as such larger growth requirements were dismissed.</p> |
| | <p>4. Increased levels of development in Countesthorpe / Whetstone.</p> | <p>This was examined because Countesthorpe / Whetstone have a good range of services and facilities (as identified</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | in the village services fact file) – including a secondary school and Community College at Countesthorpe (which offers educational opportunities to take beyond school age) and Employment Opportunities at Whetstone. They have a good functional relationship with Leicester (including public transport provision) . Notwithstanding this, Countesthorpe has limited employment opportunities (with limited opportunities for expansion) and limited potential to expand retail facilities. There is a need to prevent coalescence of these and neighbouring settlements. |
| | 5. Provide additional growth in some of the rural settlements – including Sharnford / and Sapcote. | This was examined in order to safeguard existing services and facilities – and in the case of Sharnford to secure the Sharnford by-pass. Whilst there are some services and facilities within these smaller settlements, they are relatively remote from higher order services and have more limited public transport services. Focussing large scale growth within the rural areas would be contrary to the Regional Plan and would not provide the most sustainable solution in relation to accessing services and public transport. |
| | 6. To provide a lower level of development at Stoney Stanton and not propose it as a Rural Service Centre. | This option was considered to not support the role of Stoney Stanton as the only rural centre in the District. It is the only settlement in the south of the District which has a library, school, church, pub, post office, Doctor, chemist, optician, convenience store, supermarket and Community Building in the same village. |
| Policy 6 - Affordable housing | 1. To seek to secure the level of affordable housing need identified in the SHMA. | The SHMA (2008) indicates that some 289 houses per year would be required to meet the affordable housing needs of the District of Blaby. This equates to some 80% of the total annualised housing requirements set out in the East Midlands Regional Plan. |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | The initial findings from the 'Affordable Housing Viability Assessment' (AHVA) (received June 2009) identified that the market in the District of Blaby was unable to sustain this level of affordable housing. A figure of 30% in the SUE and 25% outside of the SUE is a more realistic target. |
| | 2. To seek a threshold lower than 15 houses (the national indicative minimum). | The initial findings of the AHVA do not give sufficient support to reducing the threshold for on-site provision of affordable housing below the national indicative minimum contained in PPS3. Given that the majority of development will occur on sites above this level it is unlikely to significantly diminish the amount of affordable housing capable of being achieved. Notwithstanding this, the SPD has the potential to set a policy context for securing contributions toward affordable housing on smaller sites. |
| | 3. To seek a higher percentage of social rented housing and less intermediate housing. | There is insufficient evidence in the SHMA and AHVA to support this approach. |
| Policy 7 - Mix of housing | 1. Not to have a housing mix policy. | The findings of the SHMA indicate that the housing mix in Blaby does not meet the optimum mix required. There are low levels of provision of small houses (in the market sector) and low levels of larger houses in the affordable sector. To not have a housing mix policy would further distort the balance of the housing market. |
| | 2. To specify a mix of houses. | Notwithstanding the above, it was not considered appropriate to set out a detailed mix of housing within the Core Strategy. It is recognised that the CS will endure for at least 15 years, during which time additional growth will continue to shape the housing market. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Requirements will be based around the SHMA (and subsequent updates) and ongoing monitoring of housing mix – as identified in the ‘monitoring strategy’ section. |
| | 3. To use different criteria to determine what represents a ‘large’ site. | The large site definition is consistent with that used for development control purposes. Schemes of 10 houses or more have the potential to provide a mix of sizes, lower thresholds are unlikely to provide such a mix and contribute less to the overall requirements. |
| | 4. Not to require houses to be built to “Lifetime” standards. | This would not comply with the ‘Lifetime Homes, Lifetime neighbourhoods’ strategy which requires all public sector houses to be compliant by 2011 and others by 2013 and would not allow residents to stay in their home following changes in circumstances or as they age. |
| | 5. Not to require 10% of houses to be built to ‘wheelchair’ standards. | Whilst there is no legislative requirement to insist on wheelchair standard homes, the figure of 10% broadly reflects the level of frail elderly and physically disabled people in the District identified in the 2005 Housing Needs Survey. |
| Policy 8 - Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers | 1. To set out numbers of pitch requirements up to 2026. | This was not considered an appropriate approach as it is not supported by evidence contained in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) and would not be in accordance with the RSS. |
| | 2. To identify Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Core Strategy. | This issue is not ‘strategic’ in nature and would more appropriately be dealt with in the ‘Allocations and Designations’ document. Insufficient evidence exists to specify the correct number of pitches beyond 2016 (according to the GTAA) or 2012 according to the RSS. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | 3. To use different criteria to identify an appropriate distance from a settlement. | It was considered that a greater distance would not be sustainable and would necessitate long journeys to services and facilities. Requiring new sites to be within the defined 'settlement boundaries' or in very close proximity would not be consistent with the G&T culture and would unnecessarily stifle choice for the G&T community. |
| Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure | 1. To identify a broad range of transport schemes planned for the District. | This was considered an unnecessary duplication of the Local Transport Plan, Regional Funding Allocation and other strategies. Notwithstanding this, the CS is consistent with these. |
| | 2. To include aspirations for the re-opening of Blaby Station to passengers and the National Forest Line to passenger traffic. | This was not considered appropriate given levels of uncertainty surrounding both projects. Whilst Blaby Station is a project supported in LTP2 and in the Blaby District Local Plan, there is no identified funding to secure delivery - and initial discussions with rail partners have not given support to achieving this project. |
| | 3. To specify the detailed transport works required as part of the SUE proposal. | The broad transport works required to mitigate the transport impacts of growth are set out in the 'Assessment of Highways and Transport Implications' (received June 2009). Whilst this report (based on transport modelling) indicates that a transport solution can be achieved – including public transport, the detailed transport solutions will more effectively be dealt with as part of the SUE masterplan. This will involve discussions with Leicestershire County and Leicester City Council transport teams and the Highways Agency. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | 4. To include a policy seeking a higher parking standard in areas not well served by public transport. | This policy was not pursued as there was insufficient evidence to suggest that this was a reasonable approach. |
| | 5. To include a policy on Congestion Charging and workplace parking levy. | Neither Blaby District Council, or Leicestershire County Council (the Highway Authority), consider these measures are appropriate for the District. |
| Policy 10 - Services and Facilities to support growth | 1. To set out detailed infrastructure requirements within the SUE. | This approach was considered to be too detailed for a Core Strategy. The Council is continuing to develop a section 106 strategy that will address broad requirements for infrastructure. The need for services and facilities will depend on the scale and nature of development proposed and could more appropriately be dealt with through the Allocations and Designations document and subsequently through the processing of planning applications. |
| Policy 11 - Developer contributions | 1. To set out a detailed formula specifying the quantity and costs of infrastructure. | This approach was considered to be too detailed for a Core Strategy. The Council is continuing to develop a section 106 strategy that will address some of these issues and (depending on the outcome of legislation) will consider whether to seek Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions. |
| | 2. Not to have a developer contributions policy. | Whilst the principle of seeking developer contributions is well established in Central Government Statements and Circulars, it was considered important that the District makes it clear that contributions will be sought to ensure that growth is delivered in a satisfactory way. |
| Policy 12 - Retailing and Blaby Town centre | 1. Not to place restrictions on the growth of Fosse Park and other out of town facilities. | Unrestricted provision of new retail facilities could conflict with the CS objective of 'preventing significant expansion' of out of town retail facilities and 'enhancing the vitality and viability of existing centres'. |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | A policy to relax restrictions on out of town retail growth would be contrary to the Regional Plan and Central Government guidance which promotes a 'town centres first' strategy. |
| | 2. Designate Fosse Park and the Motorways Retail Area as a town centre. | These proposals were considered contrary to the Regional Plan and Central Government guidance and would also exacerbate traffic and transport related problems. |
| Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure (GI) | 1. Not to have a Green Infrastructure Policy | Green Infrastructure is an essential part of high quality places. Whilst the need to provide GI is enshrined within the Regional Plan and in Central Government Guidance, it is considered that the provision of GI is a fundamental component of the Growth agenda which needs an explicit policy reference at the local level. |
| Policy 14 - Play and Open Spaces | 1. Not to have a play and open space policy. | To not have a play and open space policy could limit the potential to protect existing, and secure new, sports and recreation facilities. The policy provides certainty on the level of POS provision expected from new developments. |
| Policy 15 - Green Wedges | 1. Not to define the general locations of Green Wedges. | This option was dismissed as Green Wedges are a strategic planning policy which, as such, should be addressed in the CS. Not to do so may result in the unrestricted growth of towns and villages resulting in sprawl and coalescence of villages to the detriment of the character of the District of Blaby. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | 2. To maintain existing areas of Green Wedge and not undertake a strategic review of the boundaries | It is inappropriate to not consider a Strategic Green Wedge review. The scale and strategic locations of growth defined in the RSS would not allow all development requirements to be accommodated outside of Green Wedges. Failure to re-assess Green Wedge could potentially result in the plan not being in conformity with the RSS and consequently unsound |
| | 3. Not to indicate the sensitive / less sensitive parts of existing Green Wedges on the key diagram. | In light of the Strategic Green Wedge Assessment, it was considered appropriate to give a strategic steer on the relative sensitivity of parts of existing Green Wedges to development. |
| Policy 16 - Bio-diversity and geo-diversity | 1. Not to have a bio-diversity / geo-diversity policy. | Not to provide such a policy would reduce the ability to achieve the CS objective of 'preserving and enhancing important parts of the natural environment' within the District. |
| Policy 17 - Cultural Environment | 1. Not to have a Cultural Environment policy.. | Not to have a cultural environment policy would reduce the ability to protect historic buildings, areas and sites within the District. |
| Policy 18 - Energy Efficiency and the Design of New development | 1. To accelerate the energy efficiency component of the Code level targets. | In light of the cost implications identified in the Climate change study (and the prevailing market conditions) it was considered that there was insufficient evidence to support an acceleration of the Code level targets. |
| Policy 19 - Location of renewable energy | 1. Allocate sites for renewable energy uses. | Allocating sites for renewable energy uses was not pursued as the full environmental implications of such |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| facilities | | allocations have not yet been fully researched. In addition PPS22 advises that sites should not be allocated unless already identified by renewable energy providers. |
| | 2. To require a different percentage of energy on new developments from decentralised and renewable low carbon sources. | This approach would not be consistent with the Regional Plan and would not be based on sufficient evidence. |
| Policy 20 - Flooding and Climate Change related hazards | 1. Not to have a Flooding and Climate Change related hazards policy. | This would reduce the ability to resist development in flood plains within the District. |
| Policy 21 - Waste | 1. Not to have waste policy. | This would reduce the ability to encourage new developments to minimise waste and incorporate recycling initiatives. |

Appendix 6a

Alternative SUE / SES options

Other options considered - Appendix A

Potential SUE/SES – Consideration of options

| | Pros | Cons |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>Site A</u></p> <p>Glenfield Park</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local employment opportunities (2-3000 jobs) according to SES promoter. - Potential to match employment types to reflect local job needs (work undertaken by SES promoters to identify links between potential supply and demand). - Does not need major transport infrastructure, therefore could offer early delivery. The site has direct links into the strategic road network. - Close proximity to the M1 and A46 (T) Leicester Western Bypass, therefore commercially desirable. - Additional facilities (e.g. cycle ways) would be offered within the remaining Green Wedge. - Close to a Sustrans cycle route. - Public transport improvements could be achieved by extending / accessing existing routes (albeit modest – extension to bus route 94). - Could provide the 25 hectares identified in the PACEC study. - Would provide a modest contribution to housing land supply, (300 houses) including 30% affordable housing (90 houses). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An employment-led option. Would only offer 300 houses, therefore, a SUE would have to be identified elsewhere in the PUA. - Would be physically detached from any potential SUE. Therefore, limited opportunity for journeys to work from the SUE by “sustainable transport”. - Land is currently designated as Green Wedge, a large part of which would be taken for built development. - Elevated land would be prominent in the landscape and need very sensitive design. - No design “vision”. - Mix of type of employment is unclear. - Few opportunities to “link in” with Glenfield village. - Likely to attract increased traffic through Glenfield village. The impact on the existing road network is likely to be problematic. |

Summary

Ability to deliver development requirements

Site A is an employment led solution. It would meet the requirements for an SES as identified in the PACEC report, but could not be considered as a SUE as it only seeks to deliver some 300 houses. If chosen as an SUE it would necessitate the designation of a further SUE to deliver the housing requirements of the RSS.

Transport

SES A benefits from the advantages of being able to link in to existing strategic transport network to enable access for both employees and movements of goods. Whilst the Transport Assessment indicates that there are some issues relating to potential capacity at the traffic island on the A46, and increased movements in Glenfield, the former appears capable of being mitigated. The site could not achieve direct movements of vehicles onto the northbound M1 although is being capable with movements along the A46/A50 or utilising junction 21 to turn 180 degrees.

Deliverability

The land is (mainly) in one ownership with a willing developer and is therefore deliverable. The adjacent sewage works are not part of the ownership but this would not stifle development - although there would clearly be impacts on the remaining farm.

Environmental issues

The site is visually prominent at its northern edge adjacent to Glenfield where the land rises, but slopes to the south adjacent to the M1 (the area indicated in provisional plans as the location of employment). The site lies within the currently defined Green Wedge between Glenfield and Kirby Muxloe and would result in considerable erosion of this if chosen as the SES. Whilst the site is not an area indicated as 'sensitive' in the Green Wedge Assessment it is also not an area identified for review.

There are some areas of bio-diversity interest at the adjacent golf course and the Rothley Brook to the north-west (which also has flooding issues – but outside of the proposed development land), but it is considered that development could occur without detriment to these.

Links with SUE

The site proposes some 300 houses. This would not deliver the quantum of houses required in the SUE to meet the housing needs of the District. The developer has made clear that this is an employment led development. Whilst the proposal would make a contribution to employment opportunities for existing residents (some in nearby wards with patterns of deprivation – including in Leicester City) there is no strong direct links with the other potential SUEs. Walking and cycling between the SUE and new SES would be less convenient than between SUE C and SES B – to be discussed later).

Conclusion

The site is deliverable and could provide the 25 hectares of land referred to in the PACEC Employment Land Study. It is capable of providing transport solutions (based on 25 hectares of employment land and 300 houses). The site could provide employment for nearby population (including for those in nearby areas of deprivation) – although offers a less direct relationship with the potential SUE).

The site is not capable of being developed without eroding the Green Wedge between Glenfield and Kirby Muxloe and would be visually exposed at its northern edge.

The residential element has no direct vehicular links with the existing development at Glenfield (although walking and cycling links are possible). This could potentially result in a 'tacked-on' development.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Site B</p> <p>LFE</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early delivery. - Public transport on A47 Hinckley Road already exists and could be enhanced – including potential to increase capacity at Meynell’s Gorse Park and Ride. - Improve services to existing community. - Country Park and “Community Hub”. - Land not currently designated as a Green Wedge. - Opportunities to create a “high street”. - Potential to reduce out movements from LFE by providing new facilities – including shops/ retail. - Consortium have identified that all landowners are willing to develop and therefore is deliverable (needs to be confirmed by consortium). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would yield more than 3,500 houses at densities above 42 / ha assuming 50% net developable area (maximum without increasing densities to an inappropriate level) houses, slightly less than is desirable for the Blaby SUE. This would be an insufficient number of dwellings to support a secondary school within the site. - Would result in the displacement of well established formal areas of recreation – it is not clear where these would be replaced. - Loss of other leisure facilities (golf course). - Appears to be tacked onto LFE (linear growth). - A47 Hinckley Road would run through the development, potentially dividing the community with a heavily trafficked road. - Uncertainties over the opening of the National Forest Line to passengers (currently highly unlikely). - Overhead power lines are a constraint – not ideal to provide recreation opportunities below them. - - Sits on the ridge line. - Uncertain what additional jobs would be created (apart from retailing). No great potential to deliver significant employment opportunities. No immediate links with areas of employment adjacent to junction 21. - Uncertainties that the quantity of development could deliver a secondary school. |
| <p>Summary</p> | | |

Ability to deliver development requirements

SUE B is some 170 hectares. There are several constraints (primarily overhead power lines that limit the potential developable area for housing). Assuming a net developable area for housing of 50% and an average density of 40 / ha would yield 3,400 houses. At an average density of 50 ha some 4,250 houses could be achieved, although this density is considered high given the character of the area and the prevailing market demands. Only 2,550 houses could be achieved using the PPS3 indicative minimum density of 30 / ha. The quantity of development would not provide sufficient critical mass to achieve a secondary school.

Transport

SUE B benefits from being able to link in to existing transport network (primarily the A47) to enable access to existing public transport for residents. Whilst the Transport Assessment indicates that there are some issues relating to potential capacity on the A47 into Leicester and areas of stress at other key intersections at peak hours, this appears capable of being mitigated.

Deliverability

The land is in a number of ownerships. The consortium have identified that all parties are willing to include land within the development and the site must therefore be considered deliverable (further written confirmation is awaited from the consortium).

Environmental issues

The site sits at the top of gently rising land forming part of a ridge surrounding Leicester Forest East. The site lies within an area designated 'Countryside'. Development would not result in coalescence with other settlements but would extend the built form in a linear fashion along the A47 beyond the current limits to Leicester Forest East.

There are some areas of bio-diversity interest at the adjacent golf courses and there is a Scheduled Ancient Monument west of Beggars Lane to the south of the site. No flooding issues have been identified.

The site is traversed by electricity pylons and power supply wires. These are identified in initial masterplans as areas that could accommodate Green Infrastructure.

Links with SES

There are no strong direct links with the other potential SESs or existing areas of employment (particularly the concentration of employment around junction 21). There is only limited scope for accommodating (B class) employment opportunities within the development

Conclusion

The site is potentially deliverable and could provide some 3,500 houses (at average densities above 40 / ha) – too few to support a secondary school. There is little flexibility to reduce densities and achieve the quantity of development define in the RSS.

It is capable of providing early public transport solutions – mainly 'bus based' by improving existing services on the A47. The site also allows creation of a High Street containing retail and Community facilities.

The SUE has few direct vehicular links with the existing development at LFE (although walking and cycling links could be possible). This could potentially result in a 'tacked-on' development and a linear form that extends LFE westwards along the A47.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Site C</p> <p>Lubbesthorpe</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design vision. Opportunity for “flagship development”. - Masterplan demonstrates that development could occur within the defined ridge / topography. - Opportunity to deliver a “place” and real communities. - Within a single ownership which would assist negotiation and early delivery. - Sufficiently large to accommodate over 4,500 houses. Provides flexibility if District housing requirement is increased in future. - “Critical mass” for securing key services, e.g. secondary school. - Ability of the developer to fund infrastructure. - Physically adjacent to a potential Strategic Employment Site at The Warrens, Enderby (also within same ownership). - Experienced team, with proven track record on similar developments. - Transport initiatives (potential links to Enderby Park and Ride). - Land not currently designated as a Green Wedge. - Close to main areas of employment/retail/commercial leisure in Blaby District. - Significant potential for Green Infrastructure. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport challenges. - Impact of the motorways on the development – noise, lighting, air pollution and land take. Mitigation measures would be needed. - Public transport solutions need further consideration. |
|---|---|--|

Summary

Ability to deliver development requirements

SUE C is the largest of the 3 potential SUEs being more than 430 hectares in total. There are several constraints including a Scheduled Ancient Monument, Power Lines and Flood plain (to the south of the site) and buffer zones required adjacent to the M69 and M1 motorways that limit the potential developable area for housing. Notwithstanding this, some 4,500 houses could be achieved at the PPS3 minimum average density of 30 hectare. Even at low densities there would be potential to provide additional growth if housing requirements are increased through the RSS.

Transport

SUE C does not currently have direct access to existing public transport links (primarily the A47 but also the B4114) to enable access to existing public transport for residents. Proposals to create local and more strategic transport links have been promoted by the developer and, following early discussions with the Transport Authority appear to be achievable in principle. The Transport Assessment indicates that there are some issues relating to potential capacity and stress on key interchanges (including on the A47 and other routes into Leicester) intersections at peak hours, the Transport Assessment suggests measures that indicate that these are capable of being mitigated.

Deliverability

The land is in a single ownership. The owner is willing to promote the land for development and the site must therefore be considered deliverable.

Environmental issues

The site sits within a ridge surrounding Leicester. The site lies within an area designated 'Countryside'. Development would not result in coalescence between settlements but does allow opportunities to create a distinct 'linked settlement' with new Green Wedges between the site and Enderby / LFE / Braunstone Town.

There are some areas of bio-diversity interest in local pools / watercourses areas of woodland (which are also a strong landscape feature as are some of the mature trees and hedges on the site). There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument to the south of the site. There are areas that are likely to flood at the south of the site.

The site is traversed by electricity pylons and power supply wires to the south.

Links with SES

There is a strong direct link with 2 of the potential SESs (B&C) and existing areas of employment (particularly the concentration of employment around junction 21). There is also scope for accommodating (B class) employment opportunities within the development as well as employment opportunities that would arise from the secondary school and 3 primary schools required.

Conclusion

The site is deliverable and could provide some 4,500 houses (at average densities of 30 / ha). There is flexibility to provide a range of densities and achieve the quantity of development define in the RSS.

Early work on the masterplan, expressed at the Member's presentation, indicates a strong vision and innovative thinking on Design quality.

Whilst the site cannot provide early public transport solutions – mainly 'bus based' solutions appear possible following early discussions with County Council Transport colleagues.

The SUE would have direct vehicular links with the existing employment areas at junction 21 and the potential SES (walking and cycling links are also possible). This could potentially result in a development which affords more sustainable transport movements.

Recommendation

i) **Site C (Lubbesthorpe)** is the recommended location for the SUE (4,500 dwellings).

| Other Sites | Pros | Cons |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The Warrens Extension, Enderby</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only a small part of the site (a former landfill site) is on land currently designated as Green Wedge. - Early delivery off existing transport network / infrastructure (later phases on completion of link road) - Within the same ownership as SUE Option C, which would assist negotiation and delivery. Opportunity for building an Enderby relief road. - Within walking/cycling distance of the Enderby Priority Neighbourhood and potential SUE. - Close to proximity to J21 (M1/ M69). Commercially desirable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport challenges – would result in additional traffic on the already heavily used road network within Enderby and put stress on intersections. (According to the Transport study). - Prominent, elevated site. Would need very sensitive design. - Potential loss of woodland. - The site area currently defined is less than requirements of the PACEC study. - No design “vision”. - Mix of type of employment is unclear. |

Summary

Transport

SES B has an existing link through the Warrens Industrial Estate. Links into the existing transport network can be achieved but are currently experiencing ‘stress at some local key intersections including the ‘Leicester Lane / B582 junction and B4114 / B582 junction. In addition the Beggars Lane / B582 junction has stress at peak times. The Transport Assessment indicates that mitigation measures in the form of a completed Enderby relief road would offer reductions in the vehicle movements at these key areas of stress. This is in the control of the SES promoter.

The site could achieve more direct movements of goods onto the strategic road network if this were completed. The existing bridge over M69 between Lubbesthorpe and the Warrens provides an opportunity for pedestrian and cycle traffic to access the employment areas from the potential SUE.

Deliverability

Part of the land is currently being farmed. The site is mainly in one ownership. The owner is seeking to promote the land for employment purposes, it is therefore considered deliverable. The extent of the land being promoted is some 20 hectares, which falls short of the quantity suggested as an SES in the PACEC study. However, there are strong links with the SUE where additional employment land is proposed which could address any shortfall.

Environmental issues

The site is visually prominent at its northern edge adjacent to the M69 where the land is on a ridge, it slopes to the south adjacent to Enderby Park an attractive area of land designated as Green Wedge to the East of Enderby Hall. A Fox Covert lies to the immediate west of the site sloping north towards the M69. The site is currently designated as Countryside, which would result in considerable erosion if chosen as the SES. However, the site is bounded by the M1 to the east and M69 to the north and employment uses (including former waste disposal site) to the west

There are no issues of bio-diversity / flooding that could not be mitigated.

Links with SUE

The site is located very close to SUE C which has the potential to accommodate the housing requirements of the RSS. The developer promoting the SUE is also promoting SES B. There is a strong direct link via the existing bridge over the M69 with SUE C. Walking and cycling between the SUE and new SES would be less convenient than between SUE C and SES B – to be discussed later).

Conclusion

The site is deliverable. The current transport network experiences stress at nearby intersections at peak hour. Transport solutions (primarily the completion of an Enderby relief road as an extension to the Warrens) have been identified by the Transport study which would mitigate adverse transport impacts. The potential for walking and cycling from the potential SUE C to the SES also has advantages. The site could also provide employment for nearby population.

The site would be visually prominent at its northern edge (particularly on its northern edge adjacent to the M69).

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| West of St Johns, Enderby | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Close to proximity to J21 (M1/ M69). Commercially desirable.- Close to Park and Ride site allowing public transport solution using 'return trips from Leicester'- Fewer stress points identified on the network in the transport study.- Could provide the 25 hectares identified in the PACEC study.- Public transport improvements could be achieved by extending / accessing existing routes.- Reasonable links for pedestrians and cyclists from potential SUE C | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- An important part of the currently designated Green Wedge. Built development would lead to the coalescence of settlements.- Potential location for a "Community Forest" (LCC initiative – although some uncertainty exists around this proposal). |
|----------------------------------|---|--|

Summary

Transport

SES C can links into the existing transport network. The Transport Assessment indicates that mitigation measures would offer reductions in the vehicle movements at key areas of stress.

The site could achieve direct movements of goods onto the strategic road network and provides an opportunity for public transport solutions from the Park and Ride and established bus routes.

Deliverability

Part of the land is currently being farmed. There is some uncertainty as to ownership and therefore whether the site can be considered deliverable. The extent of the land being promoted is some 25 hectares, this would meet the quantity suggested as an SES in the PACEC study.

Environmental issues

The site lies within the currently defined Green Wedge between Enderby and Grove Park (which forms part of the continuous extension of the Leicester Urban Area) and would result in considerable erosion of this if chosen as the SES, whilst the site is not an area indicated as 'sensitive' in the Green Wedge Assessment it is also not an area defined for review.

There are no issues of bio-diversity / flooding / landscape / that could not be mitigated. There is potential for archaeological interest on the land.

Links with SUE

The site is located approximately 1 kilometre from SUE C via the existing bridge over the M69 with SUE C. Walking and cycling between the SUE and new SES would be possible although less convenient than between SUE C and SES B).

Conclusion

The site's deliverability has some uncertainties. The current transport network is well suited to providing public transport solutions (primarily using the new Park and Ride) The Transport study indicates that solutions exist to mitigate adverse transport impacts. There is potential for walking and cycling from the potential SUE C to the SES. The site could also provide employment for nearby population.

Recommendation

- i) **Site B (The Warrens, Enderby)** is the recommended location for the SES.

Appendix 7

Monitoring report

Monitoring Framework

It is important that the effectiveness of the Blaby Local Development Framework (including the Core Strategy) is capable of being monitored to establish if the policies contained within it are achieving the objectives.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires every Local Planning Authority to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) as part of the Local Development Framework. The AMR should contain information about the implementation of the Local Development Scheme (LDS), and the extent to which the milestones in the LDS are being achieved. The AMR should also monitor the performance and effects of LDF policies, cover the period from 1 April to 31 March and be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 December each year.

Having identified the policies to be monitored, it is then necessary to identify indicators which will allow the policies to be monitored appropriately. The aim of the indicators is to provide specific markers against which the impacts of the policies can be measured.

Table 1 contains each of the Core Policies, the objectives to which they relate, indicators and appropriate targets. These indicators have been derived from both Core Indicators identified by the Department of Communities and Local Government (which are required to be addressed in the AMR) and others derived from the Sustainability Appraisal (including the scoping report) and other .

It must be noted that indicators may be subject to change. Achieving Code level targets for energy efficiency for example, will change over the lifetime of the Core Strategy.

| Policy | CS Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Policy 1 - Locating new development | i, ii, iii, vi, vii, viii, x, xi. | <p>Number and % of new houses completed inside and outside of the PUA</p> <p>Houses permitted and completed on Previously developed land</p> | <p>263 houses per year to be completed in the PUA (5,250 2006 to 2026)</p> <p>117 houses per year to be completed outside of the PUA (2,350 2006 to 2026)</p> <p>1,475 houses (20%) 2006 - 2026</p> |
| Policy 2 - Design of New Development | v, vii | Number of schemes achieving 'Building for Life' (BFL) Silver standard | 100% of schemes of 10 units or above achieving 'BFL 'silver standard. |
| Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension | i, ii, iii, iv, v, viii, x, xi, xii | <p>Number of houses completed per year in the SUE</p> <p>Number and % of affordable houses constructed per year in the SUE (between 2013 and 2026).</p> | <p>346 houses per year to be constructed in the SUE (between 2013 and 2026) – 4,500 in total.</p> <p>104 affordable houses per year (30%) to be constructed in the SUE (between 2013 and 2026) – 1,350 in total.</p> |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site | iii, x, xi | <p>Amount of employment land provided in the Strategic Employment Site and SUE.</p> <p>Amount of floorspace developed for employment by use class.</p> <p>Amount of employment land lost to residential or other uses.</p> | <p>2 hectares of employment land provided per year (25 hectares between 2013 and 2026)</p> <p>Requirements to meet employment needs identified in the Employment Land Study.</p> <p>No loss of employment land still required for employment use</p> |
| Policy 5 - Settlement hierarchy | i, ii, iii, x, xi | Number of houses built in each of the settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy | Secure the numbers of houses identified during the plan period (Nb. An annualised target for each settlement would be meaningless as delivery will not be forthcoming in a consistent manner). Provision outside of the PUA will be monitored under policy 1. |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|---|--------------|---|--|
| Policy 6 - Affordable housing | ii, | <p>Number and % of affordable houses constructed per year.</p> <p>Type of affordable houses provided</p> | <p>25% affordable houses on qualifying sites outside of the SUE.</p> <p>104 affordable houses per year (30%) in the SUE (between 2013 and 2026) – 1,350 in total.</p> <p>80% social rented, 20% intermediate</p> |
| Policy 7 - Mix of housing | i, ii, v, x | <p>Mix of houses in terms of bedroom numbers, affordability (including tenure)</p> | <p>Continual monitoring to assess the provision of houses against the 'optimum' housing requirements set out in the Strategic Housing market Assessment.</p> |
| Policy 8 - Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers | i | <p>Number of pitches provided</p> | <p>13 residential pitches and 5 transit pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 1 x plot for travelling Show People to be provided between 2007 and 2012.</p> <p>Subsequent requirements to be informed by Accommodation Assessments.</p> |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|---|--------------|---|---|
| Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure | iii, xi | <p>Amount of new residential development in SUEs and large villages to have access to a 20 minute frequency public transport.</p> <p>% of houses in other areas to have access to an hourly bus services linking to higher order centres</p> <p>New developments above 200 units that provide new cycle and footpaths which link in with existing networks.</p> <p>Number of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA).</p> | <p>100% of houses in the SUE and large villages to be within 400 metres of a (minimum 20 minute frequency) Local Bus service.</p> <p>95% of new houses to be within 800 metres of a (minimum hourly) Local Bus service.</p> <p>100% of new developments of 200 or more houses to provide dedicated cycle and pedestrian routes & to link in with networks abutting the site.</p> <p>No requirement to designate additional AQMAs.</p> |
| Policy 10 - Services and Facilities to support growth | iii, iv, x, | <p>Available capacity in new and existing schools and health facilities to accommodate growth.</p> <p>Provision of new Community / Faith facilities to support new growth as part of the SUE.</p> | <p>100% of all new developments to provide financial contributions or new facilities to address any shortfalls in education and health provision arising from the scheme.</p> <p>New Community /Faith facilities to be provided as part of the SUE – to be determined through the SUE masterplan.</p> |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|---|---------------------|---|--|
| Policy 11 - Developer contributions | ii, iii, iv, vi, xi | Number of new developments that are deficient in infrastructure, which require financial or other contributions to improve infrastructure. | To secure from developers appropriate contributions to offset any infrastructure requirements arising from development. |
| Policy 12 - Retailing and Blaby Town centre | iii, xi | <p>Total amount of permitted and completed retail and leisure floorspace.</p> <p>Amount of additional permitted and completed retail and leisure floorspace in Blaby Town Centre.</p> <p>Amount of additional permitted and completed retail and leisure floorspace in Fosse Park and the Motorways Retail Area.</p> <p>Amount of additional permitted and completed retail development in the SUE.</p> | <p>No target considered necessary.</p> <p>100% of new development in established retail centres (including Blaby town centre) unless need / impact assessment allows out of town development.</p> <p>No target considered necessary.</p> <p>New retail facilities to be provided as part of the SUE – to be determined through the SUE masterplan.</p> |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure (GI) | iii, iv, v, vi, | The amount of new Green Infrastructure created or lost as a result of development or other interventions. | To deliver the GI projects identified in policy 13 before 2026 and in accordance with a Green Infrastructure Strategy to be prepared by Blaby District Council. |
| Policy 14 - Play and Open Spaces | iv, | <p>Creation of new formal and informal recreation space.</p> <p>Development granted on existing areas of sport and recreation space.</p> | <p>No net reduction in amount of formal and informal open space per head of population</p> <p>100% of new housing developments to provide play and open space facilities to meet the requirements set out in Policy 14, or make a commensurate financial contribution.</p> |
| Policy 15 - Green Wedges | iii, iv, vi, ix, | <p>Loss and creation of Green Wedges and type of planning permissions granted in these areas.</p> <p>Provision of new Green Wedges</p> | <p>No permissions of inappropriate uses in Green Wedges that would result in the Green Wedge functions being undermined.</p> <p>To identify a new Green Wedge as part of the SUE masterplan.</p> |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| Policy 16 - Bio-diversity and geo-diversity | vi, vii, | <p>Creation of new Local Wildlife Sites</p> <p>Protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest</p> <p>Protection of Sites of National / Regional Sites of Geological importance adversely affected by development</p> | <p>To create new wildlife sites in partnership with the Local Wildlife Trust and County Ecologist.</p> <p>No negative changes to SSSIs.</p> <p>No negative changes to RIGS</p> |
| Policy 17 - Cultural Environment | iii, vii, | <p>Number of listed buildings at risk.</p> <p>Listed buildings demolished.</p> | <p>A decrease in the number of buildings at risk from 2001 levels.</p> <p>No loss of listed buildings</p> |
| Policy 18 - Energy Efficiency and the Design of New development | v, viii, ix | <p>Percentage of housing achieving the energy efficiency code level requirements from the Code for Sustainable Homes</p> | <p>100% of all new houses to meet the phased code level requirements of the CSH.</p> |

| Core Policy | Objective(s) | Indicator | Target |
|---|--------------|---|---|
| Policy 19 - Location of renewable energy facilities | viii | % of energy provided from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources | 10% of energy provided from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources |
| Policy 20 - Flooding and Climate Change related hazards | v, vi, ix | Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on either flood defence grounds or water quality | No planning permissions for sensitive development to be granted in flood plains (contrary to advice from the Environment Agency). |
| Policy 21 - Waste | iii | Amount of waste to be recycled | 58% of waste to be recycled by 2017 |

Appendix 8

Alignment of the Core Strategy and the Blaby District Sustainable Community Strategy (2008)

Alignment of the Core Strategy and the Blaby District Sustainable Community Strategy (2008)

The table below shows the Priorities of the Blaby District SCS which have a spatial relevance and the policies of the Core Strategy with which they are aligned.

| Blaby District SCS | Core Strategy Policy |
|--|--|
| <u>Priority: A Clean, Attractive and Sustainable Environment</u> | |
| Objective: To retain and deliver job opportunities/employment land in the right location to match housing growth and needs of residents. | Policy 1 - Locating New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site |
| Objective: Increase the vibrancy of local shopping centres. | Policy 12 - Retailing and Blaby Town Centre |
| Objective: Improved infrastructure to support use of public transport and reduce road congestion. | Policy 1 - Locating New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure |
| Objective: Maximise the benefits of Park and Ride Services. | Policy 1 - Locating New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure |
| Objective: Expand cycleway and footpath networks and encourage increased use. | Policy 1 - Locating New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 4 - Strategic Employment Site Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure Policy 15 - Green Wedges |
| Objective: To reduce total amount of waste and increase recycling and composting rates. | Policy 21 - Waste |
| Objective: Improve air quality. | Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure |
| Objective: Improve the Green Infrastructure (network of linked green spaces) across the District. | Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Policy 14 - Play & Open Spaces Policy 15 - Green Wedges</p> |
| <p>Objective: Ensure that new development is sensitively designed, integrates with its surroundings and adds value to the character of the area.</p> | <p>Policy 2 - Design of New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 8 - Accommodation for Gypsies & Travellers</p> |
| <p>Objective: Managing flood risk.</p> | <p>Policy 20 - Flooding and Climate Change Related Hazards</p> |
| <p>Objective: Reduce CO² emission linked to energy use.</p> | <p>Policy 2 - Design of New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 18 - Energy Efficiency and the Design of New Development Policy 19 - Location of Renewable Energy Facilities</p> |
| <p>Objective: Ensure that new developments are of the highest design and quality.</p> | <p>Policy 2 - Design of New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension</p> |
| <p>Objective: Ensure that the right houses are provided in the right locations.</p> | <p>Policy 2 - Design of New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 6 - Affordable Housing Policy 7 - Mix of Housing</p> |
| <p>Objective: Ensure a sufficient supply of new houses.</p> | <p>Policy 1 - Locating New Development Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 5 - Settlement Hierarchy Policy 6 - Affordable Housing</p> |
| <p>Objective: Ensure that the right community infrastructure is in place around homes.</p> | <p>Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure Policy 10 - Services and Facilities to Support Growth Policy 11 - Developer Contributions Policy 12 - Retailing and Blaby Town Centre Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure Policy 14 - Play & Open Spaces</p> |
| <p>Objective: Increase and maintain the number of people who are physically active at a level which confers health benefit.</p> | <p>Policy 3 - Sustainable Urban Extension Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure Policy 13 - Green Infrastructure Policy 14 - Play & Open Spaces</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Policy 15 - Green Wedges |
| Objective: Enable older people to live independently. | Policy 2 - Design of New Development Policy 7 - Mix of Housing |
| Objective: Infrastructure is available to support locally accessible services. | Policy 9 - Transport Infrastructure Policy 10 - Services and Facilities to Support Growth Policy 11 - Developer Contributions |

Appendix 9

Housing trajectory

Blaby Housing Trajectory

| | 2006 - 2026 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 06/07 | 07/08 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 11/12 | 12/13 | 13/14 | 14/15 | 15/16 | 16/17 | 17/18 | 18/19 | 19/20 | 20/21 | 21/22 | 22/23 | 23/24 | 24/25 | 25/26 | |
| Total Annual Completions (net) | 218 | 329 | 197 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 744 |
| Large Site Commitments | | | | 88 | 115 | 91 | 71 | 56 | 50 | 48 | 39 | 26 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 624 |
| Small Site Commitments | | | | 27 | 33 | 27 | 22 | 5 | 9 | 26 | 27 | 24 | 18 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 |
| Sites without planning permission at 31/03/09 | | | | 0 | 13 | 32 | 35 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| SUE projected delivery | | | | | | | | 100 | 300 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 350 | 350 | 300 | 300 | 4500 |
| SHLAA Sites | | | | 0 | 201 | 326 | 243 | 143 | 130 | 101 | 98 | 36 | 20 | 25 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 20 | 17 | 5 | 1422 |
| Annual Requirement for District (RSS) | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 7600 |
| Annual Provision | 218 | 329 | 197 | 115 | 362 | 476 | 371 | 320 | 489 | 575 | 564 | 486 | 453 | 446 | 436 | 432 | 372 | 370 | 317 | 305 | 7633 |
| +/- Annual Requirement | -162 | -51 | -183 | -265 | -18 | 96 | -9 | -60 | 109 | 195 | 184 | 106 | 73 | 66 | 56 | 52 | -8 | -10 | -63 | -75 | 33 |
| Cumulative Requirement | 380 | 760 | 1140 | 1520 | 1900 | 2280 | 2660 | 3040 | 3420 | 3800 | 4180 | 4560 | 4940 | 5320 | 5700 | 6080 | 6460 | 6840 | 7220 | 7600 | 7600 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| (net) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Large Site Commitments | | | | 52 | 66 | 55 | 71 | 56 | 50 | 48 | 35 | 22 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 490 |
| Small Site Commitments | | | | 20 | 25 | 18 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Sites without planning permission at 31/03/09 | | | | 0 | 13 | 32 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| SHLAA Sites | | | | 0 | 201 | 326 | 243 | 143 | 130 | 101 | 98 | 36 | 20 | 25 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 20 | 17 | 5 | 1422 |
| Annual Non-PUA Requirements | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 119 | 2367 |
| Annual Provision | 53 | 63 | 112 | 72 | 305 | 431 | 348 | 203 | 180 | 164 | 149 | 75 | 45 | 43 | 33 | 30 | 19 | 20 | 17 | 5 | 2367 |
| +/- Annual Requirement | -65 | -55 | -6 | -46 | 187 | 313 | 230 | 85 | 62 | 46 | 31 | -43 | -73 | -76 | -86 | -89 | -100 | -99 | -102 | -114 | 0 |
| Cumulative Requirement | 118 | 236 | 354 | 472 | 590 | 708 | 826 | 944 | 1062 | 1180 | 1298 | 1416 | 1534 | 1653 | 1772 | 1891 | 2010 | 2129 | 2248 | 2367 | 2367 |
| Cumulative Provision | 53 | 116 | 228 | 300 | 605 | 1036 | 1384 | 1587 | 1767 | 1931 | 2080 | 2155 | 2200 | 2243 | 2276 | 2306 | 2325 | 2345 | 2362 | 2367 | 2367 |
| +/- Cumulative Requirement | -65 | -120 | -126 | -172 | 15 | 328 | 558 | 643 | 705 | 751 | 782 | 739 | 666 | 590 | 504 | 415 | 315 | 216 | 114 | 0 | 0 |

