

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
1	Bob Wollard P&DG)	It is important that the document refers back to the CIL regulations set out at para 2.2. Notably, a number of infrastructure providers are funded, at least in part, via local and central government, via public taxation based on local population figures. As such, the SPD needs to be clear that developer contributions will reflect additional, or gap funding needs arising directly from the impacts of the proposed development and are not intended to provide general funding, or unrelated off-site infrastructure. The S106 regime cannot be used as a de facto CIL scheme.	Add to para 2.2 that “developer contributions will reflect additional, or gap funding needs arising directly from the impacts of the proposed development and are not intended to provide general funding, or unrelated off-site infrastructure.”
1	Bob Wollard P&DG)	Para 4.4.9 of the Draft SPD refers to LCC’s Planning Obligations Policy (July 2019). At the recent Charnwood Local Plan Examination, the County Council alluded to the possibility of a County Obligations SPD for transport and education and the emerging SPD must be mindful to ensure that these documents will align and not conflict with each other. To that end the consultation response of the County Council to the current consultation will be salient.	In para 4.4.9 add reference to LCC SPD. Link to LCC SPD in a footnote.
2	Glenfield Parish Council	No substantive comments made	No changes required.
3	Natural England	The topic of the SPD does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment	No changes required.
4	NHS Property Services	As drafted, sections 4.4.18 to 4.4.20 sets out the way in which the Council will work to ensure healthcare needs are being met through securing financial contributions for necessary healthcare infrastructure. NHSPS welcomes that health infrastructure has been identified where an expectation has been set for development proposals to make provision to meet the cost of healthcare infrastructure made necessary by the development. However, we suggest that the Council continue to work closely with the ICB to more clearly out the process and methodology that will be followed in determining the contributions required towards healthcare infrastructure provision.	No change required. Blaby District Council will continue to work closely with the ICB.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
4	NHS Property Services	NHSPS recognises that the SPD has provided a specific section in the document which sets out a process to determine the appropriate form of developer contributions to health infrastructure. However, as seen in sections 4.2 to 4.2.10 and 4.3.1 to 4.3.49, further detailed guidance on infrastructure requirements, calculations and thresholds has been provided for Affordable Housing and Open Space respectively. In remaining consistent with this and to place health on a level footing with other necessary infrastructure, NHSPS recommends that the Council work further with the ICB to ensure the assessment of existing healthcare infrastructure is robust, and that mitigation options secured align with NHS requirements.	Add "will work closely with the ICB" to para 4.4.18.
4	NHS Property Services	<p>The SPD should emphasise that the NHS and its partners will need to work with the Council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures. NHSPS recommends that the Council continue to engage with the relevant Integrated Care Board (ICB) to add further detail and clarity within the SPD regarding the process for determining the appropriate form of contribution towards the provision of healthcare infrastructure where this is justified. As a starting point, we suggest the following process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess the level and type of demand generated by the proposal.</li> <li>• Work with the ICB to understand the capacity of existing healthcare infrastructure and the likely impact of the proposals on healthcare infrastructure capacity in the locality.</li> <li>• Identify appropriate options to increase capacity to accommodate the additional service requirements and the associated capital costs of delivery.</li> <li>• Identify the appropriate form of developer contributions.</li> </ul>	Update para 4.4.20 to include the proposed process. Update para 4.4.20 to state that "the NHS and its partners will need to work with the Council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures."

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		Healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development. Where new development creates a demand for health services that cannot be supported by incremental extension or internal modification of existing facilities, this means the provision of new purpose-built healthcare infrastructure will be required to provide sustainable health services. Options should enable financial contributions, new-on-site healthcare infrastructure, free land/infrastructure/property, or a combination of these. It should be emphasised that the NHS and its partners will need to work with the Council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures.	
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	1.3 refers to the County Council's up to date Planning Obligations Policy but it does not provide a link to any document so it is not clear what this refers to. The County Council's formal Planning Obligations Policy document appears to be the one produced in July 2019. <a href="https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2019/8/16/Planning-Obligations-Policy.pdf">https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2019/8/16/Planning-Obligations-Policy.pdf</a>	The lack of a link is because LCCs planning obligation policy is being updated. a link to the final updated document will be incorporated into the final document as a footnote is appropriate.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	The County Council has responsibility for education and highways. These are typically the areas seeking the largest contributions and their consideration rightly deserves to be a major factor during the preparation of a Local Plan and the determination of appropriate Planning Obligations at the application stage	Comment noted, no change required.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	NPPF states that transport needs to be considered at the earliest stages of Plan development and it places considerable emphasis on seeking to ensure sustainable travel by locating development in places that can achieve a genuine choice of travel. One consequence of this is that a significant proportion of new development has been allocated to locations with few facilities and where it is likely that many would be highly dependent on the use of cars and generate significant traffic.	No change required. A new local plan will consider new allocations. The SPD is not a policy document and cannot change the detail of the Policy approach outline in the Local Plan. However, the comments are noted and significant transport evidence including the preparation of an active travel strategy and

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		<p>Where transport funding has been sought from developments it has usually been directed at a few measures to marginally increase local highway capacity. Despite the predictions of a very significant increase in vehicle delay there is no sign of any change in policy leading to a consideration of the obvious need to actually reduce traffic. Developments have been primarily designed around car use and parking. Most fail to prioritise safe and convenient walking or cycling within a site or include any off-site links. The scope for attractive bus services to new sites in Blaby is limited but where opportunities exist little regard seems to have been given to maximising their use and viability.</p> <p>When the Charnwood Local Plan Examination started in 2022 the County Council recognised that numerous problems were emerging with regard to securing appropriate and timely developer contributions. There was a growing awareness that projects had been undervalued and an a recognition that inflation was going to significantly increase the cost of projects. During 2023 the County Council proposed and adopted an Interim Transport Contributions Strategy as it was concerned that it was missing the opportunity to obtain sufficient funding for highway projects relating to new developments. It continues to believe that projects that increase highway capacity are desirable despite the clear evidence that it is not a solution.</p>	LCWIP will inform new allocations and the emerging local plan.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	1.5 gives a misleading impression that if a need has been identified for services, mitigation or infrastructure that planning obligations are one mechanism for ensuring that they can be achieved. This unfortunately is not the case.	Add that "other mechanisms include government grant infrastructure e.g. bridge at Lubbethorpe. "
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	1.6 notes that they can assist, which supports the view that there is no guarantee.	Noted, but effects cannot always be fully mitigated.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	1.9 Many developments do not make any contribution to facilities and historically funding has fallen far short in terms of delivering what many people would consider to be adequate	Amend para 1.9 to include:- 'The Council has previously explored adopting CIL but at the time of writing....'

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		facilities. It seems unlikely that sufficient and fair funding could be achieved without an adopted CIL charging schedule to ensure appropriate contributions can be sought from all relevant developments. The draft SPD consultation does not say why the Council has not adopted a CIL charging schedule or provide any information to show why it is not being considered.	And 'in line with the currently adopted Core Strategy Feb 2013.'
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	<p>Planning policy is spread across numerous authorities. It often is written in complex and ambiguous language and in a way that gives rise to conflicts and a need for trade-offs. Such trade-offs may determine priorities when seeking funding.</p> <p>National policy (NPPF) states that where up-to-date policies have set out expected contributions then planning applications which comply with them should be assumed to be viable. This is a sweeping assumption that is not borne out in practice and it has significant implications. Section 3 describes the "Approach to securing planning obligations". This in turn refers to Appendix D of the Blaby District Local Plan Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was approved in February 2013. The Infrastructure Schedule listed in Appendix D includes various items which it can now be seen have been superseded by events or have shown a wide variation in terms of cost, anticipated delivery date or funding source. What emerges is the difficulty of estimating the scale, cost and delivery of many essential services and ensuring that they can be delivered at the appropriate time. Historically, no provision has been made for cost increases.</p>	Comments noted. No change required as set out under 3.14 Indexation of SPD and new IDP to be adopted for new Local Plan.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	<p>Question 3. Do you agree with our proposed approach to addressing the subdivision of sites?</p> <p>It fails to recognise that the sub-division of sites could lead to a significant difference in delivery time for different sections. This is one reason why subdivision could create significant</p>	Noted.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		difficulties with regard to the timing and delivery of facilities and infrastructure.	
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	Question 4. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed approach to addressing viability? 3.8 suggests that one of the key objectives of the SPD is to indicate the likely level of planning obligations that can be expected in advance of any planning application being submitted. While this would be highly desirable it seems unlikely in practice and as set out above previous attempts have not been successful either in terms of identifying what is necessary or ensuring that it can be delivered in a timely fashion, or at all. Viability challenges may occur at any time and further threaten the deliverability of facilities and infrastructure. Such challenges can often arise at a late stage with claims that previous promises can not be delivered.	Noted.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	Question 5. Do you have any comments regarding our approach to phasing and to holding contributions? Further thought needs to be given to how this would work in practice.	Noted.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	Question 6. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed fees for legal agreements It is becoming evident that legal agreements are not sufficiently robust to ensure that facilities and infrastructure are delivered at the appropriate time or that there is adequate funding. It may be that previous proposals need to be changed. This needs to be taken into account when setting the fee level.	Amendment to Fees paragraph 3.15. Include '....and Deed of Variations' as Deed of Variations can be sought and agreed when a change in obligation may be required. Legal Fees also apply to Deed of Variations.
5	CPRE Leicestershire (John Marriott)	Question 7. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed approach to monitoring fees and the fee level proposed? Monitoring fees should be sufficient to ensure that monitoring is effective and is seen to be effective. It is far from clear as to what targets are being monitored and whether any monitoring is effective.	Comment noted. No Change Required  Monitoring fees maybe a flat fee and/or proportionate to the level of financial contributions secured in a legal agreement. Monitoring is carried out to ensure all obligations secured in a Legal Agreement are delivered in accordance with the related legal

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		<p>The Blaby AMR covers a very limited range of indicators, and none refer to the impact of traffic or the effectiveness of any measures to reduce that impact. It is noted that the County Council often seeks fee for monitoring Travel Plans. Indicators are often mentioned in Traffic Impact Assessments but these are often weak or not capable of being measured effectively. With regard to the Lubbesthorpe development Condition 49 stated that</p> <p>“No more than 350 dwellings shall be occupied before a scheme for the regular monitoring of the impact of traffic arising from the development, in accordance with the terms of the Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which forms part of this permission, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority.” Table 3 in the AMR shows that the 350 dwellings threshold was reached during 2019/20. There is no visibility of any official reports to confirm what monitoring has been carried out or whether it has been verified. While some statements have been published in the press regarding an increase in bus use these seem to lack credibility because they appear to be very excessive in relationship to census data. It is not constructive to make extravagant claims about reducing car use when the Lubbesthorpe traffic modelling showed a 25% increase in vehicle travel (2008 to 2031) and a 110% increase in vehicle delay.</p>	<p>agreement. The District Council's Infrastructure Funding Statements ensure a transparent and accountable system by providing information on secured, received and spent financial contributions, these are published on the Council's website annually.</p> <p>As service providers of highways, travel etc Leicestershire County Council are parties to the agreement, so any query relating to their secured obligations and monitoring should be directed to them as Blaby District Council are not the monitoring authority for these and as such do not hold information relating to their obligations.</p>
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	<p>General Observations</p> <p>It is noted that a lot of larger strategic items for which contributions might be sought (ie Education, Transportation, Social Care) are addressed as County matters in the Leicestershire County Council's 'Planning Obligations Policy'. It is important that in assessing the viability considerations of the Blaby SPD, full regard is had to the implications of both sets of Obligation policies together, to understand the implications of</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added to highlight that this SPD does not change policy requirements and these remain unaltered.</p> <p>Reference to LCC Infrastructure requirements, footnote if necessary.</p>

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		policy on development viability. It is not clear that any form of assessment has been undertaken to understand the 'affordability' of the contributions sought, upon different types of development within the Borough, when combined with the additional requests for larger strategic contributions toward Education, Highways etc.	
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	3.13 – The acknowledgement that there needs to be provision for 'claw back' of unspent contributions is welcomed and supported.	Comment noted. No change required.
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	<p>3.21 – The monitoring fee at 5% of financial contributions, has the potential to be very significant, and this is objected to. Post publication, officers have helpfully clarified that there is text missing from this paragraph, which should read; 'for developments over 500 dwellings, a negotiated monitoring cost fee may be more appropriate to reflect the costs and time associated with the monitoring.' This clarification is welcomed and supported.</p> <p>For sites such as those promoted by the consortium, developer contributions toward infrastructure costs are likely to be very significant, and any monitoring fee should only be required to fairly reflect the costs necessary to monitor spending/delivery, in compliance with CIL Reg 122. In all cases, the policy should provide for there to be an 'election' by the applicant as to whether the applicant is content to settle with the 5% figure, or</p>	<p>Add the missing text "dwellings, a negotiated monitoring cost fee may be more appropriate to reflect the costs and time associated with the monitoring".</p> <p>Noted. But it is unlikely that very large sites will be submitted to be influenced by this guidance as its expected to be superseded by the requirements in the merging plan. Nonetheless additional text has been added at para 3.23 to address comments.</p>



	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		seek to negotiate a bespoke figure, directly and fairly related to the costs involved of monitoring any specific obligation.	
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.2.2 and 4.2.3 – this sets out the Council's preferred mix for Affordable Housing from the Affordable Housing 2013 SPD. It goes on to note the Government's policy on First Homes. The two approaches are not compatible with each other, but the SPD does not explain how it will look to secure a preferred mix. This requires clarity, and further amendment. The consortium reserves the right to comment further, when clarity has been provided regarding how the council will approach the Affordable Housing 2013 SPD, regarding its compatibility with First Homes policy.	The lack of conformity of the Council's existing SPD with First Homes requirement is noted in the SPD. The Council will consider the need to update the Housing SPD having regard the current LURA provisions and the time limited nature of any new SPD document now adopted.
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.2.4 – This suggests that maximum cluster size for Affordable Housing should be no more than 6 homes. This would be a low figure. Registered Providers typically welcome the ability for larger clusters to be provided, to assist in both estate and cost management. There is no evidence provided as to whether this figure is supported by local Registered Providers. It might more helpfully be framed as an 'average' figure, to allow some flexibility across larger sites.	This figure is in line with what the Council currently seeks and is implemented with some flexibility. It will be considered in any potential future update to the Housing SPD as described above.
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.3.1 – The Table should sit below, not above this paragraph.	Move table showing Policy CS15 to below para 4.3.1. .
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire	The Table indicates that there should be 1 Village/Community Hall per 2,200 people – which would potentially give rise to a need for 5.5 Village Halls for the consortium's site at Stoney Stanton. This would appear to be excessive at a strategic level. It is also unclear the evidential basis upon which the demand ratio is based. At the very least the policy should acknowledge	The "table" is existing adopted Policy CS15. Proposed future strategic allocations would be covered by policies in the new Local Plan.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Change required (Note change)</b>
	County Council	that larger strategic sites (say in excess of 500 homes) would need to address this matter on a bespoke basis, having regard to the NPPF's imperative for community cohesion, and following sound urban design principles.	
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	Section 4.4 of the SPD appears to acknowledge that there is no evidence base with regard to community Halls, but there also appears to be text missing at 4.4.6 which makes a full understanding of this part of the SPD problematic. The Blaby District Council Open Space Audit - December 2015 confirms that the whole District is within 10 minutes accessibility of a Village/Community Hall, and whilst some Halls (such as that at Stoney Stanton) are noted for requiring qualitative improvement, it is unclear on what basis the quantitative increase in provision, is promoted.	Noted.
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.3.8 – It is noted that the Council prefer the use of ManCo's for POS – but would countenance adoption on larger sites, subject to a maintenance payment. This flexibility is welcomed.	Noted.
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.3.25 – Tables 10 and 11 relate respectively to Appendices A and B of the SPD. Whilst the principle of using Spons or similar to calculate the contributions for off-site open space is accepted, it is not clear how the figures from the calculations in Appendices A and B then relate to the figures in Tables 10 and 11. There is also a query with regard to how the maintenance costs in Table 10 are calculated. Greater clarity on the evidential basis is required for these elements.	The Council has amended the approach to identify a negotiated approach based on local need. This reflects the fact that offsite provision is only delivered exceptionally, and it would be more appropriate for a bespoke approach reflecting the provision proposed on relevant sites, the typology of space and most up to date costs at the time of the application. Note it is not expected this guidance will apply to sites post adoption of the new local plan given the Governments proposals to scrap SPD as set out in the LURA.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Change required (Note change)</b>
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.3.43 – The Cemetery requirement and accessibility provision here is unclear. It requires space and accessibility to cemeteries – but then clarifies that this is not for burial, but for use as POS. Whilst the policy flows from updated Core Strategy Policy CS 15 , the evidence base behind that (Blaby District Council Open Space Audit - December 2015) confirms that it is simply seeking to maintain the current ratio of provision of population to provision. However, it further acknowledges that there is ‘limited evidence of any unmet demand for cemeteries and churchyards in the district at present’. If there is no current shortfall evidenced, it is unclear why it is then deemed appropriate to set a standard ‘equivalent to current levels of provision’, as that would result in maintaining an oversupply of cemetery land, and that would not be a CIL Reg 122 compliant request.	This standard is based on the adopted policy and forms part of the Council’s general open space requirements which remains the basis for decision making. No change required.
6	Pegasus obo Barwood Land, Parker Strategic Land and Leicestershire County Council	4.3.46 – It is noted that sports pitch provision requirements are to be deferred for review through the Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy. It will be important for the Playing Pitch Strategy to also be subject to consultation, if it is to be relied upon for supporting future requests for infrastructure provision	Noted
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	We do not wish to comment on any part of the introduction	Noted
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Of note, we are aware that the District Council are currently updating their Development Plan with Regulation 19 consultation on the emerging Local Plan occurring later this year and the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State before June 2025 and adoption expected in 2026. It should be noted that any guidance outlined within this SPD will need to be updated (and consulted on again) to ensure it	An additional paragraph is added at 1.5 to make clear that the SPD will be superseded by the adoption of a new local plan and the primary legislation makes no provision for the preparation of SPDs. These will be replaced by Supplementary Plans but these will not be an appropriate mechanism for capturing planning obligations except over specific sites.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		relates to the relevant policy in the new Local Plan and to ensure weight can be attached to the guidance in the SPD.	
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Paragraphs 3.17 to 3.21 inclusive sets out the approach to monitoring and enforcement of S106 Agreements. Paragraph 3.21 outlines that “the District Council 5% of the value of each type of financial contribution, or £360 (see website for updates) per non-financial contribution, whichever is greater, payable to the District Council.” The suggested monitoring costs include an increase from 2% and £250 (flat rate) as outlined in the existing Planning and Obligations SPD (2010). No understanding of the actual costs of monitoring are contained in the consultation document and therefore it is not known whether the suggested monitoring fees are proportionate. Notwithstanding this, the request for 5% of the value of each type of financial contribution could become disproportionate. In this respect, further justification is required to ensure the monitoring fee is proportionate and a cap should be considered to ensure any fees are not excessive, in accordance with the NPPG.	<p>Comment Noted. No change required as paragraph 3.20 justifies 5% monitoring Fee.</p> <p>The proposed 5% fee is a proportion of secured financial contributions and therefore proportionate. Current CIL regulations allow a CIL charging authority to apply 5% of receipts to administrative expenses, this figure reflects regulations.</p> <p>Para 3.21 was incomplete and suggests a monitoring fee will be negotiated for large scale developments. This could be a mechanism to ensure fees are not excessive.</p>
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Also to note, paragraph 3.21 contains an unfinished sentence that may provide further detail on the approach to monitoring fees for proposals over 500 dwellings. This should be clarified to ensure that the monitoring fee applicable to proposals over 500 dwellings is made publicly available through this SPD.	Add the missing text “dwellings, a negotiated monitoring cost fee may be more appropriate to reflect the costs and time associated with the monitoring”.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	First Homes are the government's preferred discounted market tenure and should account for at least 25% of all affordable housing units delivered by developers through planning obligations. Paragraph 4.2.3 of the SPD recognises this, however, provides no guidance on the Council's position on First Homes and how this will be secured via S106 planning obligations. This lack of guidance on First Homes will provide uncertainty and may hold up negotiations therefore delaying decisions. It is therefore considered that the Council needs to provide more guidance and evidence in respect to First Homes in Blaby District, particularly if the authority is seeking to apply its own eligibility criteria.	The lack of conformity of the Council's existing SPD with First Homes requirement is noted in the SPD. The Council will consider the need to update the Housing SPD having regard to the current LURA provisions and the time limited nature of any new SPD document now adopted.
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	The open space, accessibility and children and young people requirements outlined in Tables 1 – 9 are generally accepted. However, concern is raised with the off-site open space contributions per square metre outlined in Table 10 and detailed in Appendix A, particularly with respect to the costings relating to Parks and Recreation Grounds and Informal Open Space. The comments below should be considered in the context of the Government's guidance on viability particularly in respect of the need to improve transparency of data to ensure there is more accountability regarding how viability informs decision making (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 10-010-20180724). Although it is noted that the Spon's Architects' and Builders' Price Book 2023 has been used for the calculations, costs and commuted sums should be based on evidence which is reflective of local market conditions and therefore further evidence may be required to justify the costs.	The document has been amended to set out a more bespoke negotiated approach to establishing off site contributions given the rarity at which off site provision is sought. This will allow offsite contributions, where sought to reflect local needs and circumstance.
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Park and Recreation Grounds. The cost associated with the amenity shrub planting seems particularly high with usual costs normally around £30/m <sup>2</sup> rather than suggested £102/m <sup>2</sup> . Informal Open Space. Paragraph 4.3.18 of the SPD provides a definition of informal open space, which infers that there is less clutter so that they are easily maintained. Notwithstanding this,	See above

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		there is a significant amount of costs contributing to design fees and the boundary treatments (walls and fencing railings) although there is no detailed breakdown of these elements relating to length or type/material or cost per m <sup>2</sup> .	
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	It is also assumed that the calculations are based on an example area of 20,000m <sup>2</sup> and not 2,000m <sup>2</sup> as outlined	See Above
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Section 4.3.38 of the SPD sets out the key aspects of BNG under new statutory legislation. In this section, there is also reference to limitations on land utilised as part of BNG to also function and contribute toward open space requirements. In particular, it states <i>"In general, land that is to be used for open space should not be the same land that is set aside for BNG."</i> We disagree with this statement. Open space and BNG can work in tandem and all of the most common green infrastructure features are captured within the metric and can contribute towards a BNG outcome. It is acknowledged that the suitability of the proposed type and location of the BNG enhancement will need to be considered in line with Paragraph: 021 (Reference ID: 74-021-20240214) of the NPPG. However, in the most part, BNG will also create more attractive natural and semi natural open spaces and also amenity spaces around recreational area will contribute to BNG, which will not conflict with the delivery of the open space typology. The Council should therefore remove this statement or it will cause significant viability issues with bringing forward residential developments.	The document has been amended to reflect the comments received and it is clarified that open space can also go towards meeting BNG requirements.
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Section 4.3.39 of the SPD sets out a proposed approach to BNG that is predominantly aligned with the BNG Hierarchy as referenced in the NPPG and set out in Articles 37A and 37D of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. However, the DMPO does not set out a requirement for creation of habitats 'immediately adjoining the site or nearby' as suggested in the SPD. Rather,	This SPD does not set out Council policy and the NPPG will remain the guidance used for determining applications in the absence of local policies which will be brought forward in the new local plan.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		the hierarchy sets out that if habitat cannot be enhanced nor created onsite, that the next step of the hierarchy should be to consider 'the availability of registered offsite biodiversity gain for allocation to the development'. This does not stipulate that biodiversity gain offsite should be immediately adjoining, and therefore the phrasing of the SPD is not in compliance with Article 37A. To avoid the creation of a prescriptive approach to the Hierarchy within the SPD, the phrasing of Section 4.3.39 should be amended to be in accordance with the DMPO	But the Council can express its preferences regarding delivery of sites so the communities affected by development can be those that benefit from the biodiversity gains. Obviously, these preferences are only advisory and may be pursued by some developers in some instances on a voluntary basis.
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	The NPPG further reiterates that a degree of flexibility can be afforded to the Hierarchy - stating that the BNG Plan submitted must set out a description of how the BNG Hierarchy is followed, and provide reasons if this is <i>not</i> followed, provided the site in reference does not contain Irreplaceable Habitats (Paragraph: 058 Reference ID: 74-058-20240214). This is echoed in Paragraph: 035 Reference ID: 74-035-20240214. This again notes that the Hierarchy should not be treated as a fixed process to apply to BNG, and can be treated with some flexibility as required. This could be particularly helpful if there is a more strategic benefit to contribute to off-site habitat, which would form part of Leicestershire's Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).	This is noted. It is considered that the wording of the SPD, which is not policy is flexible and will not affect how the Council applies BNG is practice which will be guided by the NPPG.
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Part 6 Section 102 (5) (2A) of the Environment Act (2021) sets out that "...the authority must in particular have regard to (a) any relevant local nature recovery strategy, and (b) any relevant species conservation strategy...". Whilst Leicestershire County Council is currently progressing with the LNRS, the District Council should consider opportunities to reference the role of LNRS as a component of the wider biodiversity policy - this may provide additional opportunity for off-site BNG that positively contributes to the objectives of the LNRS.	The SPD is not a policy document but rather guidance. References to the LNRS and the Council's approach to BNG in relation to the LNRS will be outlined in the merging Local Plan which is due for adoption in early 2026.

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Change required (Note change)</b>
7	Pegasus obo Hallam Land Management	Paragraph 006 Reference ID: 74-006-20240214 and Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 74-019-20240214 of the NPPG note the importance of considering local off-site biodiversity that could support the LNRS. Reference to this approach through the proposed sequential approach of national policy, whilst providing wider options for offsite BNG contributions if required.	As above. The NPPG will remain the primary guidance for determining BNG aspects of new developments.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	With reference to item 3.5 – Sub-division of sites, the Parish Council would support the District Council's policy on not accepting sites being developed incrementally or sub-divided to avoid contributions, however, the Parish Council would ask for further clarification on how the District Council would enforce this and what its response would be. The District Council will be aware of a current application for land off Gillam Butts, Countesthorpe, which does not fully use the land available to the developer, which the Parish Council is concerned could be seen to be such as case of avoiding planning obligations. The Parish Council would therefore expect from this new policy that the District Council should be aware of the total land that the developer could potentially develop and therefore base any requirement for planning obligations based on the full site.	Add text "Blaby District Council will take a pragmatic approach towards the phasing and delivery of facilities, services and contributions to take account of site constraints, and encourage early engagement and collaboration between parties. Where a housing site is developed in phases or through multiple applications, and where the sport, recreation or open space provision is required on-site within the allocation, this provision is required to be master planned, co-ordinated and delivered, on an allocation-wide basis, by the promoters, landowners and/or developers working together. In these circumstances, a single site for sport and recreation facilities such as playing pitches, or a strategic open space, the provision of which is to serve all of the allocation, may be required. The proposals for open space provision on-site or off-site should similarly be coordinated and delivered on an allocation-wide basis by the landowners/developers working together to ensure that the provision fits within the overall policies of the current adopted Blaby District Local Plan.



	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
			If the required on-site provision is not delivered in the first/early phases of a housing site allocation, then these first/early phases planning permission will only be granted if the land required for sport, recreation or open space has been legally secured to ensure delivery of the required future provision."
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	The Parish Council notes item 2.3 of the Policy in relation to pooling of planning obligations that the District Council is no longer restricted to how many obligations it can pool towards a single piece of infrastructure. In line with the previous comment with regard to item 3.5 the Parish Council would ask that the District Council ensure that where there are multiple applications for development that the planning obligations be secured for meaningful infrastructure work. Therefore, the Parish Council would support 2.3 of the Policy.	Noted.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	Under item 3.2 the list of cases for which planning obligations can be sought by the District Council. This includes Affordable Housing. It is noted that 25% of each development of more than 15 dwellings should be affordable housing unless the developer can demonstrate that this would make the application unviable. The Parish Council would query what the District Council's criteria would be for accepting what unviable is. Again, there is a risk that a developer can submit applications in a piecemeal manner to avoid the thresholds, and would be contradictory to item 3.5.	See para 3.5 on subdivision and para 3.8 on viability.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	With regard to item 3.6 the Parish Council would acknowledge that it is beneficial for pre-application discussions to take place prior to a planning application for larger scale development to take place. Whilst the Parish Council supports this, as it would give indication at an early stage that the concerns raised previously, are being responded to by the District Council, however the Parish Council would wish to see a more	We have a consultation process and Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Parish Councils are welcome to comment on planning applications, but the District Council are led by the statutory consultees.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		committed agreement prior to an application being submitted whether the application is outline or full. Preferably, the Parish Council would support that parish councils are consulted at an early stage on its views for the need for planning obligations in its area, for example if the parish council has more local knowledge that a proposed development will have an adverse impact on the local road network, that priority be given to that when negotiating with the developer. The Parish Council would also consider that parish councils should be consulted if a potential application is not within its boundary but could still have an adverse impact on infrastructure and services.	
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	The Parish Council notes that tables indicating the level of obligations to be sought depending on size of a dwelling. When responding to the government's consultation on the proposed Infrastructure Levy, the Parish Council considered that a dwelling can make the same level of impact regardless of size of the dwelling and its view therefore would be that planning obligations be sought for the development site as a whole, which would also prevent a developer making significant changes to the types of dwellings throughout the building stage.	Comments noted. No change required as statistics show different sized dwellings, could potentially impact different infrastructure due to demand.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	Whilst the Parish Council supports the proposed requirement of open spaces and community facilities as referred to in item 4.3.1, it would have concerns that, as land develops, how realistic this would be in achieving. An example being, that for example the proposal for a community facility to be provided per proposed 2200 people or 800 metres travel time. The current proposed applications affecting Countesthorpe, should they all be approved, would result in this trigger, but the Parish Council sees no evidence on how the District Council can agree with individual developers who would contribute the land to such facilities such as sports and recreation or community facility. The Parish Council is disappointed to note that under item 4.4.5, the District Council has not carried out an	This SPD will apply only to existing consented schemes not proposed, future strategic schemes. This SPD is not a planning policy document.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		assessment of community halls, and considers that this should be carried out as part of the strategic planning process. The Parish Council particularly highlights that the provision of potential local shop facilities are not included in the list referred to in 4.3.1 to prevent the need to travel to facilities as settlements grow in size.	
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	with regard to item 4.3.4, the Parish Council would query the District Council's process for agreeing off-site open space and recreation, where on-site provision is deemed not feasible. Whilst the Parish Council notes that the District Council has attempted to respond to this in item 4.3.7, the Parish Council would reiterate its view that all planning obligations are agreed prior to an application being approved.	<p>Comment noted. No change required.</p> <p>Where there is a full application the level of obligations and infrastructure provision are secured via a legal agreement, approved plans or planning condition as on/off site provision and detail is known at this time. Where there is an outline application and full detail is to be provided at Reserved Matters, the legal agreement will be agreed to ensure required obligations are secured, as quantity and on/off site provision is determined as part of the Reserved Matters application. The Council is therefore not always able to agree the level of all planning obligations prior to an application being approved, and will secure obligations based on detail being provided by the developer at a later date</p>
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	With regard to item 4.3.8, the Parish Council would wish to see that agreement on who would be responsible for the future ownership or management of an open space to be agreed prior to the application being submitted/approved.	If there's a mechanism for delivery of open space, then there will be responsibility assigned through that process.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	With regard to item 4.3.36 – Sustainable Drainage Systems, the Parish Council would argue that the developer should provide appropriate drainage, not only to eliminate the flood risk on-site, but also to give consideration to any risk to off-site locations that may be adversely affected by the development. An example being as to whether the Leysland development in	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has a section on planning and flood risk and Blaby District Council will be following the national policy.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		Countesthorpe has adequately prevented any surface water flood risk to the remaining surrounding open spaces which are also subject to potential development.	
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	With regard to item 4.3.38 – Biodiversity Net Gain, the Parish Council would expect to see any potential design and usage of open space to be agreed as part of discussions prior to the planning application stage	Although the PCs comments are noted and it could be useful to identify the design and usage of sites at the pre-app stage the application process provides an opportunity for various stakeholders and other interested bodies to feed into and have a say on these issues.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	The Parish Council would support the proposals in item 4.3.49 that contributions may be sought to provide improvements and expansion to playing pitches or sports related ancillary facilities.	Noted.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	With regard to item 4.4.13, the Parish Council acknowledges that it is the County Council's responsibility to ensure that adequate educational facilities have been provided, however, it would ask that the District Council liaise closely with the County Council to ensure that the County Council has a full understanding of the full picture in terms of further potential applications that may be imminent in the future.	Noted.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	Under item 4.4.19, the Parish Council would support the District Council's requirement that the Integrated Care Board clearly set out how it would intend to spend any planning obligations, however, it is disappointed that this system is not already in place, in light of the impact of the current applications affecting Countesthorpe. The Parish Council would wish to seek clarification as to when this Policy would start to be implemented and whether it would be applicable to applications that have already been submitted but yet to be decided, in particular Outline applications, or whether it will only be applicable to new applications.	Comment noted. No change required  Consultation responses submitted to the District Council from Health are uploaded to the Council's website and available for the public to view. S106 Legal Agreements are also available to view on the Council's website and include detail of how secured funds are to be spent.
8	Countesthorpe Parish Council	In summary, the Parish Council would support the proposals of the draft policy, however, it has concerns that there are issues within it that would be difficult to implement or enforce. The	It isn't policy.

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		Parish Council does feel that the new policy has some potential to offer more flexibility for the use of developer contributions as it is the Parish Council's view that contributions should be open to a wider demographic of beneficiaries.	
9	Nineteen47 obo of Davidsons	It is encouraging that the Council recognises that viability is a key issue. Paragraph 58 of the NPPF states that all viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available. It is important that the SPD is consistent with the approach to viability in national planning guidance and is flexible enough to reflect future changes to that guidance. Viability should be addressed via an open book appraisal and any findings of an independent assessor should be made fully available to the Applicant during the course of these discussions. The SPD should also identify circumstances other than viability where planning obligations may be revised (e.g. a change in the market conditions may mean that a Registered Provider is unable to take on a requirement for social rented dwellings). The SPD should recognise that a change in the affordable housing tenure can help achieve viability for a development (for example, by providing first homes or discounted market sale housing instead of social or affordable rent) and the SPD should be flexible enough to accommodate differing tenure types if required. The SPD should acknowledge that the Council will work proactively with developers to ensure that changes in market conditions will not result in development stalling. This would be particularly useful in ensuring the Council meets the NPPF requirement of boosting its housing supply.	<p>Additional paragraph under Viability</p> <p>'Section 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act allows planning obligations to be modified or discharged in certain circumstances where the developer and planning authority wish to do so. Therefore, any requests will be considered and dealt with proactively on a case by case basis by the District Council, to avoid any unnecessary delays in the starting of development.'</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8 addresses open book financial appraisals.</p> <p>The District Council's adopted Housing Mix and Affordable Housing SPD provides further detail on Affordable Housing.</p> <p>National Policy allows for planning obligations to be renegotiated where there is no agreement and the planning obligation predates April 2010 or is over 5 years old, an application can be made to the Council to change the obligation where it 'no longer serves a useful purpose' or would continue to serve a useful purpose in a modified way.</p>

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
9	Nineteen47 obo of Davidsons	<p>The tenure of affordable housing on qualifying sites is set by the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted in 2013. At that time, the NPPF 2012 included only 'Social Rented Housing', 'Affordable Rented Housing' and 'Intermediate Housing' within the definition of affordable housing. The tenure split in the SPD reflects this as it only refers to these types of affordable homes. The SPD should however recognise that since the adoption of the Affordable Housing SPD in 2013, the NPPF has introduced updated definitions of affordable housing which includes 'discounted market sales housing' and 'first homes'. These are forms of affordable housing which play a critical role in the delivery of new housing and which assist first time buyers or those with less capital income to get onto the housing market. The SPD should therefore be updated to accord with National Planning Policy in terms of the definitions of affordable housing and to provide greater flexibility to the different tenure types of affordable housing that could be delivered by development. The SPD makes reference to the updates in the PPG which states that First Homes should comprise 25% of affordable housing. However, the tenure split of affordable housing within the SPD does not reflect the First Homes requirement in the PPG and it should be updated to accord with national guidance in this respect.</p>	<p>An additional sentence has been added to para 4.2.3 committing to update the Housing SPD if appropriate. In the interim the SPD flags the current position and advocates early engagement with the Council's Strategic Housing Team.</p>
9	Davidsons	<p>Please enter your comments with respect to the approach to identifying open space requirements. The SPD has been updated so that developments of 200+ dwellings are required to provide Allotments and Community Gardens on site. It is important that this requirement, plus other requirements in Table 1, are caveated. The SPD should recognise that it may not always be possible or appropriate to provide such facilities on site. For example, the land / soil composition may not be suitable for the provision of allotments, or the location of the allotments may not be the most appropriate to serve the wider</p>	<p>Additional wording has been added para (4.3.5) to reflect this point.</p>

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		community, particularly in those communities where there is an existing shortfall of such facilities	
9	Davidsons	The SPD updates the off-site Open Space contributions substantially. The percentage increase for each Open Space Type (per sq.m) is as follows: Parks & Recreation Grounds - 414%; Natural Green Space - 492%; Informal Open Space - 132%; Provision for Children & Young People - 249%; Allotments & Community Gardens - 102%. Whilst it is appreciated that the original SPD is based on costings from 2010, the proposed increase in costs is not provided incrementally and there will be a sharp and significant increase when the emerging SPD is adopted. This could have significant implications for the viability and deliverability of a number of residential sites across the District, particularly ones which are already in the pipeline, such as existing Local Plan allocations, or sites which have been submitted to the Council for consideration in the emerging Local Plan. It is noted that the costings have been calculated using the Spon's Architects' and Builders' Price Book 2023. All costings in the SPD should be fully justified and evidenced to ensure an open book approach which will allow developers to accurately calculate any potential costings themselves prior to the submission of the formal planning application.	The document has been amended to set out a more bespoke negotiated approach to establishing off site contributions given the rarity at which off-site provision is sought. This will allow offsite contributions, where sought to reflect local needs and circumstance.
10	Michael Jacques	No specific comments made	Noted
11	Dominic Steel	Do you have any comments on section 1 of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)? No housing development should be actioned or approved until Schooling, Doctors and food shopping is improved. If any housing is approved then ample drainage and ponds etc should be in place as the village has suffered from flooding in recent years and is getting worse!	Noted but there are cases when the existing infrastructure is adequate to support the proposed development.
11	Dominic Steel	Question 3. Do you agree with our proposed approach to addressing the subdivision of sites? Do not agree. I feel very	Noted. The District Council will Consult in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		little is given to people who live in these areas that planning is passed before anyone actually knows what is going on.	
11	Dominic Steel	Question 8. Do you have any comments regarding our approach to and requirements for securing affordable housing in new developments? "Affordable Housing" is NOT affordable to the vast majority! House prices are extremely inflated at the moment and with inflation and interest rates.	Affordable Housing is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This SPD uses the NPPF definition of Affordable Housing.
11	Dominic Steel	Do you have any comments regarding our approach to identifying open space requirements in new developments? A lot more should be provided to villagers and time frames	Delivery timeframes are contained in legal agreements. Policy CS15 sets out the current expected quantum of provision and this SPD provides the detail to support Policy CS15.
12	Stewart Pilkington	Question 1. Do you have any comments on section 1 of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)? Section 1.5 speaks of the need for new or improved infrastructure services or facilities. I take infrastructure to relate to sewers, water mains, gas mains and storm water and the need to ascertain whether those existing are able to cope with the additional loads imposed by new developments. I see no mention of such considerations here or elsewhere in the document.	Add footnote to clarify what the SPD means by infrastructure. Utilities are funded differently. SPD infrastructure means education, highways, open space, health, waste etc.
12	Stewart Pilkington	Question 2. Have we adequately described the legislative and policy context for securing planning obligations in Blaby? I say no in order to be able to comment. Section 2.9 still doesn't include the infrastructure elements of which I provided examples in my comments on Section 1 of the document. Looking at the current applications for planning approval at 20.3.2024 (Gillam Butts, Foston Road and Willoughby Road) it seems that the developer presents the case for the adequacy of main infrastructure elements. Davidsons have done a reasonable job presenting a report on gas, water and telecoms requirements for Willoughby Road (for example) but choose to ignore Severn Trent's preferred option on sewage disposal. Can the council not look to demand S.106 contributions for infrastructure enhancements? Or to take an extreme case, when the Wigston Sewage works runs out of capacity will	As above, utilities are not funded through s106 agreements.



	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		Severn Trent be solely responsible for footing the bill for enhanced treatment works? Similarly do Severn Trent foot the bill for new sewers and storm water drains?	
12	Stewart Pilkington	Question 3. Do you agree with our proposed approach to addressing the subdivision of sites? I don't understand the question, other than my understanding that with the current 3 No. aforementioned planning applications I understand that the council must consider each one individually rather than looking at the overall impact on all relevant areas affecting (e.g.) Countesthorpe when/if all 3 developments go ahead. This seems akin to splitting a site into smaller elements (subdivision in this parlance).	This SPD outlines the approach for existing committed development. The District Council will work with infrastructure providers when speculative applications come forward.
12	Stewart Pilkington	Question 4. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed approach to addressing viability? Please enter your comments with respect to the proposed approach to addressing viability Do you believe that the developer will have identified all of the likely costs associated with the planned development? And where costs are attributed to a particular element (say a road junction improvement), who is to say that the estimated cost is realistic? Is there a mechanism to claim money retrospectively if the proposed scheme is deemed to be non-viable?	<p>Comments noted, no change required.</p> <p>The key objective of this SPD is to indicate the likely level of planning obligations that can be expected from proposed development in advance of submitting a planning application, so these can be factored into schemes at an early stage to help avoid uncertainty.</p> <p>As per NPPG it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate any circumstances where there is a need for a viability assessment.</p>
12	Stewart Pilkington	Question 7. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed approach to monitoring fees and the fee level proposed? Please enter your comments with respect to the proposed approach to monitoring fees Only as in (8) above. Can you claim additional money if you need to do so?	<p>Comments noted, no change required.</p> <p>See previous above comments</p>
12	Stewart Pilkington	Question 8. Do you have any comments regarding our approach to and requirements for securing affordable housing in new developments? It has always seemed easy for developers to use the get out clause on social housing that "the development becomes non-viable when the 25% social	Noted but Council's approach is bound by the NPPF and NPPG and exceptionally the need for development could outweigh the requirements to secure plan compliant development. In practice very few sites in

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		housing requirement is applied". It would be easy to read this sort of comment as manipulation of the open-book figures to ensure that more large (read more profitable) houses can be built to enhance the return on investment for the developer. Also it seems by observation that social housing tends to be segregated away from "normal" housing. This can and does create ghetto areas. I could show you some in Countesthorpe.	<p>Blaby come forward offering a non-compliant development and associated viability assessment. However, where this happens the Council will publish all viability assessments alongside other information supporting the application and the Council's consultant's assessment of the viability appraisal.</p> <p>Re comments on affordable housing this guidance reiterates the existing requirement that affordable units should be spread across the development in clusters of no more than 6 dwellings.</p>
12	Stewart Pilkington	<p>Question 9. Do you have any comments regarding our approach to identifying open space requirements in new developments?</p> <p>I see the relevant tables from Table 1 onwards but can you combine developments in arriving at the dwelling numbers?</p>	<p>Combining numbers from multiple developments in a close geographical area is unlikely to be feasible for open space provision.</p> <p>Add text for health facilities "Where there are separate housing allocations or developments in a close geographical area, e.g. around a town, that taken together generate a need for a whole health facility, contributions need to be made from all of them to that new facility provision or towards improving and/or extending an existing facility provision which can meet the anticipated demand. Such a facility may need to be located on land on one of these housing development sites. Through early engagement with the District Council and the masterplanning of such</p>

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
			<p>sites, opportunities should be sought to secure delivery into the most appropriate site, or on new unallocated sites, or on sites with an existing health provision and available space.</p> <p>Developers should cooperate locally to identify a solution which is acceptable to the Council. Separate housing allocations or developments which are within a close geographical area will only be granted planning permission if the land required for health provision has been legally secured to ensure delivery of the required future provision, or there is agreement with the Council on how this provision will be made.</p>
13	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Q3. Do you agree with our proposed approach to addressing the subdivision of sites? No. It is not considered that the approach goes into sufficient detail about what happens if/when sub-division happens. Furthermore, the document doesn't cover seeking contributions for the cumulative impact of lots of smaller developments</p>	<p>Same response on sub-division of a site as above for 8. Countesthorpe PC.</p>
13	Leicestershire County Council	<p>Q4. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed approach to addressing viability? The document doesn't cover what has (up to now at least) worked well in Melton Borough and Harborough District.</p> <p>Melton - Their SPD sets out a priority order of contributions in the event of any viability challenges – could this be agreed with BDC?</p> <p>Harborough - In the event of any viability, regardless of the outcome, a late-stage review of viability clause is added in to resultant S106 agreements to see whether the development <i>could</i> afford more, and this is helpfully being undertaken as a usual practice. Harborough have been very positive with</p>	<p>Comments noted, no change required.</p> <p>Any viability issues that need addressing will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, as there can be different infrastructure priorities on sites dependant on the detail of the development.</p>

	Name	Comment	Change required (Note change)
		supporting the County Council on this. This is also being factored into other LPA's decision making, including Melton.	
13	Leicestershire County Council	Q7. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed approach to monitoring fees and the fee level proposed 3.20 and 3.21 sets out a 5% or £360 fee – whichever is higher, or a £360 fee on any NFO's. It is not clear how this would affect income levels. The end of paragraph 3.21 appears to be missing information. The final sentence simply says "For large scale developments of more than 500."	Paragraph updated and completed.
13	Leicestershire County Council	<p>As the LLFA, we are content with the section on Sustainable Drainage Systems (paras 4.3.36 and 4.3.37). Regarding Developer contributions, we might expect to see something about contributions in areas at risk of flooding. E.g. line from EM4 for Coventry's Local Plan: <i>All opportunities to reduce flood risk in the surrounding area must be taken, including creating additional flood storage. In this instance reference should be made to the Councils IDP or Regulation 123 list.</i></p> <p>The LCC Planning Obligations Policy is currently being refreshed. A summary of the proposed changes has recently been taken to LCC Scrutiny Commission (10 April 2024). Public consultation is scheduled for May to June 2024, and it is intended that LCC Cabinet will receive a further report in September 2024 on the outcome of the consultation and will consider the revised policy. Full Council will be asked to approve the final Policy in late September 2024.</p>	Noted
14	Vodafone	No comment – returned form	Noted
15	Environment Agency	No Comment	Noted