

MATTER 11 – CULTURE AND TOURISM

Issue 11: Has the Plan been positively prepared and is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy in respect of its policies and proposals for culture and tourism in Leicester?

General Questions on Culture and Tourism

391. **Is the Plan consistent with national policy in paragraphs 93 and 99 of the NPPF in respect of:**

- (a) **guarding against the unnecessary loss of existing leisure and cultural facilities? And**

Yes, but the Council recognises the importance of protecting leisure and cultural facilities and has proposed a new policy as part of Main Modification MM20 to address the loss of these facilities when assessing applications.

- (b) **ensuring an integrated approach to considering the location of housing and cultural and leisure services?**

Yes. The Council proposes that the majority of cultural and leisure facilities should be included within the Central Development Area which is the location of the majority of proposed housing growth. Leisure is subject to a sequential assessment to ensure a main town centre first approach, and where necessary an impact assessment. The Council have made reference to the protection of these facilities within the CDA as of the proposed main modification MM20 to create a new policy titled 'Policy CT02 Protection of Cultural Facilities'. It should also be noted that the Council have open space policies in chapter 14, that seek to retain and expand, where appropriate, sports and leisure facilities.

392. **For the Plan to be clear and effective, should Chapter 11 include a statement on what leisure needs and facilities are required within the Plan area?**

The Council acknowledges that there is not any supporting text for Policy CT01 that sets out the position in respect of leisure needs and facilities in the city. The Leicester Retail and Leisure Study 2021 (EB/TC/1) assessed the need for commercial leisure needs for bingo, cinemas, tenpin bowling and casinos. These types of leisure facilities were considered in the study because they require a substantial site to accommodate them.

The study found that Leicester is generally well provided for in respect of bingo halls, casinos, cinemas and bowling and that there was no need to plan for new floorpace to accommodate them. It also recognised that there was some potential to increase the ten-pin bowling provision within Leicester. However, this must be considered in the context of the existing Hollywood Bowl at Meridian Leisure Park located just outside of the Leicester authority area, which also serves the needs of Leicester residents.

The council proposes the following modifications to add clarity about the Leisure needs and facilities based on the findings of the study.

Evidence Base

Add the "**Leicester Retail and Leisure Study, 2021**" to the list of evidence studies.

Add supporting text after para 11.02:

Leisure

The need for commercial leisure uses in the city was assessed in the Leicester Retail and Study, 2021. This considered the need for bingo halls, casinos, cinemas and bowling alleys as these uses require a substantial site to accommodate them. The study found that Leicester is well provided for in respect of these uses and there is not a need to plan for additional floorspace to accommodate them.

However, it did recognise that there was some potential to increase the ten-pin bowling provision within Leicester. However, this must be considered in the context of the existing Hollywood Bowl at Meridian Leisure Park located just outside of the Leicester authority area, which also serves the needs of Leicester residents.

Policy CT01 – Culture, Leisure and Tourism

393. **Is it clear what is meant by 'enhancing the local culture of the area' in criterion e) of Policy CT01, and would it be evident how a decision maker should judge proposals for cultural, leisure and tourism facilities against this requirement?**

The Council considers the meaning of criterion e) of Policy CT01 to be

clear. It is a matter of judgement on a site-by-site basis.

Policy CT02 – Assets of Community Value

394. **Does Policy CT02 serve a clear purpose in relation to proposals for development? Would it be evident to decision makers how the policy should be applied in determining applications for planning permission?**

Yes, the Council provides a list of assets that could be used to determine the planning applications against. A link to this can be provided in the supporting text to the page describing these assets. The inclusion of an asset as an ACV would be considered to be a material consideration in any development management decision.

Policy CT03 – Protection of Public Houses (Class Sui Generis)

395. **Would Policy CT03 be effective in enabling the protection of public houses in order to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments?**

Yes, this policy is robust and informed by advice from Campaign for Real Ale in Regulation 19 representations. The Council proposes a main modification to include 'and' between criteria a and b of this policy in order to make it clear that the criteria are to be read conjunctively.

396. **To be effective should applications fulfil the requirements of criteria 'a' and criteria 'b' in Policy CT03, rather than one or the other?**

See answer to 395 above.

Policy CT04 – Great Central Railway Museum

397. **Is Policy CT04 sufficiently robust and clear about what is expected from development at Red Hill Roundabout, particularly in terms of the type and scale of associated facilities for the proposed museum and park and ride, given the ecological and strategic importance of the site as part of a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and a green wedge, and its location**

within the setting of the nearby Grade II listed Mobil garage, and adjacent to the Belgrave allotments? Should the policy set specific standards and mitigation measures in respect of these constraints to ensure effectiveness, such as those set out for developments in the Central Development Area?

To be consistent with other draft site allocation policies in the Plan the Council would consider adding more detail in respect of constraints and mitigations to this policy. The Non-Strategic Sites Proposed for Allocation (SD/19) provides information on mitigation requirements that would be expected as part of the development.

398. Is the boundary of the site relating to Policy CT04, as shown on the Policies Map, justified in including part of the adjacent Belgrave allotments site?

No. This needs to be amended in the policies map as part of a Main Modification to remove the part of the site that covers the allotments. This should not have an impact on the overall scheme.

399. Is the last sentence of Policy CT04 clear and unambiguous regarding the type and scale of renewable energy proposals that would be permitted on the site?

The Council have referenced climate change policy CCFR01, in policy CT04, which sets out the expectation for renewable energy on development sites. Planning judgment will determine the type and scale of renewable energy proposals that would be permitted on site. This could vary depending on the nature of the proposal that came forward.

Policy CT05 – Provision of new and retention of existing Places of Worship

400. Is it clear what is meant in criterion a) of Policy CT05 by the 'appropriateness of the location in terms of meeting a local need' and is it evident how a decision maker would apply this principle to a proposal for a new place of worship?

The council considers that this would be a judgment which needs to be formed on a case-by-case basis. In view of this the council proposes to remove reference to meeting the local need in the policy which allows a more flexible approach to provision of places of worship.

401. How does Policy CT05 plan positively for the retention/unnecessary loss of existing places of worship?

The council would be happy to include reference to retention of existing places of worship within the policy.

Burial Space

402. Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan refers to the requirement for a new burial site between 2025-2030 to address the need for burial space in the city. Whilst paragraph 11.20 recognises burial space and appropriately designed facilities would be acceptable within green wedges and open spaces, no sites have been allocated in the Plan for the development of a new facility. In order to be positively prepared, should the Plan be allocating a site for new burial ground?

The city council have very tight boundaries, and as a result whilst it has maximised its housing supply a large amount has been exported to the districts. The tight boundary also means that there is very little scope to provide additional burial space within the city. In view of this, and the Council's burial strategy which identifies a need for burial space, the council have exported this need to Charnwood Borough Council. This is included within Charnwood Borough Council's latest Local Plan, which is set out in paragraph 3.229. This is also set out in paragraph 5.1 of Charnwood Submission Document SCG/8 'Statement of Common Ground - Leicester City Council (December 2021)'.