

CPRE Leicestershire

Annual Report 2023/24

Introduction

The main activities of CPRE Leicestershire are to promote and encourage the improvement and protection of the Leicestershire countryside for the benefit of everyone.

These activities are achieved in part by monitoring, commenting and supporting or objecting, as appropriate, to Local Plans, transport policy and planning applications.

Some of the latter are brought to our attention by CPRE members, Parish Councils and the public. Over the last year representatives of the branch have also attended and joined in discussions at formal hearings concerning the Charnwood and Leicester Local Plans and the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI).

The branch also advises on Neighbourhood Plans and responds to local and national Consultations.

Structure and Governance

CPRE Leicestershire is constituted as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO), which is a financially independent charity related to the national CPRE charity and is managed and run on a voluntary basis, by a committee of trustees. Serving on a continuous basis for a maximum of six years. They are selected by the committee subject to confirmation of their positions annually at the Annual General Meeting (AGM).

Trustees

The branch has gone through significant change in its board of trustees over the past year.

The Chair, Tony Stott and Treasurer, Tony Simpson, both stood down in November 2023, having reached the end of their six-year tenure of being trustees. Their substantial contributions are recognised and the branch expresses its deep appreciation for their hard work over the years.

Martin Cooper stepped up to become Interim Chair in December 2023 and he initiated the recruitment process for both a new Chair and a new Treasurer. This was in addition to his volunteer co-ordination work. Our gratitude is extended to Martin for his dedication in leading the organisation during this period. Due to other life commitments, Martin decided to step down from the branch in June 2024.

In December 2023, we welcomed a new Treasurer, Priyanka Jeswani, who brought her finance expertise into the branch. Unfortunately, other life priorities resulted in Priyanka stepping down in April 2024.

Two new trustees, Paul O'Donnell and Rowena Reid joined us in February 2024 and April 2024 respectively. Paul helped with developing branch governance policy priorities, building on his commercial experience and Rowena brought small business expertise into the branch. Due to other work commitments, Rowena and Paul chose to stand down as trustees in November and December respectively.

Our new Chair, Adrian Jarvis, joined the branch in July 2024. Adrian brings 40 years of business experience in the energy sector in the UK, EU and US, including ensuring responsible stewardship of the environment when hosting critical national infrastructure. He has spent the first six months of his tenure understanding the challenges and opportunities for the branch, identifying how the branch needs to develop and setting up an initial strategy for 2025 and 2026. He has spent time developing a network with other local branches, the national office and other like-minded organisations with whom we may work in future.

Our second Treasurer of the year, Danielle Bland, joined us in September 2024 and she produced a draft of the financial statements within this Annual Report. Due to work commitments, Danielle unfortunately had to step down as Treasurer in December 2024. Our thanks are extended to Danielle for her contribution in the short time she spent with us.

Our long-standing trustees, Rita Bullivant, Rahoul Naik and John Marriott continued their supportive contribution to the branch, notably in the areas of recruitment, vision document design and responses to local plans, major developments and development consultations. Their sustained commitment and dedication to the branch have been greatly appreciated.

During December 2024, two further changes occurred. Anne Thomas Hughes was appointed as a new Trustee and Rahoul Naik decided to stand down, due to work commitments. The branch trustees would like to thank Rahoul for his extensive effort in the marketing and technology work for the branch. He was also instrumental in the design of the final vision document. While Rahoul will no longer be a trustee, he will be remaining as a member of the branch and will continue to support the branch as it plans the launch of the vision during 2025.

We would also like to extend a warm welcome to Anne, whose business experience and passion for the countryside will be an invaluable asset as the branch moves forward in 2025 and beyond.

Also, for information, our Branch Administrator, Jill Prior, stood down from her role in October 2024. Jill has been a great asset to the branch and her knowledge and skills will be missed. Jill's successor, Sarah Cunningham, joined the branch in September 2024 and she is already making her mark with keeping the branch organised.

The vacancy for Treasurer will be unfilled leading up to the 2023/24 AGM, to be held in January 2025. As an interim solution, Tony Simpson, who remains a member of CPRE Leicestershire, is providing the branch trustees with his advice and support with regard to financial best practices. The branch is once again grateful for Tony's support. Tony will be invited to rejoin the branch as Treasurer at the AGM, in line with the branch Constitution.

Following these changes, the trustees at January 2025 are as follows:

- Adrian Jarvis (appointed July 2024)
- Rita Bullivant
- John Marriott
- Anne Thomas Hughes (appointed December 2024)

Branch Activities

The branch has participated in a number of consultations throughout the year, notably Hinckley Rail Freight, the new National Planning Policy Framework and the Charnwood Local Plan. Full details of this vital work are set out in Appendix A. Members are encouraged to read this and to contribute to future work. They should contact any of the trustees for further information regarding how to get involved.

National CPRE

Buckingham Palace confirmed that His Majesty King Charles III will continue as Patron of CPRE.

The President of CPRE, Mary-Ann Ochota, sends this [message of thanks](https://www.youtube.com/shorts/nOSatF14fO4) (<https://www.youtube.com/shorts/nOSatF14fO4>) to all our members, supporters and volunteers.

National CPRE have many campaigns underway, including:

- New government – building relationships with new MPs.
- Rooftop solar power – unlock cheap, clean energy and protect the countryside.
- National Planning Policy Framework – shape the debate around rooftop solar, affordable social housing, brownfield priority, protecting Green Belt (and local countryside) and raise the profile of local voices.
- Planning system and the energy transition – clean energy infrastructure while protecting nature.
- Affordable homes – Advocacy for a countryside in which everyone can afford to live.
- Our countryside next door – celebrating the Green Belt and improving access.
- Making a local impact – countryside projects, such as ‘Hedgerow Heroes’.

Our trustee, Rahul Naik, appeared on the national [CPRE website](#), representing Leicestershire in a series of stories about making a local impact. This was a helpful promotion of the branch, the local countryside and our community.

Trustees attended a range of national meetings, including the national Annual General Meeting, along with sessions of the Planning Campaign Group, the CPRE Assembly, Chairs Chat with colleagues from other branches and the national CPRE Chair.

One of the trustees joined a small group of like-minded members in other branches to review the national CPRE transport policy and flag up the importance for CPRE to press for the close integration of land-use and transport policy. There is now some indication that the new government recognises this is important.

What 2025 and beyond will bring

Our work has never been more important.

The changes in the leadership team and the policies being developed by the new Labour government will enable us to make a strategic pivot into implantation of the branch vision. It won't be easy, but the benefits to the countryside and the community will be worth the effort.

Due to the potential increase in developments aligned to new government policies, Planning will remain a core part of what the branch does. We will be looking to increase the capacity and capabilities of the branch, so we can become more impactful in our work with influencing policymakers, respond effectively to formal consultations and become more supportive of decisions that enable responsible stewardship of our countryside.

We will also look to launch a set of interesting and beneficial countryside projects which will enable volunteers to become more active in work that will directly benefit the countryside, the local community and the responsible implementation of national and local policies.

In order to develop the capabilities, capacity and availability needed for the above, we are undertaking an organisational review to ensure we set ourselves up for future success, in 2025, our 2026 centenary year and beyond.

The branch will be communicating directly with members during 2025 in order to establish the level of interest in becoming more engaged in countryside matters.

Watch this space for some interesting, exciting and beneficial projects!

FINANCIAL REVIEW: YEAR-ENDING 31st MARCH 2024

The Branch's full Accounts for the year ending 31st March 2024, including a detailed analysis of income and expenditure, are disclosed in a separate report, which (subject to the approval of the members) will be filed with the Charity Commission. The main points to note are as follows:

The Charity recorded a surplus of £27,243 on its regular activities for the year, compared with a surplus of £5,811 in y/e 31/3/23. At the beginning of the financial year a surplus of £13,495 was forecast – hence the result was £13,748 better than anticipated. The main reasons for this variance are as follows:

Income (£15,636 higher than forecast):

- o Donations were forecast at £12,500, but a total of £25,734 were actually received, a difference of £13,234.
- o The Branch's share of national income was £6,118 compared to a forecast of £4,860 - £1,258 more income.
- o The Branch's share of the distribution of regional funds was £995 higher than forecast.

Expenditure (£1,888 higher than forecast):

- o Consultancy costs were £7,616 compared to an original budget of £5,000, an excess of £2,616.
- o Admin expenditure was only £1,471 versus a budget of £2,500 – an underspend of £1,029.

In addition to its regular activities, the Charity also incurred costs of £275 in the year on the Leicestershire Vision. As all income relating to the Vision had been recognised in previous financial year, this gave additional expenditure for the Charity as a whole of that amount, resulting in an overall result for the period of net income of £26,968, as can be seen in the Accounts. Some of the remaining £7,804 to be spent on the Vision, (notably for the design of the final document) is expected to take place in financial year 24/25. The remaining balance will be used to formally launch the vision toward the end of 24/45 and into 25/26.

The assets of the Charity at 31/3/24 amounted to £77,944, compared with £50,977 at the end of the previous year. This total comprised bank balances as follows:

	As at 31/3/24 £	As at 31/3/23 £
Business account	35,544	18,875
Savings account	42,400	32,102
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	77,944	50,977
	<hr/>	<hr/>

The Charity had no amounts either receivable or payable at 31/3/24.

APPENDIX 1 – BRANCH ACTIVITIES

A major concern for the Branch continues to be the loss of excessive amounts of greenfield land for development. The branch has put significant effort into trying to influence the planning process driven by a desire to promote better use of underused land and reduce the amount of traffic generated by new developments to minimise congestion.

This has mainly been done through the Local Plan process which has included appearing in person at a number of formal public planning Examinations. Changes to the planning system mean that more decisions are being taken at a national level, which removes or reduces the ability of local input being able to influence of what goes where and why.

Proposed changes to Local Government

The Government has announced it will invite all two-tier local authority areas, including Leicestershire, to restructure into unitary authorities. It is also proposing to create larger strategic authorities with mayors. The outcome of this process is uncertain, but it will clearly have implications for land-use planning and transport. It may also see Leicestershire disappear as a local authority.

In the County of Leicestershire, the seven District Councils are currently the Local Planning Authorities (LPAs). They deal with most aspects of land-use planning. The County Council is the Local Highway Authority (LHA) and the Local Transport Authority (LTA) for its administrative area. As LHA, it is also a Statutory Consultee on planning applications; specifically with regard to road safety and access to the road network.

The City of Leicester, in the middle of the county, is a Unitary Authority and is both a Planning and Highway/Transport Authority.

Current issues

The main demand for greenfield land comes from housing, logistics and solar farms.

The previous government had long-standing proposals to deliver 300,000 homes per year nationally, although actual rates have been far lower than that for many years. In December, the government announced a new methodology for calculating housing need which nationally increases the desired level above that included in current Local Plans.

CPRE is one of many organisations that has criticised the methodology and argued that it will not solve the lack of houses which people can afford to buy or rent. Much blame has been directed at the planning system for low housing delivery, but in many areas, including Leicestershire, the shortfall is caused by slow buildout rates, not a lack of planning permissions.

Over the last decade or so, there has been a significant increase in the development of large-scale logistics warehouses in Leicestershire. Its central position in the country's strategic road network makes it convenient to serve many other areas. A large area in three counties has been designated as a Freeport around East Midlands Airport. There is little clarity regarding

what this might entail. There has also been a rapid growth in solar farms, with ever-larger sites being proposed.

Green Belt land, which has benefited from greater protection under the planning system, is now frequently mentioned as it comes under greater pressure for development. While there is no Green Belt land in Leicestershire, the county abuts Green Belt land in Nottinghamshire along the River Soar near Kegworth and in Warwickshire, along the A5.

In the 1980s, the Leicestershire Structure Plan introduced Green Wedges around Leicester to maintain some separation, but these do not have the same protection as Green Belt and they are gradually being eroded by development proposals and lost.

Current development proposals mean that there will soon be continuous development along the A6 from Great Glen to Hathern with a reasonable possibility this could extend to the airport and the River Trent. There is now a distinct possibility of a near continuous swathe of development extending from Great Glen to Fenny Drayton and the A5, near Nuneaton.

Planning Policy

National planning policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There have been frequent revisions and the latest was in December 2024. It is a rather ambiguous document with conflicting statements and priorities.

The County, City and District produced a Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) in 2018 for the whole area, for the period up to 2050. A notable omission was any consideration of Climate Change. A key feature of the SGP was a 40km dual carriageway Expressway around the south and east of Leicester, from the M69 Junction 2 north-east of Hinckley, to the A46 at Thrussington. It was envisaged that much development would take place around this road with some more concentrated around East Midlands Airport. In 2021, the sub-national transport body, Midlands Connect, said there was no strategic case for an Expressway, but the SGP remains unchanged. The area around the airport has since been designated as a Freeport and this includes land in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.

National Planning Policy sets targets for the delivery of new houses based on an assessment of need and these need to be included in Local Plans. If a local planning authority (LPA) cannot demonstrate it has granted planning permission to deliver sufficient housing over a five-year period, it opens the door for speculative applications outside the normal Local Plan process. The LPA is likely to find it difficult to refuse such applications and faces the prospect that many are likely to be granted approval on Appeal.

The initial stage of the Local Plan process is a 'call for sites' where land is offered up for development by landowners, or others with an interest in the land. The Planning Authority then must choose which sites it should include in the Local Plan. In effect, the 'planning' is driven by land interests and not by pragmatic analysis.

Leicester City Council considers that it cannot meet its housing need within its boundary. Current government policy requires local authorities to co-operate to resolve such matters and

each of the seven county districts has agreed to take a proportion of the housing demand which the City states it cannot meet. The proposed changes to local government would present different challenges.

Many people and organisations, including CPRE, recognise that housing targets do not deliver houses. The rate at which houses are built is largely determined by developers/ builders with an interest in maximising profit. A common claim from the government is that building more houses will make them more affordable, but that suggests prices will fall. In an open market, this would require an excess, which seems improbable and unlikely to find favour with existing owners. It is evident that only a strong commitment to delivering more social housing on a significant scale can produce truly affordable houses.

Many people are increasingly concerned about the lack of facilities and infrastructure to cope with the growth of development and the loss of so much greenfield land. An increasingly common ploy by developers is to argue that various things that sites were supposed to contribute to or provide cannot be delivered because the site is no longer viable. This puts even more strain on existing public facilities, which are already struggling to cope, for example hospitals, medical services, schools and transport.

Our recent involvement

Charnwood Local Plan

The formal Examination of Charnwood Local Plan started in June 2022 and the last public session was in February 2024. Two factors have significantly delayed the Examination and these are ongoing:

- Housing need assessment.
- Infrastructure funding and delivery, particularly in relation to the impact of travel and its mitigation.

At the time of writing, the Examination Inspectors have yet to submit their report.

An issue regarding housing provision was raised the day after the Examination opened. This concerned the provision of a relatively trivial addition of 78 homes per year, over a previously assessed need for 1111. This arose because of a change in the assessment methodology which the City Council said it could not accommodate.

Recent Borough Council Monitoring Reports showed that it was unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable sites, despite having given outline planning permission for three very large housing developments at Loughborough (3200 dwellings in 2020), Thurmaston (4500 in 2016) and Rothley (1950 in 2020). Work on all of these has now started, but fewer than 400 have been completed to date. More large-scale development is underway in Shepshed on several sites and there is more in other locations. The Monitoring Reports recognised that the supply

was being impeded by slow progress on the buildout of sites. The Council continues to use the forecast low rates of completions provided by developers.

In July 2024, the current government issued a new draft housing need methodology. Just twenty-six authorities nationwide, including many cities like Leicester, had a cut in their housing need. Charnwood was one of very few other areas to receive a cut. In December 2024, a revised methodology cut the need still further. It is now evident that the delay to the Plan of several months was unnecessary.

With regard to transport, CPRE Leicestershire has expressed various concerns about the approach taken by the County Council. It has sought some contributions from developers to increase the capacity of the road network, but has done very little to encourage development to be designed and located in places where it would reduce the need to travel by car. It also has a desire to increase the capacity of the A6 and Epinal Way through Loughborough, which has been identified as a priority. It is evident that the schemes proposed have been poorly designed and that any additional capacity would have a very short lifetime. Works to alter M1 Junction 23 were completed in 2021, but these are now deemed inadequate.

It may be that these concerns led to the withdrawal of most transport elements of the Infrastructure Schedule immediately after the Examination started. These were replaced by a vague concept of three 'Transport Strategy' areas. There is still no clarity regarding the funding or delivery of these.

In mid-2024, the County Council consulted on a proposed methodology that the Borough Council could use to obtain funding from new developments for some transport proposals. This approach was subsequently withdrawn because the Borough Council decided to seek a formal Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is used by many authorities outside Leicester and Leicestershire. The process for this is expected to take at least 18 months.

A key requirement for the Examination of a Local Plan is to show that it is effective, viable and deliverable. The Examination Inspectors now must decide whether the Charnwood Local Plan can be approved with the proposed modifications or whether more fundamental changes are required.

Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI)

A developer submitted a proposal for several large warehouses and a rail freight terminal to the north-east of Hinckley. The site lies between the M69 and the Leicester – Hinckley railway line. The development is of a type and scale that it is regarded as nationally significant. This means it goes through a Development Consent Order (DCO) process conducted by the government's Planning Inspectorate and the ultimate decision is made by the Secretary of State, in this case for transport. The DCO process is also used for developments like large solar farms. The process is intended to be short with most information being in the form of written submissions. There is little scope for discussion and it is unclear whether the Inspectors have the necessary competences to properly understand and evaluate some technical details, particularly related to transport issues.

Perhaps surprisingly, a rail freight terminal does not have to be served by trains from the outset or at all. It must only have the capability of being served by rail. The site has been promoted assuming that trains would bring some containers to the site from seaports such as Felixstowe, Southampton or Tilbury and there are already several other rail terminals in the vicinity (Kegworth, Crick, and Tamworth). There is a strong likelihood that a considerable amount of the incoming freight and almost all the outgoing freight and all other traffic would use the road network. It is unclear from where staff would be drawn, but the location of the site means that most employees would be most likely to travel to the site by car.

The proposal includes a new road link between M69 Junction 2 and the A47. The M69 junction would need to be modified by the addition of two south facing slip roads which could radically change traffic flows in the surrounding area. These slip roads were not built when the M69 opened, because of concerns about traffic using unsatisfactory roads, particularly those through Sapcote and Stoney Stanton. This concern is even more valid now, given congestion around Junction 21, Leicester and Hinckley. CPRE Leicestershire and Sapcote Parish Council produced a co-ordinated response with assistance from a consultant.

M69 Junction 2 is the location of the southern end of the SGP's Expressway proposal for a route around the south and east of Leicester. The prospect of a link between M69 Junction 2 and a potential new Junction 20a on the M1, has already generated proposals for major housing development adjacent to both junctions. This demonstrates the need to consider transport and land-use together, which is not a feature of the current planning system. The impact of adding the slip roads for the HNRFI development on roads such as the M1, M69 and A5 could have very serious consequences for the local and strategic road network. The local and national highway authorities have attempted to use traffic modelling to forecast future traffic patterns, but CPRE has many concerns regarding the processes used, the outcomes and the lack of transparency.

The Inspectors recommended that the DCO should be rejected for several reasons, including the impact of traffic through M1 Junction 21 / M69. In September 2024, the previous Secretary of State (Louise Haigh) indicated that she was 'minded to refuse' consent for the development, but invited further comments from the developer. These have now been submitted and further comments are now invited regarding these.

Leicester Local Plan

CPRE submitted extensive comments on the Plan during its development process. Major concerns included proposals to allocate land which had been identified as Green Wedges for development and the seeming lack of desire to encourage a form of development which showed any commitment to seeking to reduce the need to travel by car. A recent development at Ashton Green, south of Thurmaston, has no bus service and no facilities apart from an existing primary school. Despite its location within the city boundary, it shows how car use and storage dominates the design. The Plan also proposed developing another large site north of the A46 bypass and adjacent to the Thurmaston Conservation Area. Delivery of houses in that part of

Leicester has been extremely slow for several decades and the allocation of both sites at this stage is premature. CPRE considers that insufficient regard is being paid to making much better use of disused and underused land and properties within the city with the prospect of more requiring new uses.

At the Examination, the City Council said it considered that all the necessary infrastructure was in place for the developments and therefore the Plan did not need to demonstrate how it would secure the funding and delivery of additional infrastructure. The Inspectors appeared concerned about that approach. The need for an effective traffic and travel solution for development at Beaumont Leys was recognised over forty years ago with concerns about traffic using minor roads in Birstall and Anstey. Such concerns are now widespread, with extensive developments either already built, in progress or proposed that would significantly increase traffic, without appropriate solutions.

The Inspectors' report is awaited.

Other Local Plans

CPRE has made comments recently on plans for Hinckley, Northwest Leicestershire and Harborough which have yet to be finalised. These comments were made regarding the experience with the Leicester and Charnwood Local Plans.

All three authorities have also chosen to allocate sites in locations where there is little prospect of being able access or use existing facilities without access to a car. The County Council, as Local Transport Authority, has seemingly not discouraged this approach. It continues to maintain a belief that some impacts can be mitigated by seeking contributions from developers to slightly increase the capacity of a few junctions.

An ongoing problem with the Hinckley Plan relates to protracted discussions relating to contributions for such works for two long-standing development proposals and the seeming impossibility of dealing with traffic issues on the A5. It is evident that the County and District authorities have given virtually no consideration to the delivery and funding of measures that could reduce the traffic and travel generated from new and existing developments.

Following the decision by Charnwood Borough to go through the process of introducing a CIL, it seems likely that other Districts might follow that lead.

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Leicestershire Branch)

Registered Charity Number 1164985

Financial Statements

Year Ending 31st March 2024

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Leicestershire Branch)
Receipts and Payments
Year Ending 31st March 2024

	Year ending 31/3/24			Year ending 31/3/23		
	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £	Total Funds £	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £	Total Funds £
RECEIPTS						
Branch share of national income	6,118	-	6,118	5,150	-	5,150
Branch share of regional funds	5,245	-	5,245	-	-	-
Bank interest received	298	-	298	71	-	71
Donations received	25,734	-	25,734	12,700	-	12,700
	<u>37,395</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>37,395</u>	<u>17,921</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>17,921</u>
PAYMENTS						
Subscriptions	440	-	440	190	-	190
Newsletter	-	-	-	511	-	511
Travel expenses	53	-	53	-	-	-
Room hire	-	-	-	30	-	30
Marketing and communications	-	-	-	54	-	54
AGMs	238	-	238	131	-	131
Office expenses	1,471	275	1,746	2,616	100	2,716
Insurance	335	-	335	322	-	322
Consultancy	7,616	-	7,616	8,256	882	9,138
Research	-	-	-	-	200	200
	<u>10,153</u>	<u>275</u>	<u>10,428</u>	<u>12,110</u>	<u>1,182</u>	<u>13,292</u>
NET RECEIPTS/PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR	27,242	(275)	26,967	5,811	(1,182)	4,629
Transfers between funds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net assets at end of previous year	42,871	8,106	50,977	37,060	9,288	46,348
Net assets at end of current year	70,113	7,831	77,944	42,871	8,106	50,977

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Leicestershire Branch)
Statement of Assets and Liabilities
As at 31st March 2024

	As at 31/3/24			As at 31/3/23		
	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £	Total Funds £	Unrestricted Funds £	Restricted Funds £	Total Funds £
CURRENT ASSETS						
Cash at bank and in hand	70,113	7,831	77,944	42,871	8,106	50,977
LIABILITIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
NET ASSETS	<u>70,113</u>	<u>7,831</u>	<u>77,944</u>	<u>42,871</u>	<u>8,106</u>	<u>50,977</u>

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Leicestershire Branch)

Notes to the Accounts

Year Ending 31 March 2024

1. Basis of Preparation of Financial Statements

The financial statements are prepared under the historical cost convention and in accordance with the Financial Reporting Standard for Smaller Entities (effective January 2015).

The accounts have been prepared on a receipts and payments basis, rather than an accruals basis, permissible given that the gross income of the charity is less than £250,000 for the year.

2. Assets and Liabilities

At the beginning and end of the financial year the Charity's only assets were its bank account balances. No liabilities existed at either date.

3. Restricted Funds

In financial year 20/21 the Charity received a grant of £10,000 from the Strategic Collaboration Fund of the CPRE. This is being used to fulfill three key objectives for CPRE Leicestershire:

- (1) To strengthen relationships with other, like-minded organisations, creating and building collaboration by means of shared working;
- (2) To create a Vision for CPRE Leicestershire; and
- (3) To revise the Charity's Strategic Plan.

The attainment of these objectives - and therefore the utilisation of the grant received - is expected to make progress during 2024/25, with all work related to the grant to be completed during 2025.



Section A

Independent Examiner's Report

Report to the trustees/
members of

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Leicestershire Branch)

On accounts for the year
ended

31/03/2024

Charity no
(if any)

1164985

Set out on pages

4-5

(Remember to include the page numbers of additional sheets)

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of the above charity ("the Trust") for the year ended 31 / 03/ 2024.

Responsibilities and
basis of report

As the charity's trustees, you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ("the Act").

I report in respect of my examination of the Trust's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination, I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent
examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no material matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination which gives me cause to believe that in, any material respect:

- the accounting records were not kept in accordance with section 130 of the Charities Act; or
- the accounts did not accord with the accounting records; or
- the accounts did not comply with the applicable requirements concerning the form and content of accounts set out in the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 other than any requirement that the accounts give a 'true and fair' view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

Signed:

Date:

14.01.25

Name:

ANTONY HUMPHREYS

Relevant professional
qualification(s) or body
(if any):

ICAEW
(Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales)
8710624

Address:

Rose Villa, 42 Glebe Street, Loughborough, Leicestershire, LE11 1JR

Section B**Disclosure**

Only complete if the examiner needs to highlight material matters of concern (see CC32, Independent examination of charity accounts: directions and guidance for examiners).

Give here brief details of any items that the examiner wishes to disclose.