



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held 24 September-1 October 2014

Site visit made on 1 October 2014

**by P Willows BA DipUED MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 28 October 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/A/14/2217036**

**Lower Packington Road, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire LE65 1TS**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Hallam Land Management Ltd against the decision of North West Leicestershire District Council.
- The application Ref 13/00694/OUTM, dated 16 August 2013, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2014.
- The development proposed is residential development of up to 70 dwellings (Class C3) Green Infrastructure to include: retained vegetation; habitat creation (including new woodland planting); open space, amenity space and play areas; sustainable drainage systems/features; and new walking/cycling/recreational routes. Infrastructure to include highway and utilities and associated engineering works (including ground modelling) and vehicular access via the construction of a new junction off the existing Lower Packington Road.

---

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Application for costs**

2. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### **Procedural matters**

3. The proposal seeks outline planning permission, with all matters other than the points of access reserved for future consideration. Accordingly, I have treated the submitted Masterplan as illustrative only.
4. The Council carried out notification of the appeal on 7 May 2014. Unfortunately, some consultees were not notified at that time, as they should have been. The Council notified those people on 29 August and alerted the Planning Inspectorate to the situation at the same time.
5. Upon receiving its late notification, Leicestershire Police sought and was granted Rule 6 status, and played a full and active part in the Inquiry.
6. Ashby de la Zouch Town Council initially indicated an intention to attend the Inquiry but, in the event, was unable to do so. However, under the circumstances I accepted a late written submission.

7. Having considered these matters I concluded that, despite the breach in the rules that had occurred, no party had been substantially prejudiced and that the public interest was best served by proceeding with the Inquiry.
8. Iceni Projects, acting for the Money Hill Consortium, requested that the Inquiry be adjourned due to concern that a decision on this appeal might undermine the ongoing examination of the Charnwood Local Plan in relation to the issue of housing land requirements. However, there is nothing unusual about this situation; the examination of local plans is a widespread and continuing process, and I do not consider that the circumstances in this instance would justify delaying the determination of this appeal.

### **Main issues**

9. The main issues are:

- the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
- whether the proposal would be sustainable development; and
- whether there is an adequate supply of land for housing in the district and, if not, whether the need for housing land outweighs any harm arising from the development.

### **Reasons**

#### *Planning policy*

10. The development plan consists of the North West Leicestershire Local Plan. This was adopted in 2002 and selected policies saved in 2007. Thus the policies remain, but the extent to which they may be regarded as up to date and the weight to be attached to them must be considered with regard to the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), notably within paragraphs 49 and 215. The Council did not rely on any development plan policies in refusing the planning application, but now refers to S3, H4 and H4/1.
11. Policy H4 lists housing allocations, but the appeal site is not one of them. H4/1 sets out a sequential approach for the development of land for housing, but the Council accepts that this is not consistent with the Framework<sup>1</sup>. It is evident that the Council cannot meet current housing need on the basis of the allocations in the Local Plan. Consequently, its policies for the supply of housing, which include H4 and H4/1, are out of date. That was the position that existed at the time the planning application was determined, and I do not see that adding to the supply outside of the Local Plan process can change that.
12. Policy S3 restricts the types of development permissible in the countryside. The policy it is clearly relevant to this site, which the Proposals Map shows as falling within a Countryside designation. Nevertheless, it must be applied with regard to current circumstances, including the need for housing. Irrespective of my findings regarding whether there is a 5 year supply of housing land, the Council acknowledges that meeting long term housing need post-2011 requires the development of land outside the Limits of Development shown in the Local

---

<sup>1</sup> Murphy Para 5.9

Plan<sup>2</sup>. Thus, the evident conflict with S3 cannot be decisive in this instance. I did not identify conflict with S3 as a main issue at the Inquiry and neither side contended that it should be.

*Character and appearance*

13. The appeal site is a field, located on the southern side of Lower Packington Road. When I viewed the site it was being used for grazing sheep. To the northern side of the road there are suburban housing estates, beyond which lies the centre of Ashby de la Zouch. However, the character of the land to the south of the road, including the appeal site, is of countryside.
14. A sports ground abuts the site to one side, and this has some urban features, including a building located next to the appeal site boundary. However, the site is mainly open and green. To the other side of the site, the dwellings at Mill Farm have been created through the conversion of farm buildings, and still retain much of their agricultural character. To the south of the appeal site is the very busy A42 trunk road. The noise from this is a constant presence in the vicinity of the appeal site. Visually, however, the road is barely noticeable from the site. Overall, while all of these features have a bearing on perceptions of the area, they do not fundamentally change its countryside character. Mr Coles, for the appellant, acknowledges that the site is, 'in open countryside and is pleasant in character'<sup>3</sup>.
15. A public footpath runs along the site's western boundary, allowing views of the site looking towards the town. Yet even from here, the impact of the nearby housing development on the other side of the road is limited by the tree belt which screens much of it. This reinforces the impression that the appeal site lies firmly outside the built confines of the town.
16. Given this setting, the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area would, notwithstanding the substantial proportion of the site that would be devoted to green infrastructure, be very marked indeed. The road and tree belt would prevent a housing development in this location from relating visually to the housing to the north, and it would clearly be very different to the countryside to the southern side of the road. Thus, it would not seem to be an appropriate or sympathetic expansion of the urban form into the countryside. Rather, it would appear as a self-contained island of housing development within an essentially countryside location. As a result it would be highly incongruous within its setting.
17. I have considered carefully the landscape evidence provided by Mr Coles and the Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal carried out for the appellant, and agree that the site is not especially sensitive or remarkable in landscape terms. In this regard it is relevant that the site is not identified as a 'Sensitive Area', to be protected under the provisions of Local Plan Policy E1. One of the purposes of the policy is to protect important settings and approaches to settlements – a consideration that the Council's case focuses on. However, the lack of an E1 designation does not alter the need to take account of the visual impact of the development on this pleasant, if unremarkable, landscape.

---

<sup>2</sup> Murphy Para 5.9

<sup>3</sup> Coles 7.5

18. Mr Coles' evidence is that the site is well contained and has limited visibility in the landscape<sup>4</sup>. However, the development would clearly be highly prominent in views from Lower Packington Road and from the public footpath along its boundary, from where it would have a marked visual effect.
19. For these reasons I conclude that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the locality. This places the proposal at odds with the Framework, which establishes at Paragraph 7 that 'contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment' is an aspect of sustainable development. Additionally, the Core Planning Principles at Paragraph 17 include the requirement to 'take account of the different roles and character of different areas'. In my judgement, the appeal proposal would fail in that regard.

#### *Sustainability*

20. The Framework establishes that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental<sup>5</sup>. It makes clear that the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions. The Council's concerns focus on the environmental dimension, and I consider this first.
21. There is little before me to challenge the appellant's assertion that the town of Ashby de la Zouch is a sustainable settlement. It is the second largest settlement in the district and has a wide range of services. Furthermore, measures designed to improve the connectivity of the appeal site are proposed. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the location of the site outside the urban fabric of the town creates difficulties in terms of transport and accessibility. There are no shops or other facilities to meet day-to-day needs near to the site. Nor would any such facilities be provided within the scheme. Thus, even for something as basic as a newspaper or some milk, residents would need to travel into Ashby (or further afield).
22. Of course, some people will make trips by walking or cycling. However, the town centre is about 1km from the appeal site, a distance likely to deter many in my view. Moreover, the trip takes in significant gradients and there are no dedicated cycle routes close to the appeal site. Although buses run past the site, the services are limited and infrequent. The 19/19a service runs busses approximately hourly, while the 7 service is less frequent, and neither would serve the development at late hours or at all on Sundays. Thus, in my judgement, even allowing for measures linked to the scheme such as bus stop improvements, many people would rely on their cars even for trips to buy one or two small, everyday items. Health facilities, the 'public transport hub' (Ashby Post Office) and the leisure centre are all located further still from the site, and this is also likely to place undue reliance on car trips.
23. Furthermore, the site is not well-related to Ashby's main employment areas, which are concentrated to the north of the town. The nearest of these, at Nottingham Road, is about 2km from the site. I am mindful that many people would be likely to commute to jobs further afield, irrespective of the jobs available locally, and so attach only limited weight to this consideration. Nevertheless, the infrequency of buses past the site and the limited routes,

---

<sup>4</sup> Coles 7.6

<sup>5</sup> Para 7

would clearly limit the opportunities for people to travel to work by public transport, and this adds, to a degree, to my concerns regarding transport and accessibility issues.

24. The proposal includes a Travel Plan, designed to encourage sustainable transport options within the development. However, there is nothing unusual in this – indeed, Mr Cheetham acknowledged that it was largely a ‘generic’ document. Having considered the details of Travel Plan, and the possibility of a condition requiring further detail, I am not persuaded that its provisions would overcome the underlying difficulties that would arise from this development on this site.
25. The *Comparative Accessibility Appraisal* carried out for the appellant suggests that other potential housing sites around Ashby are broadly comparable with the appeal site in terms of accessibility. However, irrespective of that, I remain concerned that the specific scheme before me would place undue reliance on car use.
26. I have borne in mind that Leicestershire County Council did not object to the proposal, and have completed a *Statement of Common Ground on Transport and Highway Matters* with the appellant. This confirms the County Council’s view that, ‘subject to the planning conditions and section 106 obligations, the site is in an acceptable location in terms of its sustainability and relationship to the settlement of Ashby de la Zouch and its facilities and amenities’. However, I have arrived at my own view, having considered all the expert evidence before me, tested at the Public Inquiry.
27. The appellant points out that the Council recently resolved to grant planning permission for 2 developments totalling 72 dwellings at Packington, about 2.3km from Ashby de la Zouch. However, the Head of Regeneration and Planning advised in relation to these schemes that Packington itself contains a range of facilities, including a primary school, shop, church, village hall, public house, play area/recreation ground and some small scale employment sites. Consequently, the distance to Ashby is only one aspect of the sustainability of those sites, and the comparison is of little value.
28. The sustainability of Ashby rubs off, to an extent, on the appeal site. Simply by being close to the town, the length of trips for many purposes would be limited. Nevertheless, for the reasons I have outlined, it appears to me that the appeal proposal would result in a development in which residents would be over-dependant on their cars and where opportunities for non-car modes would be limited. As such, it fails in the objective of actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, as outlined in Paragraph 17 of the Framework.
29. The Framework says at Paragraph 32 that, ‘Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe’. In my judgement, the sustainable transport difficulties of this site are significant, but not severe. Thus, on their own, they would not be sufficient reason to withhold planning permission. They are, however, an important factor in my overall assessment of whether the proposal amounts to sustainable development. Bearing in mind also the visual harm that would arise from the scheme, I conclude that it would fail to support the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

30. The housing provided by the scheme would assist in delivering the social dimension of sustainable development. In this regard, the provision of 21 affordable units, which would help to meet an identified local need, is of particular relevance. However, my concern regarding the lack of accessibility to local services reduces the weight I attach to this; in describing the social dimension, the Framework refers specifically to 'creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services'.
31. The development would make a contribution to economic development commensurate with its scale during its construction. This is a clear benefit of the development. The new residents would also contribute to the local economy. However, I am not convinced, on the evidence before me, that such a development is currently needed in this location to meet any specific economic needs. This limits the weight I attach to the economic role of the scheme.
32. Weighing up these considerations I conclude that the proposal does not, viewed overall, amount to sustainable development. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in the Framework<sup>6</sup> does not apply.

#### *Housing land supply*

33. When it determined the planning application the Council conceded that it did not have a 5 year housing land supply. However, it advised before the Inquiry that the position had changed and that it now considered that a 5 year supply was in place. The new stance arose from both changes in the requirement and in the identified supply of housing land, and I consider each in turn.
34. There is no up to date figure for housing land requirements in the development plan. When the planning application was determined, the Council considered the annual housing requirement to be 388 dwellings per annum. This was based upon the now abandoned (and never adopted), Core Strategy. However, in June 2014, a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Leicester and Leicestershire, prepared by consultants G L Hearn, was published.
35. The Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>7</sup> advises that, where evidence in Local Plans has become outdated and policies in emerging plans are not yet capable of carrying sufficient weight, information provided in the latest full assessment of housing needs should be considered. But the weight given to these assessments should take account of the fact they have not been tested or moderated against relevant constraints. In addition to the SHMA I have considered the detailed assessment of housing need provided by Mr Bolton on behalf of the appellant.
36. The appellant is critical of the SHMA. Key to this is the claim that the requirement is not a 'policy-off' figure, and cannot, therefore, be regarded as *objectively assessed need* (OAN) for housing. It is common ground that OAN must be a policy-off figure, but there is disagreement as to what this means in practice.

---

<sup>6</sup> Para 14

<sup>7</sup> Reference ID: 3-030-20140306

37. The SHMA identifies a range of 75,500 to 84,300 homes for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) over the period 2011-2031. It translates this to 5,700-7,000 homes for North West Leicestershire, which amounts to 285-350 dwellings per annum. These figures take account of the implications of future growth in employment for housing needs (as set out in 2013 econometric forecasts by Experian). However, the SHMA does not apply the figures directly to individual local authority areas. Instead, it distributes the growth in employment across the HMA based on the relative size of the current economic base. This has the effect of substantially reducing the housing need for North West Leicestershire (a figure of 478 is shown before the adjustment is made)<sup>8</sup>.
38. The appellant is critical of this approach, and argues that there is no reason to assume that past patterns of employment growth, which have seen strong growth in North-West Leicestershire, should not continue. Indeed, it is said that the East Midlands Gateway project alone, which falls within the district, will generate 7,000 direct jobs, as well as construction jobs.
39. However, past levels of growth may have reflected past strategies. Furthermore, major projects such as the East Midlands Gateway are likely to have far-reaching effects, well beyond the district. Indeed, the East Midlands Gateway is located at the northern end of the district and lies within the Derby Travel to Work Area. Taking account of growth with regard to the current distribution of employment, as the SHMA does, seems to me to be as close as possible to establishing needs within the HMA without being drawn into policy-on areas of decision-making. The SHMA recognises that the distribution of housing within the HMA and the targets for individual local authorities may change to take account of factors such as strategies for economic development, but clearly sees such matters as falling beyond its remit. That is, in my view, an appropriate approach, in accordance with the Framework and the PPG.
40. The SHMA assumes that current levels of double-jobbing will continue<sup>9</sup>. Although the appellant is critical of this, I cannot see, on the evidence before me, that it is an unreasonable assumption to make.
41. There is a difference in the economic activity rates assumed in the SHMA and those in Mr Bolton's assessment. However, the SHMA uses Census data, which I regard as a reliable source. While the amount of data is limited, the SHMA is conservative in its approach, assuming only half the rate of change seen over the previous decade. This appears to me to be a reasonable approach which will not unduly reduce the assessed need for housing.
42. I appreciate that the housing requirement figures arrived at in the SHMA for North West Leicestershire are significantly below the 510 per annum set out in the (now revoked) East Midlands Regional Plan. However, the purpose of the assessment is to consider *current* needs. Moreover, it is quite possible that the actual requirement for the district will change as plan-making progresses to meet policy requirements. Given the emphasis within guidance of considering housing needs at an HMA level, I do not see that the figures that have been arrived at for North West Leicestershire are at odds with the need to boost the housing supply. It is clear that there is ongoing cooperation between the

---

<sup>8</sup> SHMA Table 21

<sup>9</sup> Ireland 5.49

Leicestershire authorities to ensure that housing needs across the HMA are met, as evidenced by a Memorandum of Understanding of July 2014.

43. I am mindful that the Inspector who determined a planning application at Blaby under s62A of the Act<sup>10</sup> did not give significant weight to the SHMA. However, it is clear from the Statement of Reasons that this was due to a lack of evidence before him rather than any identified methodological weakness in the SHMA. The weight I can give the SHMA is reduced by the fact that it has not been subject to scrutiny through the local planning process. Nevertheless, in my view it is, as things stand, the best evidence available as to the current objectively assessed need for housing in North West Leicestershire, and I have considered the question of the 5 year requirement and supply on that basis.
44. It is common ground that the 5 year requirement must redress past under-supply. The Council uses the Core Strategy figure of 388 per annum to calculate the requirement for the period 2009-2011, whereas the appellant relies on the 510 per annum from the Regional Plan. This has only a minor effect on the requirement. From 2011, the Council relies on the 2014 SHMA requirement of 350 per annum and the appellant on Mr Bolton's figure of 651 per annum (although other figures have been considered, including the 478 from Table 21 of the SHMA). Both sides build a 20% buffer into their calculations. On this basis, the tables provided to me during the course of the Inquiry<sup>11</sup> show that the Council calculates a 5 year requirement of 2,494 at September 2014, while the equivalent using the appellant's preferred figures is 5,914. Given my conclusion on the SHMA, I prefer the Council's figure.
45. The Council calculates its supply of land as of the time of the Inquiry, rather than using the figures from March, produced as part of its annual updating exercise. Although the Framework refers to updating supply calculations annually, there is nothing within it to suggest that interim assessments should not be made. Thus, I do not disregard the Council's assessment for that reason. On this basis, the Council calculates that 3,279 units can come forward over the next 5 years - equivalent to a 6.57 year supply.
46. The Council's assessment includes an allowance for windfall development of 43 dwellings per annum. The Framework establishes that this is, in principle, permissible, but only if there is compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.<sup>12</sup> In this case, the Council has provided details of the windfall sites that have come forward in previous years. However, it cannot be assumed simply on this basis that dwellings will come forward at the same rate. There is no analysis of the effect of policy changes, or of capacity. Moreover, the figures themselves suggest that there may be some tailing-off in the supply. Overall, I am not satisfied that there is 'compelling evidence' to support the Council's assumption of 43 dwellings per annum.
47. The appellant is critical of the inclusion of sites which are the subject of resolutions to grant planning permissions (subject to s106 planning

---

<sup>10</sup> S62A/2014/0001

<sup>11</sup> Document 24

<sup>12</sup> Para 48

obligations). Clearly, such sites, by and large, may be regarded as more uncertain than sites which have planning permission. Yet there is no requirement for sites to have planning permission in order to be included in the housing land supply. By and large, I regard the passing of a resolution to grant planning permission as a clear indication that a site is likely to come forward for housing development. Moreover, the Council has not included 2 of these sites in its supply due to uncertainties in their delivery. This critical evaluation of the sites suggest to me that some care has been taken to ensure that sites that are included have a reasonable prospect of coming forward. I therefore accept that these can properly be included as part of the supply.

48. The appellant has raised other doubts in relation to specific sites included within the Council's supply. However, the Council has provided an assessment of each site, recording the views of developers and critically evaluating the prospects of the site coming forward and the timescale in which it is likely to do so. In my view there is no clear evidence to cast significant doubt on these assessments.
49. To conclude on this issue, I have expressed concern regarding the Council's allowance for windfall sites. Nevertheless, even if this is removed entirely from the figures, there would still be a 5 year supply. I therefore conclude that a 5 year supply of housing land is currently in place.

#### *Planning obligations*

50. An agreement under s106 of the Act has been submitted. This would address matters including affordable housing, healthcare facilities, open space, the River Mease Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest, a construction traffic routeing scheme, public transport, education and libraries. It is common ground that the agreement is necessary to meet requirements that would arise from the development. Additionally, the appellant has submitted a unilateral undertaking, dealing with financial contributions to support the provision of police services. The need for this, claimed by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire, is disputed by the appellant. However, since the appeal is dismissed for matters unrelated to the planning obligations, it is not necessary for me to consider either the agreement or the unilateral undertaking further.

#### *Other matters*

51. I have had regard to the 2010 appeal decision relating to the larger Packington Nook site (APP/G2435/A/09/2102468). But that scheme was of an entirely different scale, relating to an area of some 61 hectares compared to the 4.7 hectares of this appeal site. It also included non-housing elements, including a local centre. While the visual impact of the proposal before me would clearly be less, so would the benefits in terms of additional housing. Accordingly, comparisons are of little value in my view, and I have considered the proposal before me on its own merits.
52. Other matters raised by those opposing the scheme included concerns relating to noise at the appeal site and road safety. However, having considered the technical evidence before me concerning these matters they do not weigh against the proposal.

53. Notwithstanding my conclusion on the housing land supply, the housing that the scheme would bring forward is a clear benefit of it, to be weighed in its favour. The Framework makes clear the objective of boosting significantly the supply of housing<sup>13</sup>. Additional benefits include the economic considerations I have highlighted and the green infrastructure that would be provided.

*Conclusion*

54. I have found that significant harm would arise from the development. While relevant policies for the supply of housing are out of date, I have nevertheless concluded that a 5 year supply of housing land currently exists. With this in mind, I conclude that the adverse impacts of allowing the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Moreover, since I have concluded that the proposal is not sustainable development, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as outlined in the Framework, does not apply. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Peter Willows*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>13</sup> Para 47

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Paul Wakefield BA(Hons) LARTPI	Senior Associate Solicitor, Marrons Shakespeares
He called	
Nick Ireland BA(Hons) MTPI MRTPI	Planning Director, G L Hearn
Andrew Murphy BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Director, Stansgate Planning

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Andrew Williamson BA, Dip TP, MRTPI	Partner, Walker Morris Solicitors
He called	
David Cheetham BA(Hons) MSc	Waterman Transport and Development Ltd
Brett Coles BA(Hons) DipTP, DipLA, MRTPI	FPCR Environment and Design Ltd
Roland G Bolton BSc(Hons) MRTPI	Strategic Planning Research Unit, DLP Planning
Christopher Michael Hough BSc FRICS	Sigma Planning Services

### FOR PACKINGTON NOOK RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:

Nigel Garnham	
John Trinnick	
Chris Tandy	
They called:	
Nigel Garnham BEng PhD CEng FIET	Chairman, PNRA
John Trinnick Bsc(Eng) CEng MICE MIHT	PNRA

### FOR LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Nisha Varia	Solicitor for County Solicitor, Leicester County Council
She called	
Andrew Tyrer	Development Contributions Officer
Steve Kettle	Special Projects Manager, Library Services
Julie Muddimer	School Places Officer

### FOR THE POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR LEICESTERSHIRE:

Victoria Hutton, of Counsel	
She called	
Michael Lambert	Growth and Design Officer, Leicestershire Police

**INTERESTED PERSONS:**

Michael Ball

Ashby-de-la-Zouch Civic Society

**DOCUMENTS**

1	Local Plan Proposals Map
2	Speech for Appeal – Michael Ball
3	Web Page – BBC News
4	Application Summary – Erection of Medical Centre
5	Ward Map
6	Planning Committee Agenda Item
7	Position Statement on Housing Land Supply
8	DLP - Replacement Charts 1 and 2
9	DLP - Replacement Tables 1 and 28
10	DLP - Table of distance and Travel Times
11	Table of travel distances
12	Planning condition – travel Plan
13	Amendment to Proof of Evidence – John Trinnick
14	Document List - PNRA
15	LLEP Advisory Group – 24 July 2014
16	Letter dated 15 July 2014 from Richard Bennett
17	Leicester and Leicestershire Growth Deal
18	Memorandum of Understanding - Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area
19	DLP – Replacement Charts 1 and 2 (Revised)
20	Map – 2001 Travel to Work Areas
21	5 Year Housing Land Supply Assessment – Individual Site Assessment – 24 September 2014
22	Representation from Ashby de la Zouch Town Council
23	Statement of compliance with CIL Regulations
24	5 year land supply assessment September 2014 – Tables 1-8
25	5 Year Housing Land Supply - Site Commentary – January 2013

26	Appeal Decision APP/T2405/A/11/2164413
27	Opinion – Claims for s. 106 contributions by Leicestershire Police – David Elvin QC
28	Advice re planning obligations in favour of the Police – Ian Dove QC
29	Agreement and Planning Obligation dated 1 October 2014
30	Unilateral Undertaking dated 1 October 2014