

North Kilworth Neighbourhood Plan

Notes from the Public Meeting held on 13th May 2016 at 6.30pm Belgrave Village Hall, North Kilworth

Attendees: Stephen O'Hara (Parish Councillor / Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group)
John Green (Parish Councillor / Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group)
Stephen Bettles (Parish Councillor)
Stephen Sandercock (Parish Councillor)
Peter Jones (Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group)
Katherine Clarke (Parish Clerk)
Gary Kirk (Managing Director, Your Locale)
Stephen Pointer (Strategic Planning and Housing Manager, HDC)
Members of the public

The meeting was chaired by Councillor Stephen O'Hara.

Abbreviations: Harborough District Council (HDC)
Leicestershire City Council (LCC)
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)
Neighbourhood Plan (NP)

1. INTRODUCTION – Councillor Stephen O'Hara

The implementation of a NP for North Kilworth has been in process for two years. The consultation period for the draft plan generated a vast amount of feedback regarding the development sites. North Kilworth has a Parish Plan and the NP is the evolution of this document to meet current guidelines. There is no conflict of interest from the Parish Council, the Parish Council want to implement the NP to safeguard the future of the village. There has to be development in the village, the alternative to the NP is not no development. The NP should dictate how development should evolve. The NP will be valid until 2031, we need to think of the long-term. The Parish Council will try to get options from this meeting to incorporate into a ballot and ultimately feed into the revised draft.

2. YOUR LOCALE – Gary Kirk

Your Locale were appointed two and a half years ago to support the Parish Council in the implementation of a NP. It is pleasing to see so many people attend this meeting, it is a shame that a negative point has given rise to the meeting but the outcome of the meeting should have a positive impact on the final plan.

In its simplest form a NP is the transfer of power from the Local Authority to the Parish. It is an opportunity for planning policies to be shaped specifically to North Kilworth. It is not just housing policy but heritage, environment, employment and transport. The NP when finally made will sit against HDC's Local Plan. The NP has to conform to strategic policies and the existing Core Strategy. The NP cannot propose a target for housing which is less than the requirement stated by the district council. HDC will provide a minimum housing requirement that North Kilworth will have to meet. At present, HDC is reassessing and updating housing requirement numbers, it is understood that the requirement for North Kilworth could range between 17 and 31. It is a good idea to try and future proof by accepting a higher number than required in case housing need increases. North Kilworth is

at a critical point in the development of the NP, to move forward and avoid rejection at referendum, some form of consensus needs to be achieved. The implication of no plan does not mean no development, it means no control over development.

QUESTION: Toby Lenahan (Parishioner) – Planning applications are to still be submitted to HDC, will applications have to comply with HDC planning policy and the conditions of the NP? **RESPONSE: Gary Kirk (Your Locale)** - The plan will not get through the examination process if there are conflicts with HDC planning policy. HDC will consider applications in light of the NP once approved.

QUESTION: Tony Jones (Parishioner) – If planning applications are to be considered in line with the NP, is it appropriate that an application has already been submitted for the South Kilworth Road site? **RESPONSE: Gary Kirk (Your Locale)** – As soon as the NP is submitted to HDC is carries weight. The Parish Council will have the opportunity to comment on the application and will request that a decision is deferred until the NP is completed.

QUESTION: David Sanders (Parishioner) – How safe does a 20% buffer on agreed development make us? **RESPONSE: Gary Kirk (Your Locale)** – Not completely, some parishes have built in reserve sites with specific criteria as a safeguard if housing needs change or there is a failure to build the number in the plan on the proposed site(s).

3. HARBOURGH DISTRICT COUNCIL – Steven Pointer

At present, there are 20 localities undertaking neighbourhood plans in the Harborough District. 3 localities in the district have had their NP adopted. HDC welcome the work done by North Kilworth to date to prepare their NP. The Local Plan is at the stage of rationalising options, in the previous Core Strategy most development was committed to Market Harborough, now other options are being explored for the future. Most people are supportive of a focused approach to development in the district plan settlement hierarchy. North Kilworth is classed as a Selected Rural Village in the Core Strategy. The current planning period is 2011 – 2031. As at September 2015, 32 dwellings are reported as consented or completed in North Kilworth. The rate of future growth is likely to be similar. A new assessment of housing needs is taking place and there is a probability of between 30 – 40 dwellings required. It is important to note, the number is a starting point, things can change, and other parishes have looked at the possible district requirement and increased it.

The purpose of SHLAA is to identify potential development sites. It is a fairly high level assessment to find out if the proposed site is physically capable of undertaking development. It was deemed in the 2015 SHLAA that the site to the south of Station Road was not deliverable due to access issues. The site owner appealed the decision with further information regarding the site, the information submitted to LCC was accepted as sufficient and the site deemed as deliverable. The final SHLAA has not yet been published but has been shared with the NP Steering Group. There are sites that are at this time considered undeliverable. The South Kilworth Road site is viewed as a possible 22 site capacity and the Station Road site as a possible 70-80 site capacity. It is important that these figures are viewed as a starting point for consideration.

QUESTION: Stephen O'Hara (Parish Councillor) –What is the implication of a SHLAA site submitted late in the day? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – The process is dynamic, you can't stop people making submissions. Further sites will be assessed by HDC and made available.

QUESTION: Jean Floodgate (Parishioner) – I do not understand the SHLAA criteria discussed re. the Pincet Road site which was favoured in the original consultation. **RESPONSE: Gary Kirk (Your Locale)** – The land is owned by an elderly gentleman in his nineties. The Parish Council have been advised

that the land is not available. To be included in the NP there must be evidence that the site is deliverable, it has not been presented to HDC as the owner is not willing to sell. The risk is that the examiner would want evidence that the site will be forthcoming.

QUESTION: Peter Morgan (Parishioner) – What period does the assessment of houses already built cover? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – 2011 is the baseline for the plan.

QUESTION: Ian Bartlett (Parishioner) – Could the Selected Rural Village status be lost if there is a large development? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – It could be lost if there were a loss of a facility within the village. The level of development we are looking at will not push it further up the hierarchy. We are looking at moderate growth.

QUESTION: Anne Vincent (Parishioner) – With new development will there not become a stage when the village will need additional facilities? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – Yes, but we are not discussing development at this level.

QUESTION: Fran Ritson (Parishioner) – What are the key factors in a Selected Rural Village status? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – The key factors are provision of a food shop, GP surgery, library, post office, primary school and pub. North Kilworth has 3 out of the 6 key services to support its status as a Selected Rural Village. A Selected Rural Village needs at least 2 of the key services to maintain its status.

QUESTION: Rachel Root (Parishioner) – An excellent RPS report was initiated in 2001 and was incorporated into the Village Plan in 2004. In the NP, how much consideration was given to the RPS report? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – Recent changes mean these reports are now superseded, it was commissioned a long time before the SHLAA system was introduced.

QUESTION: Stephen O'Hara (Parish Councillor) – If 30 – 40 is the estimate for housing requirement, how would you factor up for the next 5-10 years? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – Infill / windfall sites can be taken into account. You would need to work with HDC and look at the history of the village, you can add an allowance but it must be based on what is likely to happen. Make it a conservative estimate, by definition they are windfall / bonus.

QUESTION: Dylan Mathieson (Parishioner) – There have been cuts to local bus services. Is public transport counted in Selected Rural Village analysis? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – The problem is that so many bus routes are subsidised, the effect of any factor change risk is too great to calculate.

QUESTION: Sue Dunford (Parishioner) – The Evergreen Field Farm site has had a number of retrospective planning applications approved, could this happen with housing developments? **RESPONSE: Steven Pointer (HDC)** – This has happened in limited amounts, one-off applications, not larger developments.

4. POSSIBLE SITES – Councillor Stephen O'Hara:

The sites currently being discussed are South Kilworth Road and Station Road. A further option is to decide on no site at all. It is not mandatory to allocate sites, planning criteria could be set but no site named. This sets a benchmark for development but doesn't designate sites, ultimately pushing the responsibility to HDC and market forces.

COMMENT: Mick Vincent (Parishioner) – Standing as representative of local group. NP states sticking with small scale developments then this suddenly changed to two fields (*referring to Station Road site*). Original voting status was irrelevant and made the vote pointless. Station Road is not suitable

for an entrance to a development. If Station Road site goes ahead it will keep developing / evolving. If the village is not careful housing development will continue to grow.

COMMENT: Gill Malkin (Parishioner) – Isn't it clear that the development would have to be split across the proposed sites.

COMMENT: Paul Johnson (Francis Jackson) – LCC approved the report deeming Station Road suitable for a site entrance.

COMMENT: Gaye Duncombe (Parishioner) – Concerns regarding traffic speeds of up to 100mph reported on Station Road.

COMMENT: Chris Knight (Parishioner) – The marina development will bring traffic calming measures.

COMMENT: Ian Duncombe (Parishioner) – Tried to implement speed controls around marina but HDC has stated that it does not want to slow traffic.

COMMENT: Rosemary Gandy (Parishioner) – On the former Gandy site there are six housing association houses and a number of large, private developments. The village needs to ensure smaller housing is developed. Everything needs to be in place to ensure HDC do not get out of what they agree.

COMMENT: Gary Kirk (Your Locale) – The need for a mix of housing is recognised, the NP can influence what is provided.

COMMENT: Norman Byrd (Parishioner) – The village should embrace the opportunity for decisions rather than oppose it. This is a big opportunity to express need for a pedestrian crossing etc. The Station Road site is not a satellite site. Is there any scope for future development on the allotment site?

COMMENT: Colin Haynes (Parishioner) – The Station Road site would be a satellite site, the South Kilworth Road site would be central.

QUESTION: David Sanders (Parishioner) – We don't have to specify sites but we can influence style of housing etc. We are used to having small, bijou developments in North Kilworth, could we just use infill sites to meet the allocation? **RESPONSE: Gary Kirk (Your Locale)** - The key is if the site is deliverable. From HDC's perspective it is simpler to assess deliverability if it is one site. If you spread development across multiple sites the examiner would want to see evidence that all the sites are deliverable.

QUESTION: Ian Bartlett (Parishioner) – Need to be really clear and careful about numbers. Need to work together and not play into HDC's hands by giving them a higher number than we are required to. **RESPONSE: Gary Kirk (Your Locale)** – Until the Local Plan is finalised we will not know the final number. Everything approved up to 31st March 2015 is already accounted for in the number. Any development after this date will be deducted from the target.

COMMENT: Stephen Sandercock (Parish Councillor) – The two main sites are at opposite ends of the village, both sites could grow and grow. It seems ludicrous land is idle when development can take place. Until we get something in place the goalposts can be moved.

COMMENT: Graham Sidorowicz (Parishioner) – As the village grows facilities need to add value in line with needs. How do we negotiate with the developers?

COMMENT: Rosemary Gandy (Parishioner) – Station Road access is ok, there is one private residence that is going to access from this point.

COMMENT: John Poole (Parishioner) – Main concern is access on the main road. A roundabout would cause more problems. A development of 80 houses would eventually need a by-pass.

5. CONCLUSION – Councillor Stephen O’Hara:

CURRENT HOUSING REQUIREMENT: 17 – 31

COULD BE REVISED TO: 30 – 40

Need buffer on top of these numbers to future proof the NP.

The proposed ballot will need to decide if development is to be proposed at:

1. South Kilworth Road site
2. Station Road site
3. Shared between the two sites
4. No site is designated in the NP

Details of the ballot and the voting options will be released as soon as possible.

Councillor O’Hara thanked Gary Kirk and Stephen Pointer for their time and thanked all present for attending and their contributions to the meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.00pm.