

## Appendix 1: Summary of scrutiny/member’s comments on Regulation 18 and 19 Local Plans with officer responses and amendments proposed to the Plan.

### Section 1: Record of minutes of Scrutiny Meetings - Reg 18 Local Plan Consultation Sept to Dec 2020 – officer responses and actions/proposed changes to the Local Plan

1 <sup>st</sup> December 2020	Heritage, Culture, Leisure & Tourism
26 <sup>th</sup> November 2020	Neighbourhood Services
12th October 2020	Economic Development, Transport and Tourism
4th Nov 2020	Housing
26th Oct 2020	Adult Social Care & Health and Wellbeing (Joint)
30 Nov 2020	Children, young people, and education
3 Dec 2020	Overview Select

#### 1. Heritage, Culture, Leisure & Tourism – 1<sup>st</sup> December 2020

##### Responses & actions in blue

###### AGREED:

1. That the Local Plan specify essential green and open spaces which are well used by residents for recreation, exercise and sports should be protected and improved, not be considered for new developments.

###### RESPONSE

Policy OSSR02 sets out criteria that will protect, maintain, and enhance open spaces in relation to proposals for new development. Sites that have been allocated for development have been assessed against the provision of open space within each ward and area. The requirement for development to provide Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy NE02) will contribute towards enhancing existing green spaces.

###### ACTION

Amendments to reflect this concern have been made to the policy and text in chapters 14 and 15.

2. That the Local Plan should consider building upwards for new homes and offices etc, rather than outwards, as open spaces are precious and valued.

###### RESPONSE

As part of the evidence base for the new local plan the council commissioned independent consultants to assess the potential capacity within the city centre which would be the most sustainable location for new homes. The capacity study has led to a significant increase in potential development on brownfield sites compared with the last plan.

In response to the representations received during the last consultation the council has increased the required densities on new sites to make more efficient use of land.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policies in Chapter 5 - Housing to increase densities.

3. The local plan should create more 'green-walls' to offset and identify where open space has been lost and consider the heatsink effect created by higher densities.

**RESPONSE**

Biodiversity Net Gain requirements (Policy NE02) means that all development must result in a 10% net gain in biodiversity onsite, with offsite provision only to be considered if BNG cannot be achieved onsite. Various methods of achieving BNG, including green walls, will be considered on their merits in the context of the site in question.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to Chapter 15 – The Natural Environment to address biodiversity net gain.

4. That Planning officers should consider Members comments in progressing work on the Local Plan.

**RESPONSE**

All comments have been considered in preparation of the final version of the plan

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text throughout the plan, where appropriate to address members comments.

5. Existing heritage sites to be protected, and heritage forums in the city to be consulted on the local plan.

**RESPONSE**

Heritage sites will be protected where possible through the policy HE01. Demolition of heritage assets will only be permitted if there is a strong justification.

We undertake a wide range of consultation as part of preparing the local plan including heritage forums in the city.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to Chapter 10 – heritage to address these issues.

6. The Local Plan should reflect the culture, history, and contribution of the diversity of Leicester City.

**RESPONSE**

The plan should be read as a whole, policies in the culture & heritage chapters support this.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to Chapter 10 – heritage strengthen this issue.

7. That there should be a report back to HCLS Scrutiny on sports and leisure facilities being included in the Plan – when finalised.

**RESPONSE**

The infrastructure assessment that underpins the Local Plan looked at costings for new sports and leisure. However, as the council is about to start a review of sports and leisure facilities this is not available at this stage. The council will be producing a developer contributions guidance document (SPD) which will set out the priorities for infrastructure provision linked to growth.

**ACTION**

No changes to plan. This is addressed in the Infrastructure study.

## 2. Neighbourhood Services – 26th Nov 2020

### Responses & actions in blue

**AGREED:**

Members of the Commission recommended that that Head of Planning and Development be requested to:

1. Note the Comments made by Commission Members

Noted

2. That new development accommodates public amenities to meet the needs of a growing population through engagement with local Councillors

**RESPONSE**

The local plan aims to do this, particularly for the strategic sites, where large new communities are being introduced into an area. Detailed master planning is undertaken for each of the sites that considers the needs of the new communities.

The Local Plan is also supported by an Infrastructure Assessment that gives this further consideration.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to Chapter 4 – Strategy for Leicester.

3. That policies protect local areas across the city

**RESPONSE**

Although, the majority of the policies in the plan apply across the whole city they are flexible enough to consider the local area when assessing planning applications. For example:

The Employment Chapter – Although, employment policies address the large employment areas that have a strategic role they also address employment in the smallest employment land designations (textile areas and Neighbourhood employment areas). Although, these

areas do not have particularly good or strategic access they are very important for the local community around them and the city's economy.

The Central Development Area – A lot of analysis has gone into identifying areas with distinctive characteristics and developing different development objectives for each of these areas. This will help to manage and guide future development without losing what makes the area distinct and special.

Housing policies include policies to address specific issues in certain areas such as the retention of family housing, houses in multiple occupation and hostels.

Design and Heritage policies are flexible enough to consider local circumstances when assessing applications.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text throughout the plan. Some examples are given above where policies provide focus on local areas in the city.

4. That green and open spaces are protected to promote well-being and protect wildlife

**RESPONSE**

The Local Plan includes policies aimed at protecting and enhancing good quality green spaces and wildlife species and habitats.

**ACTION**

Policies and text in chapters 14 and 15 address these issues.

5. Include guides on food hubs and their impacts on local areas

**RESPONSE**

This is beyond the scope of what we can require through the Local Plan

**ACTION**

No changes made to the Local Plan

6. And that, all future developments are energy efficient with green energy and green transport.

**RESPONSE**

There are specific policies in the Climate Change chapter on ensuring that all development becomes more energy efficient and also developing a sustainable transport network in the Transport chapter.

To be most effective, climate change policies must be applied alongside policies in other chapters such as housing, transportation, the natural environment, open space, sports and recreation, and health and wellbeing which also seek to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

Government policy restricts local policy adoption. It is anticipated that policies will be assessed and strengthened at the next plan review, to consider progressively increased levels of greenhouse gas reduction, culminating in a net zero emissions requirement as soon as possible in alignment with national regulation.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policies and text in Chapter 6 Climate Change and Flood risk to strengthen this issue as far as possible in the context of Government Guidance.

**3. Economic Development, Transport and Tourism - 20<sup>th</sup> October 2020****Responses and actions in blue**

1. The need for more and better public transport particularly in areas of population growth and an infrastructure that enables and encourages more environmentally friendly transportation.

**RESPONSE**

Due to the fact that the Local Plan is a land use plan rather than a transport plan it has limited control over the provision of public transport. However, the local plan will be supported by an infrastructure assessment which will help set out priorities for infrastructure funding linked to growth. The council is also in the process of preparing a replacement local transport plan which will shape the council's approach to transport priorities in the future.

**ACTION**

No changes to plan.

2. The enhancement of green public spaces particularly in areas of dense housing.

**RESPONSE**

The local plan can safeguard sites and facilities, and contributions towards site enhancements can be secured. The requirement for development to provide Biodiversity Net Gain will help enhance existing green spaces as well as create new ones as part of new developments.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapters 14 and 15 to support this issue.

3. The wisdom of designating scarce NHS land at the General Hospital site for new housing in view of the growing need for health services and beds, resulting from population increase and ageing. Land owned and being promoted by the NHS Trust. Planning does not have control over the scope of release of the land for development. Ongoing discussions with the NHS about this site.

**RESPONSE**

LGH site has been removed from housing allocations, but dialogue to continue on future use.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policies and text in the plan and policies map to remove the Leicester General Hospital allocation from the draft Local Plan.

4. The development of brown field sites including derelict and disused factory buildings for new employment and business opportunities and for other designated purposes.

**RESPONSE**

Independent capacity work has been carried out to look at how we can maximise the use of brownfield within the CDA but at the same time respecting the important historical assets of the city and ensuring that the homes provided are reflective of the city's need.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapters 5 and 9 to address this issue.

5. Enabling development measures designated to create more local jobs, green jobs, and business start-ups.

**RESPONSE**

Policies in the draft plan to facilitate new jobs through provision of new employment land and start-up businesses as well as protecting existing employment in residential areas to support local employment. Policies in the plan, particularly climate change and transport (in addition to objectives set out in the council's climate change action plan) will aim to ensure that jobs are as green.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapters 12, 6 and 16 to address this issue.

6. Ensuring that accessibility is a thread running through all parts of the Local Plan.

**RESPONSE**

Accessibility is a key theme within the plan. The plan in particular promotes the principle of the '15-minute neighbourhood' which will aim to ensure that all major services are available within a 15-minute walk of where you live. The transportation chapter also has policies which promotes accessibility for all.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text throughout the plan to highlight accessibility as a key issue.

7. Protecting family houses in areas where Houses in Multiple Occupation conversions are adversely impacting upon neighbourhood communities and heritage assets.

#### **RESPONSE**

Policy Ho10 prevents concentrations of HMOs from developing and existing HMO concentrations from intensifying. Policy Ho09 prevents family houses within HMO Article 4 Direction areas from being converted to flats.

#### **ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in chapter 5 to address this issue.

8. Controlling the numbers of betting shops, massage parlours and food take-away establishments in neighbourhoods with vulnerable populations and/or levels of saturation.

#### **RESPONSE**

**Betting shops:** Since 2014/ 2015 we have only received one application for a new betting shop. This was in 2021 and was on Granby Street. It involved the relocation of an existing betting shop to a new premises further down the street.

Numbers of physical betting shops are reducing in the city. The issue is going online. Planning policy is about preventing the proliferation of betting shops. If numbers are reducing in the city, it will be difficult to demonstrate that there is a proliferation of betting shops. We would not have the evidence to support a more restrictive policy.

**Massage parlours:** Policy TCR05 seeks to direct Massage parlours to shopping centres (town district and local shopping centres where they would cause less disturbance to residential areas.

**Hot Food Takeaways:** Planning and Public Health have thoroughly explored and debated this issue in preparing the Local Plan. A policy could only apply to applications for new HFTs. Food delivery is radically changing the way people can access takeaways (e.g. uber, Deliveroo). The physical location of the business is less of a factor in accessing high calorific food than in the past. No longer have to leave home to get a takeaway. An overly restrictive policy around secondary schools – would only have a negligible impact on health & wellbeing and could conflict with local centre policies.

#### **ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapter 13 - Town Centre and Retail which considers these issues.

9. That the Director of Planning, Development and Transportation be asked to forward the suggestion of establishing start-up and business development premises to relevant officers for consideration.

#### **RESPONSE**

Policies within employment chapter address this issue – see 5) above.

#### **ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapter 12 – Employment.

**Responses and actions in blue**

1. What percentage of the plan would be social housing as opposed to affordable housing or home ownership?

**RESPONSE**

Social housing will be sought through the affordable housing contribution based on the housing mix evidence. Housing provided on council owned sites may be council developed or managed by social housing landlords. Affordable housing includes social rent and intermediate rent.

**ACTION**

Amendments to clarify this have been made to policy and text in Chapter 5 – Housing.

2. Environmental groups had requested higher housing density in order to create more open space with 100 dwellings per hectare in the Central Development Area and 70 per hectare elsewhere. Additionally, would brownfield sites be developed before greenfield sites and was there any direction on creating housing in such a way as to discourage car use

**RESPONSE**

Local plan suggests minimum densities of 75 dph in CDA and 35 dph elsewhere. This does not preclude schemes coming forward with higher densities subject to adhering to other policies in the plan.

The plan suggests both brownfield and greenfield sites to accommodate growth. However, the aim is that brownfield sites should be developed first subject to viability.

The Transport section in the plan encourages sustainable modes of transport.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to address this issue in policy and text in Chapters 5, 4 and 16.

3. Was Student Accommodation built to the same standards as residential accommodation? It was desirable to avoid having to retrofit such accommodation with features such as insulation if they then required to have their use changed, as it had been suggested that such accommodation could be useful to single people within the city.

**RESPONSE**

All new C3 homes will be expected to meet the Nationally Described Space standards.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to clarify policy in Chapter 5 – Housing.

4. Are there any standards by which we can expect houses to generate some of their own energy?



**RESPONSE**

Policy CCFR01 promotes all development to maximise opportunities to produce and use renewable energy on site, utilising storage technologies.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to Chapter 6 – Climate Change and Flood Risk, which address this issue.

5. The Council was constrained by the local plan and what the Government was insisting on. Constituents had expressed the desire for social housing rather than affordable housing as it was not seen as affordable despite its name. As the population grows more people would be unable to afford their own home and would rely on local authorities to provide housing. It was important to take health into the equation and the need for green spaces was seen as important. It was good that Brownfield sites were being considered before Greenfield sites, but further to this an area needs facilities for health and to help the environment

**RESPONSE**

Please see response to (1).

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapter 5 – Housing.

6. How much land in the plan was owned by Leicester City Council? It has not yet been determined how much of the land would be private housing and how much would be social housing. Would the Council Housing Scrutiny and the Housing Lead have a role in determining this?

**RESPONSE**

Council owned sites allocated in the Local Plan amounts to around 180 Hectares. (This is the total site size, and this does not take account of plot developable ratios and any master-planning or other constraints on the sites).

The Local Plan includes policies to seek the housing mix including affordable housing as suggested in the latest Local Housing Needs Evidence which will be consulted alongside the plan.

Determination of use of land in this regard owned by the council will be a separate consideration to the Local Plan involving relevant Executive and Scrutiny functions.

**ACTION**

No changes to the Local Plan required.

7. It was important not to lose green areas to housing particularly in Beaumont Leys Ward

**RESPONSE**

All sites have been assessed against the provision of open space within each ward and area, this has been taken into account when allocating sites for development.

Open space is expected to be taken into account within new development

**ACTION**

This has been considered through site assessment work.

Policies relating to open space and new development can be found in Chapter 14 – Open Space, Sports and Recreation.

8. Highways had caused problems on new developments as road layouts had not been consulted on properly. Local Ward Councillors knew their areas best, however, if a site was objected to, then an alternative should be put forward.

**RESPONSE**

Whilst the local plan will set some priorities around transportation requirements, road layouts will ultimately be decided via negotiations with the local highway's authority and the site developer. The local plan will require master-planning for all major developments which will help create suitable highways layouts at an early stage and comments will be allowed on this once an allocation gets to planning application stage.

**ACTION**

No changes to the Local Plan required.

9. What was the expectation of replacing old housing with new housing?

**RESPONSE**

The plan policies do not preclude this.

**ACTION**

No changes to the Local Plan.

10. There was a contentious space in Eyres Monsell Ward, and it had been difficult to steer the public towards answering the consultation rather than resorting to petitions and involving the media.

**RESPONSE**

Featherstone Drive Open Space – This has been removed from site allocations.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policies and text to remove this site from the draft Local Plan.

11. It was important for Councillors to engage with constituents as the plan would last for years once adopted.

**RESPONSE**

Noted.

**Responses and actions in blue**

The Chair, in noting all that was discussed in the meeting, summarised the points raised as follows:

1. The Local Plan did not have a lot of specificity in that it was quite broad in that it could give a general direction for a land use but could not address things such as whether some things should be socially rented to cater for older people, and that it was quite hard beyond general residential use to find specificity.

**RESPONSE**

Although, the policies in the plan can seem quite broad they are flexible enough to consider the local area and also specific issues when assessing planning applications.

The Local Plan is also supported by detailed evidence such as on housing mix that has been taken into account when drafting policies. The evidence base will also be used when assessing applications. Policies in the Reg 19 draft of the Local Plan are more detailed than the last Reg 18 consultation version.

**ACTION**

No changes to the Local Plan.

2. In terms of the General Hospital site, further specific information about the provision of health facilities under the Community Facilities heading was needed. There was real concern over the disposal of such a large site at General Hospital, and possible site around Glenfield Hospital (though could not be confirmed at the meeting) that disposal of land based on a plan to 2023 would not be seen through to 2035, and once disposed of it might be able to be bought back but at great cost to the taxpayer.

On top of looking at the feasibility of the site as residential accommodation, evidence that where the county caters for some of the city's needs in terms of housing, that the city will need to cater for the county's needs in terms of health services and particularly acute health services. The Chair pressed the need to see more evidence and ask those who were promoting the disposal of the General Hospital and potentially other University Hospital Leicester sites to other uses to have an answer for where it would stand in 2035.

**RESPONSE**

The Leicester General Hospital site is no longer formally allocated for housing in the Local Plan as the UHL Trust is not in a position to confirm the site availability at this time. This does not mean the site won't be coming forward for development at some point in the future, once UHL's plans are firmed up and the council will work closely with the Trust on their plans in the future.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policies and text in the plan and policies map to remove the General Hospital allocation from the draft Local Plan.

3. In terms of open space standards, it was considered the St Mary's allotment site provided a blueprint of something that could be achieved with the disposal of a site, with a good mix in terms of the use of the space to provide much needed housing, and high-quality provision of green open space and facilities for both the houses and surrounding community and was a good way to bring back in sites. However, it was noted that it was relatively easy to achieve the development as it was within the Council's ownership and would need to look for ways to embed that into the Local Plan and compel the City Council and private developers to achieve developments across the same standard.

#### **RESPONSE**

The local plan policies when read together will support high quality development across the city. The council has selected the sites for development based on availability and robust assessment.

#### **ACTION**

No changes have been made.

4. In terms of internal space standards, the Members noted the encouraging signs from government, in terms of offices being changed to residential without any need for a planning application, that they would achieve minimum space standards, and that those minimum space standards should be adopted.

#### **RESPONSE**

We have a city wide Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) policy for C3 housing in the new local plan.

#### **ACTION**

Note relevant policy and text in Chapter 5 – Housing.

5. The open space standards and the private space standards clearly had a mental and physical health remit.

#### **RESPONSE**

##### Open space Standards

The Local Plan sets open space standards for the city. The importance of green spaces and access to green spaces for physical and mental well-being is recognised in several chapters of the plan including Health & Wellbeing (Chapter 7), Open Space, Sport & Recreation (Chapter 14) and the Natural Environment (Chapter 15).

##### Private Space standards

The Local Plan contains a new policy on Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), which proposals for new dwellings must meet as a minimum.

#### **ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policies and text in chapters 7, 14 and 15 to recognise the

links between these issues.

6. It was noted under use class orders the ability to change one property use into another but was also noted that takeaways would still require permission. The Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission would specifically within its physical health remit be interested in what controls the Local Plan would seek to put particularly over takeaway food outlets.

#### **RESPONSE**

The Local Plan does include a policy on hot food takeaways. It seeks to locate these uses within shopping centres in the first instance and take account of the number, distribution and proximity of other hot food takeaway and drink uses within the centre. This is to maintain a balance of uses in the centre and reduce the impact on the vitality and viability of the centre.

In preparing this Plan, Planning and Public Health have thoroughly explored and debated the possibility of widening the policy to address health issues related to hot food takeaways and the consumption of high calorific food. Through the Local Plan the policy would only apply to applications for new HFTs. Therefore, we could not address any impact from existing hot food takeaways.

In, addition, food delivery is radically changing the way people can access takeaways (e.g. uber, Deliveroo). The physical location of the business is less of a factor in accessing high calorific food than in the past. No longer have to leave home to get a takeaway. A restrictive policy around secondary schools would only have a negligible impact on health & wellbeing.

#### **ACTION**

Minor amendments have been made to the hot food takeaway policy and text in Chapter 13 – Town centre and Retail in help manage hot food takeaways in local centres. The policy does not propose restrictions around schools.

7. It was noted with interest there would be a 10-year plan in terms of the provision of social care that would be shared with the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission at a future meeting. It was asked that as far as practical to ensure that future care home demand is taken into account in the Local Plan, which would interact with the strategy. This was seconded by Councillor Joshi.

#### **RESPONSE**

The infrastructure assessment under pinning the Local Plan has been revised for this consultation. It takes into account future requirements for extra care accommodation as per the council's adopted strategy on this matter.

#### **ACTION**

Amendments made to policy and text in Chapter 5 – Housing (supported living) to include requirements for extra care accommodation.

AGREED:

1. the points summarised above to be provided to officers as consultation feedback from the Joint Adult Social Care / Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission.
2. The 10-year plan in terms of the provision of social care be taken to a future meeting of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission.
3. The Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission to look at what controls the Local Plan would seek to put over takeaway food outlets.

#### 6. Children, Young People and Education – 30<sup>th</sup> Nov 2020

#### Responses & actions in blue

The Commission scrutinised the Draft Local Plan, commenting as follows

1. There was some concern amongst a few Members of the Commission in relation to play spaces/ areas for children which had been identified for housing site developments. It was further expressed that the loss of these play sites impacted the health and wellbeing of children. The Assistant City Mayor for Education and Housing noted that the commission could have a broader umbrella that also looked at places which impact children such as play spaces/ areas rather than just school sites.

#### RESPONSE

The importance of green spaces and access to green spaces for physical and mental well-being is recognised in several chapters of the plan including Health & Wellbeing (Chapter 7), Open Space, Sport & Recreation (Chapter 14) and the Natural Environment (Chapter 15).

Unfortunately, given the constraints of the city and the level of need for new housing it is not possible to avoid development on greenfield sites and play spaces altogether. Sites that have been allocated for development have been assessed against the provision of open space within each ward and area and opportunities for access to alternative spaces.

As part of new development and particularly the strategic sites in the Local Plan provision will be made for appropriate green spaces and play areas. Policies in the Local Plan also allow sites to benefit from planning contributions where appropriate.

#### ACTION

Amendments have been made to policies and text in chapters 7, 14, 15 and 4 which address the need for open space provision and recognise the importance for physical and mental wellbeing.

2. Due to several factors and fluctuation of patterns over time, it would be difficult to know the demand for the number of children going to schools in 20-30 years' time. The Assistant City Mayor for Education and Housing agreed to bring back to the commission details about Pupil Place Planning, which was carried out every 5-10 years and allowed for an estimation of these numbers to be achieved as well as a whole range of factors that would also need to be monitored going forward.

**RESPONSE**

The Infrastructure Assessment considers likely pupil provision. However, it is dependent on the quantum and location of development that comes forward. We will continue to monitor this over time and s106 Supplementary Guidance will be updated following the Plan adoption

**ACTION**

No changes to the Plan.

3. In regard to the Metropolitan Academy, dialogue with Education colleagues would need to take place to see if there was a justification to safeguard/ retain that site or if it could be allocated residential redevelopment. Feedback was being awaited and the site would be kept under review.

**RESPONSE**

Now anticipated for housing use.

**ACTION**

Included in residential capacity calculations.

4. Concerns of replacement oversupply and undersupply of open sites would more be included in the next consultation.

**RESPONSE**

We have considered the oversupply and under supply of open space sites when undertaking thorough assessments of sites for development. For instance, sites that have been allocated for development have been assessed against the provision of open space within each ward and area and opportunities for access to alternative spaces have been considered.

As part of new development and particularly the strategic sites in the Local Plan provision will be made for appropriate new public provision for green spaces and play areas. Policies in the Local Plan also allow sites to benefit from planning contributions where appropriate.

**ACTION**

The over and undersupply of open spaces has been considered in the site assessments. Policy and text in Chapter 14 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation and Chapter 4 – Strategy for Leicester consider the issue of open space provision.

5. It was confirmed that all schools with potential site allocation had received correspondence.

Noted

AGREED:

1. That the presentation be noted.

2. To be updated on the schools playing sites selection process and in addition be informed of the measures that the Council put in place to address the loss of playing fields, playing spaces as well as the monitoring of developer contributions.

3. To return at the next point of public consultation with the local plan in full.

7. Overview Select - 3 Dec 2020

### Responses and actions in blue

#### Summary of main points

1. Councillor Kitterick - concerns about General Hospital & fact that only included details of provision to 2024, in terms of the need to protect all or some of the site for hospital use.

#### RESPONSE

The Leicester General Hospital site is no longer formally allocated for housing in the Local Plan as the UHL Trust is not in a position to confirm the site availability at this time. This does not mean the site won't be coming forward for development at some point in the future, once UHL's plans are firmed up and the council will work closely with the Trust on their plans in the future.

#### ACTION

Amendments have been made to policies and text in the plan and policies map to remove the Leicester General Hospital allocation from the draft Local Plan.

2. Councillor Porter against any development of greenfield sites. The importance of good quality and easily accessible green space for physical and mental wellbeing was emphasised.

#### RESPONSE

The importance of green spaces and access to green spaces for physical and mental wellbeing is recognised in several chapters of the plan including Health & Wellbeing (Chapter 7), Open Space, Sport & Recreation (Chapter 14) and the Natural Environment (Chapter 15).

Unfortunately, given the constraints of the city and the level of need for new housing it is not possible to avoid development on greenfield sites altogether. Thorough assessments have been undertaken to select appropriate sites for development. The provision of new, good quality homes will secure health benefits, including mental health for future residents.

#### ACTION

Amendments have been made to policies and text in chapters, 7, 14, and 15 which the importance of green spaces and recognises the importance for health & wellbeing.

3. Councillor Waddington noted that Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission, raised the need for an examination of brownfield sites to properly assess their suitability for redevelopment, particularly for affordable housing.



## RESPONSE

All sites have been assessed against availability as well as a wide range of criteria to determine their suitability for development before being put forward for allocation in the Local Plan. The CDA capacity has considered the potential from brownfield sites. Local Plan policy Ho05 encourages higher density development in the CDA (minimum of 75 dwellings per hectare).

The provision of affordable housing on development sites will be informed by policy Ho04 when the council receives a planning application. The affordable housing policy has also been informed by the Viability Assessment that supports the Local Plan.

## ACTION

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapter 5 – Housing, which considers these issues.

4. Councillor Cassidy referred to recent debates concerning the need to encourage and support a return to traditional family housing in the city and to reduce the numbers of conversions to houses in multiple occupation.

Policy Ho10 prevents further concentrations of HMOs from developing and existing HMO concentrations from intensifying. Policy Ho09 prevents family houses within HMO Article 4 Direction areas from being converted to flats

## ACTION

Amendments have been proposed to policies and text in Chapter 5 – Housing, which consider these issues.

---

## Section 2: Record of minutes of Scrutiny Meetings - Reg 19, September 2022 -and officer responses and actions/proposed changes to the Local Plan

20 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2022	Heritage Culture Sport & Neighbourhood Joint Scrutiny Committee
21 <sup>st</sup> September 2022	Adults Social Care; Children, Young People and Education and Health & Wellbeing Joint Scrutiny committee
22 <sup>nd</sup> September 2022	Housing & EDTCCE
27 <sup>th</sup> September 2022	Overview Scrutiny Committee

1. Heritage Culture Sport & Neighbourhood Joint Scrutiny Committee – 20<sup>th</sup> September 2022

### Responses and actions in blue

That the Leicester Local Plan report be noted.

1. That in taking decisions on the delivery of the allocations in the Local Plan (once it is confirmed), the executive seeks to maximise the social housing delivery on Council owned sites (wherever possible).

**RESPONSE**

The purpose of the Local Plan is to make sites available for development. Once adopted the Executive would make subsequent decisions on development, delivery and disposal options.

**ACTION**

No changes needed.

2. That in regard to green spaces used for non-housing uses, (such as leisure) the green space impact should be minimised and mitigated and be fully justified.

**RESPONSE**

Policies OSSR01 and OSSR02 set out criteria that will protect, maintain, and enhance the city's green wedges and open spaces in relation to proposals for new development. Sites that have been allocated for development have been assessed against the provision of open space within each ward and area. The requirement for development to provide Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy NE02) will contribute towards enhancing existing green spaces.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to the policy and text in Chapter 14 and 15 that considers this issue.

3. That new development should be designed to deliver a distinctive sense of place and character.

**RESPONSE**

Achieving good quality design and creating places that have a distinctive sense of place and character is a key aim of the Local Plan. Chapters in the Local Plan that give consideration to the quality of design and character of places are chapters 8 (Design Quality), 9 (Central Development Area) and 10 (Heritage).

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to the policy and text in Chapters 8, 9 and 10, which aim to ensure that development achieves good design quality and creates a distinctive sense of place.

4. That the recommendations be passed to the Overview Select Committee on Tuesday, 27<sup>th</sup> September 2022.

**2. Adults Social Care; Children, Young People and Education and Health & Wellbeing Joint Scrutiny committee – 21<sup>st</sup> September 2022**

**Responses in blue**

Members welcomed the report and congratulated officers on this enormous task.

**Question submitted prior to the committee: -**

Melissa March - Cllr for Knighton ward

- keen to understand better the quotas around sheltered housing and how we will meet this, as well as around the anticipated impact on well-being of the loss of open spaces.

The response is incorporated in responses below.

The ensuing discussion included the following comments:

1. The plan was speculative since no-one could predict what the world would be in the future and suggested areas may not be approved for development or the types of housing that would be needed.

**RESPONSE**

The council will seek to encourage any future development that would be in compliance with the new Local Plan policies that have been informed by the latest housing needs evidence which will be consulted alongside the Plan.

In respect of the delivery of affordable housing the Local Plan could not dictate the method of delivery on site, as that would be for the Executive to decide. However, the local plan is the mechanism to establish the principle for development, by allocating potential sites.

There would need to be more discussion around methods of delivery of housing by the Executive and Council and that those decisions would be informed by the plan and supplementary guidance that will follow to develop other s106 contribution levels in the context of viability assessment work.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to relevant policies in the Plan in Chapter 5 (Housing) to take account of the latest housing needs evidence.

2. The longer-term demographic as far as numbers of single occupants, families, children etc would also need to be known when deciding factors such as the types of housing to be built and the number of schools needed.

**RESPONSE**

In relation to the number of schools, planning officers have worked closely with education colleagues to look long term at potential school numbers/places and to consider infrastructure commitments as well as educational provision and that was within the supporting documentation.

**ACTION**

No changes made to the plan.

3. Concern was expressed at the loss of green and open space, and it was queried how that loss was measured in terms of health and wellbeing impacts. It was also commented that the open spaces spread across the city were often in densely built-up areas where people needed green space.

**RESPONSE**

In relation to concerns about cumulative health impacts through loss of open space the local plan process had started by reviewing over 1000 sites. Through various stages of plan preparation and consultation the number of open spaces proposed for allocation has been

substantially reduced. There has been a balanced recognition of what has been retained against the overall loss now proposed.

A health impact assessment had been carried out on the Plan, although that did not provide a quantitative measure, the proposals put forward tried to balance the benefits of design of open spaces with meeting housing need as well as weighing the costs of reducing green space.

Although, the local plan does allow development on open spaces there are mechanisms within the policies to retain and enhance local open space on site or enhance open spaces nearby.

#### **ACTION**

The provision of open space has been considered through supporting evidence and site assessments. The provision and retention of open spaces are considered further in Chapter 14 – Open Space, Sport and Recreation.

4. Further concerns were raised about losing such areas to housing development and it was suggested that where possible the council should look to prioritise the building of more purely social housing on its own sites.

#### **RESPONSE**

Officers noted that the Plan purpose was to make sites available for development, and that the Executive would make subsequent decisions on development, delivery and disposal options.

#### **ACTION**

No changes made to the Local Plan

5. Engaging with young people

#### **RESPONSE**

In respect of engaging with young people and incorporating their “voice” into the plan, during the last consultation officers had sought to engage as widely as possible albeit during the covid pandemic.

A lot of engagement had been facilitated through councillors and by dialogue held in schools, these talks have been very constructive. A number of potential site allocations removed near schools were driven by the arguments put forward by school children which had formed a powerful part of the assessment.

#### **ACTION**

Some potential sites have been removed from the draft Local Plan in recognition of comments received from school children.

6. Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell commented on the importance of supported living arrangements. There was a brief discussion around supported living and the issues involved with the local authority building their own sheltered accommodations due to the way in which government funding worked.

**RESPONSE**

The Local Plan addresses this issue through the housing mix policy which is informed by the latest housing needs evidence which will be consulted alongside the Plan.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to relevant policies in the Local Plan in Chapter 5 (Housing) to recognise support living.

7. Concerns were expressed about the current pressures on health service delivery such as availability of GP services and access to dental practices. Building more houses would increase the pressure on health service and educational inequalities etc. leading to further crisis.

**RESPONSE**

The local plan will cover a 15-year period. It provides a framework for development, which means that those managing programmes of investment can see the areas where growth is planned. This will allow them to align infrastructure provision to serve that growth.

The delivery of health and education is separate from the Local Plan. However, it is covered through the Infrastructure study which defines the investment needed for a range of infrastructure and services over the period. The Infrastructure study has involved conversations with key stakeholders and involved in providing infrastructure to give value to the process.

**ACTION**

This issue is considered in the Infrastructure Assessment.

8. Members discussed the “ownership” of the plan noting that the next 15 years were likely to see more challenges and less funding that may lead to a need to change the plan. It was advised that the government required the local plan to be reviewed every 5 years and delivery against the targets to be monitored, this could be by way of a partial review, and was monitored through an annual assessment of housing delivery. In terms of ownership, once approved the plan was owned by the Council.

**RESPONSE**

Once the local plan is adopted it would have a lot of weight. However, as time goes on the Local Plan becomes more out of date. As this becomes the case, we would weigh up policies in the plan against national planning guidance. In this instance the rules dealing with the national framework would have more weight than an out-of-date local plan.

In respect of the current process, once the next public consultation had been completed the local plan would be submitted to the independent planning inspectorate with the consultation responses for an examination in public (EIP) early next year. The Inspector would examine the local plan, including whether it is viable. If it was found unsound it could effectively go back to start of process. However, if inspectorate to made recommendations for modifications, those would come back to full council to consider and approve.

There is no way to guarantee how much of one provision should be provided over another within the plan. Whilst the plan considers the requirements of a whole range of supported accommodation and demands, the plan would go as far as it could in terms of what standards

could be provided, the directional lead on that would come forward relied on funding programmes and through other policies and executive decisions.

**ACTION**

No changes made to the Local Plan.

9. Members were keen to understand better the quotas around sheltered housing and how the council would meet those. It was also queried whether there was anticipation of additional extra care housing.

**RESPONSE**

As far as meeting the overall plan target, that was set by government assessment and the council had to evidence this as being deliverable and the studies showed that proposing the delivery of all the housing sites by the Council could not deliver all the housing need. In terms of any “wrong” types of housing built, in a crude sense those would still contribute to the target, and national Government planning policy did not allow the council to be so interventional about conversion of existing properties.

**ACTION**

No changes made to the Local Plan

10. Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell explained that the term supported housing was now carefully used to cover all types of different housing need and to keep options open and flexible for those different housing needs which were all supported housing.

**RESPONSE**

Noted and this has been reflected in the Housing Mix policy.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to the Housing Mix policy in Chapter 5 (Housing) to reflect this.

11. There was concern that the housing mix needed would not be reflected and issues raised about existing properties e.g., flats for sole occupants or designated housing for over 65's were sitting vacant and not being repurposed.

**RESPONSE**

The latest housing needs evidence takes into account projected need based on existing need and supply and has been used to inform the housing policies in the Plan.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in Chapter 5 – Housing to consider housing mix.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and drew the discussion to a close and noted the recommendations put forward during discussion which were formally agreed.

AGREED:

1. That the key local plan strategies, policies, site allocations and provisions for consultation be noted.
2. That it be recommended at Full Council that where possible the Council should look to prioritise the building of more purely social housing on Council owned sites.
3. That it be recommended at Full Council that where possible the Council should act to minimise the impact of new developments on existing inequalities (such as health, education and social etc) especially on sites owned by the Council.

### 3. Housing & EDTCCE – 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022

#### Responses in blue

#### Question submitted prior to the committee (from Cllr Kitterick):

1. The documents supplied refer to site allocations but there does not appear to be the policies document, will we be voting on this as well (I assume we will)? The specific policies I would be interested in are as follows but clearly, I would like to peruse the whole policies document.

- a. Space standards, especially the issue with the potential "studio" loophole.

#### RESPONSE

As in the Draft Plan subject to consultation in 2020, it is proposed that the standards will apply to all residential C3 accommodation. We will make the case that they will apply to studio flats.

#### ACTION

Amendments have been made to policy in Chapter 5 Housing to consider this issue. There has been a subsequent period of extended scrutiny of all documents and drop-in sessions offered to all members.

- b. Retention of "whole" houses and resisting sub-division of houses into flatted units where there is a proven demand for whole house accommodation.

#### RESPONSE

New policy drafted seeks to secure this objective within approved Article 4 Direction areas.

#### ACTION

Amendments have been made to policy in Chapter 5 Housing to address this issue.

- c. Purpose built student accommodation.

#### RESPONSE

The same criteria-based policy to that was set out in the Regulation 18 Draft Plan will be recommended.

#### ACTION

No changes made to the Local Plan.

- d. Hostel accommodation.

**RESPONSE**

An adapted policy to the previous Draft version is proposed which seeks to strengthen management controls.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy in Chapter 5 Housing to strengthen management issues in respect of hostel accommodation.

- e. Tall Buildings policy and the "secret" city centre streetscape document.

**RESPONSE**

The Character Area assessments published in full at the previous consultation stage have been refreshed in line with new Government Guidance. New Supplementary Design Guidance will need to be prepared for further detailed consultation after the Local Plan adoption.

**ACTION**

Changes have been made to policies and text in Chapters 8 (Design Quality) and 9 (Central Development Area) to address these issues.

**2. In terms of site allocations can I ask the following:**

- a. Has there been any consideration to a much broader approach to changing planning designations where it is clear the location no longer fits the use? It will be of little surprise that the site I will be discussing is the Freemans Common area which is far more suited towards providing residential accommodation with its easy access to a range of services and thousands of jobs opportunities, than the current use as wholesale distributors to the building, motor and retail trades, car showrooms, religious meeting rooms, sports halls and associated parking.

**RESPONSE**

Allocations can only be made for sites which can be proven as available and deliverable. The estate is fully occupied and does not therefore comply with these requirements.

As well as housing the Plan needs to accommodate employment need. We have only allocated around 30 ha and are reliant on Charnwood accommodating our unmet employment need. Loss of Freeman's common would therefore need to be compensated for either within or beyond the city boundary to meet the evidenced demand.

Across the city we have a very low employment vacancy rate, 4% as opposed to 10% which is generally advised as being needed.

**ACTION**

No changes to be made to the Local Plan.

- B. Some of figures for residential capacity are a bit odd e.g. the "Braunstone Gate" site is down as having a capacity of "8". This also occurs for some other sites where it is clear the capacity is greater. I would also be keen to explore this particular site as moves have been made to put a very tall development on this site.

**RESPONSE**



The capacity formulas have been revised and reviewed especially in respect of the Central Development Area resulting in a substantial increase in plan supply capacity. This considers emerging proposals and planning approvals.

**ACTION**

Changes have been made to the policy and text in the Local Plan by increasing housing numbers for the CDA in Chapter 5 Housing.

**Question submitted prior to the committee (from Cllr Susan Waddington):**

1. Brownfield sites. Do you have a map of the brownfield sites in the city? For example, there is a long stretch of disused factory buildings on Woodgate and the sites of previous factories on Repton Street. Most no doubt in private ownership. No reference to their future use for housing or employment that I can see in the plan. I would like to see a list of brownfield sites in the city and a set of proposals for their use in the local plan.

**RESPONSE**

Details of the sites assessed during the development of the plan, showing brownfield and greenfield status and the associated flood risks have been included in the evidence. This has been circulated to all members, including those sites in the Woodgate area.

**ACTION**

No changes made to the Local Plan

The Chair thanked the Head of Planning and all Officers involved in the process for their detailed work in preparing the Local Plan.

Particular comments from Commission Members, and Members of the Economic Development, Transport and Climate Emergency Scrutiny Commission were noted as follows. It was confirmed that the issues would be considered separately, and Members would be advised of updates accordingly.

1. The previously submitted petition concerning the designation of land on the allocation 309 on Land adjacent to Anstey Lane would be clarified.

**RESPONSE**

The allocation would not specify detailed site and open space layouts. The issue would be explored with the site promoters, and outcomes would be circulated. (Note: extent of site subsequently confirmed to Cllr Bhatia)

**ACTION**

Minor amendments have been made to policy in Chapter 4 Strategy for Leicester to set out the requirement for open space and biodiversity enhancements to be considered through the master planning process.

2. Residents' concerns about the proposed allocation on land at Netherhall Drive were reported.

**RESPONSE**

The Local Plan allocation will identify around half the site for future potential land use. However, it was noted that planning applications for development were not expected in the short term and there would be local engagement on site development and subsequent

applications should the Plan be adopted. It was confirmed residents would be able to register concerns at the upcoming consultation stage should it be approved by Council.

**ACTION**

Changes have made to the site allocations document in respect of this site.

3. Further information concerning the allocation and designation of permanent and temporary traveller's sites was requested.

**RESPONSE**

It was confirmed that the revised Plan took forward the permanent site proposed at Western Park Golf Course as per the previous consultation, together with two options for transit provision which would need to be subject to further consultation post Local Plan adoption.

**ACTION**

Amendments have been made to policy and text in chapters 4, 5 and 12 to set out the requirements for permanent and traveller's sites.

The Chair thanked Members of the Economic Development, Transport and Climate Emergency Scrutiny Commission, together with Councillor Kitterick for their input and participation.

**AGREED:**

That the key local plan strategies, policies, site allocations, and provisions for consultation be noted and supported prior to further consideration at Overview Select Committee and Full Council.

4. Overview Scrutiny Committee – 27<sup>th</sup> September 2022

**Responses and actions in blue**

A summary of discussion and consideration from each of the scrutiny commissions had been published and circulated to the Overview Select Committee prior to the meeting. The extracts had reflected extensive questioning on the plan.

Members were informed the plan needed to be evidence based, and the intention was to make all documents with evidence available to all Members for review over the coming weeks, and to give opportunity for Members to seek clarity from officers.

Councillor Westley reported back from:

The Housing Scrutiny Commission which had been joined by Members of the Economic Development, Transport and Climate Emergency Commission. He added he been pleased that Members had been able to make a series of comments and observations which they hoped the Executive would act upon. He expressed thanks on behalf of all Members to Grant Butterworth and his team, in that they were able to set out what was a complex picture in an understandable way. Points made were:

- For Housing Scrutiny Commission Members, the key factor in the Plan was the need to provide enough development land to meet the social housing needs of the community over the coming decades.
- A more general point made related to the relationship between housing and employment. It was felt those provisions should be near each other to reduce travel time and costs and to curtail air pollution impacts.

- Members were also concerned that space standards for new buildings be clearly set out in the Local Plan.
- Another concern that had been raised was the planning for high-rise buildings. Members were concerned that isolated high-rise blocks were a worse option than high-rise development near existing similar schemes.
- Finally, there was discussion about brownfield sites. It was felt some could be developed, though members were warned that the Environment Agency had stopped the development of several sites because of the risk of flooding. Members had asked for a summary report on brownfield sites across the city and their status in terms of what obstacles there were in developing them.

Councillor Halford reported back from:

The Heritage, Culture, Leisure and Tourism Scrutiny Commission who had been joined by Members of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Commission for joint scrutiny of the Local Plan item.

Some of the points covered were:

- Having a reassurance for space standards for new development housing areas.
- Priority be given to affordable social housing for future housing developments.
- The council to retain and control our open spaces, as much as possible.
- The council to retain a sense of place and sustainability with consideration to be given to the history of land areas and archaeological sites of interest in Leicester, for example the Western Park Golf course site.
- Consideration be given to the needs of the younger generation and the elderly generation within areas of development, with amenities planning for all age groups, for example Rancliffe Crescent.
- Green wedge land area should be retained where possible, for example the land adjacent to Grand Central Railway.

Councillor Halford then thanked Grant Butterworth and his team for preparing an excellent presentation to scrutiny, and for taking on board the views and comments of scrutiny members to feed into the Local Plan, as it was a massive and complex topic for the council and the city.

Councillor Thalukdar, reported back from:

The Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Commission, added that housing was needed in the city, with social housing being particularly important for the next generation of people who were finding it very difficult to buy a house. He also added retainment of green space was important and should not be protected as far as possible.

Councillor Batool (for Councillor Pantling) reported from:

The Adult Social Care, Children, Young People and Education, and Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commissions which had examined the Local Plan proposals at their joint meeting. It was reported the meeting had been well attended by Members across the three commissions. Points raised mainly related to:

- Concern around the loss of green space and the impact it had on health and wellbeing.
- A desire for the Council to build its own social housing.
- The impact of further house building on access to front-line health services, including GPs and dental practices.

- The need for young people, particularly through schools, to be engaged in the process.

The meeting had agreed two specific recommendations: -

1. That where possible, the Council should look to prioritise the building of more purely social housing on Council owned sites; and
2. That where possible, the Council should act to minimise the impact of new developments on existing inequalities (including those relating to health and education) especially on sites owned by the Council.

The request was that Overview Select Committee endorse those comments and recommendation ahead of Full Council consideration.

Note that in relation to questions raised at the above scrutiny commissions, officer responses and any changes subsequently proposed to the plan are shown in Appendix 1, section 2 above.

Members were then given the opportunity to make comments and ask questions and responses were given:

- A Member stated the Local Plan consultation had been ongoing for several years and had gone through another round of scrutiny, and that as part of the process members should have had the opportunity to see those documents which would have addressed some of the issues raised.

#### **RESPONSE**

The detailed plan and supporting evidence would be made available for a period of further review and comment before being brought back to Overview and Scrutiny Committee for final comment

- With Government directives, and the current Levelling Up Bill, the new Prime Minister was reported to have said she did not believe that housing targets works and wanted to abolish them.

#### **RESPONSE**

There had been various changes in legislation and comments made by prospective prime ministers, the Prime Minister, and ministers. The Government had set a target of 300,000 a year and it was believed the Government would set new context on how they would be delivered nationally. It was reported that the latest announcement talked about investment zones as an answer to how houses would be delivered and where local authorities want to see the houses developed. Since the announcement, the indication was the investment zones would not be able to deliver the requirement for the level of housing need evidenced. Officers noted the Levelling Up bill was based upon the White Paper produced over two years ago, and that there was a danger that legislation took a long time to come to fruition, and the Levelling Up bill did not specify a new approach to housing targets so there was likely to be even more delay before the new government had chance to consult to confirm a new mechanism.

- Members believed the radical plans the government had announced on planning could have an impact as well. The paper on the Housing Crisis to be discussed later in the meeting noted

that additional land was needed, with Leicester running short on sites, therefore, it would be a long, up-hill struggle to reach any targets.

#### **RESPONSE**

It was noted that the comments made at all the scrutiny meetings included the need to find deliverable sites for housing to tackle housing crisis. In the Plan the majority of the sites were on brownfield land but there was a need to open up other sites that were the most deliverable.

In the meantime, the biggest imperative was to progress as quickly as possible the duty to cooperate which would be abolished under the Levelling Up bill, which would mean the Council would lose the ability to capitalise on the agreement with the districts, which sought to deliver just over half of the total of housing need

- It was asked if the Local Plan could be obsolete within 18 months, and that sites allocated with a few thousand houses on could be kept as green spaces.

#### **RESPONSE**

It was concluded that the Plan would not be out of date until the government introduced new planning legislation, but even if they decided to amend targets through the Levelling Up Bill it would take several years for secondary legislation to come through to confirm targets, in which time the Plan would be due its five-year refresh.

Officers also stated it was highly unlikely that, with the government recently increasing the target by 35% which led to all of the work with the districts to take half of the housing need from the city, that the government would reduce the housing requirement below the level recommended in the plan.

- A Member was pleased that some of the pressure had been reduced on some of the green field sites within the city, but that shifting the problem of housing building to the other side on the boundary with a large amount of people moving to the surrounding areas of Leicester would still place pressures on existing services such as hospitals, GPs, etc which were already struggling to cope, and that unless there was an approach laid out in the Local Plan on how it would be addressed, it could be disastrous.

#### **RESPONSE**

Officers noted the infrastructure study, a very substantial document which had been published at the last consultation stage and had invited comment on health and a whole range of infrastructure topics to support the delivery of the Plan. This had since been updated and was included in the bundle of evidence which would be published in support of the Plan. The Government, and those in charge of development and partners such as the police would find that infrastructure information very useful.

- A Member stated that the impact of all the development, new housing, and industrial units on the fight against global warming and climate change, with the construction industry being

a major contributor to carbon emissions, which should be addressed in the Local Plan through policy and construction materials and was something the Council should be pushing. As the first environment city in Europe, Leicester should look to have minimal impact on the environment.

**RESPONSE**

With regards to global warming and carbon efficiency, officers responded that the authority was restricted by national government policies on how far the Local Plan could go in terms of setting those standards.

- The Chair asked why the process had taken so long to reach its current stage.

**RESPONSE**

There had been many statutory processes to negotiate and it had been a complicated process which had required careful consideration of sites, with the procedures being changed by Government on a number of occasions throughout the process. It was also worth noting that the authority were significantly some way into the process compared with other authorities.

Officers also responded that the draft plan had been due to go out to consultation just when the first lockdown was announced, following which there had been reconsideration of sites, and reconsideration of capacity work. Officers had also been working with districts on the issue of unmet need and there had been a lot of evidence and work done on where unmet need could be accommodated, which had been a huge piece of work affecting timescales.

**Section 3: Local Plan all member drop-in sessions - Reg 19 Draft Local Plan, October 2022**

11 <sup>th</sup> October 2022 (17.00-19.00pm)	Local Plan drop-in session
13 <sup>th</sup> October (17.00-19.00pm)	Local Plan drop-in session
14 <sup>th</sup> October (10.00-13.00pm)	Local Plan drop-in session

1. Local Plan drop-in session – 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2022 (17.00 – 19.00pm)
<b>Responses and actions in blue</b>
No comments made
2. Local Plan drop-in session – 13 <sup>th</sup> October 2022 (17.00 – 19.00pm)
<b>Responses and actions in blue</b>
No comments made
3. Local Plan drop-in session – 14 <sup>th</sup> October 2022 (17.00 – 19.00pm)

<b>Responses and actions in blue</b>
No comments made

**Section 4: Extra two-week consultation for all members - Reg 19, October 2022**

5 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	Extra two-week consultation for all members
--	---

<b>Extra two-week consultation for Members: 5<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022</b>
Responses and actions in blue
No comments received