

## Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011

### Topic Response Analysis – First Deposit Version

#### Topic: Lapworth Kingswood Inset Plan

##### Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Site adjoining Clover Hill should be included within the Village Envelope.  
*5/AC Mrs Cristina Knight-Adams*
2. Kingswood Nurseries should be included within the Village Envelope  
*35/AA Verguti Franco; 56/AA Kathleen Chambers; 63/AA Patricia Harrison; 83/AA Hugh Steven Williams; 97/AA Sheila M Light; 100/AA J B Hale; 112/AA Jeffrey Masters; 118/AE Mr & Mrs G Bull; 119/AE Bloor Homes; 133/AA Norma Cole; 206/AA Graham Hames*
3. Kingswood Farm should be included within the Village Envelope.  
*56/AA Kathleen Chambers; 112/AA Jeffrey Masters; 206/AA Graham Hames*
4. Land off Broome Hall Lane should be included within the Village Envelope.  
*170/AA Mr Martin Wood*

##### Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The purpose of the Village Envelopes is to define the boundary of the built area of the settlement within which limited infilling, according to the spatial policies of the plan, will be appropriate.  
Structure Plan Policies GD.3 and GD.5 direct “most” new development to towns of over 8,000 people, firstly, within the existing built up area and then to easily accessible locations adjacent to these towns and outside the Green Belt. “Most” new development is defined as the whole of the migration element as well as an element of local needs which is proportionate to the number of people living in towns. In Warwick, this amounts to a requirement of 420 dwellings to meet the needs of the rural areas between 1996 and 2011. However, by April 2004, 1027 dwellings had already been built in the rural areas and a further 245 dwellings had the benefit of planning permission. For this reason, the Deposit Plan sought to restrict new housing in the rural areas to affordable housing. However, taking into account representations to Policy RAP.2, it is accepted that this policy is too restrictive and that some market housing should be allowed where there is evidence that this meets a local need.  
Structure Plan Policies RA.2 and RA.3 direct rural housing to areas within or adjacent to villages according to a hierarchy of settlements based on existing facilities, transport and job opportunities. This hierarchy should be defined in the Local Plan and any development should meet local needs, as identified by the community, and/or support communities.  
Structure Plan Policy GD.5 states that greenfield land should only be released for housing where there are no available sources of previously developed land and, in such cases, greenfield sites should only be released within or adjacent to towns with over 8,000 people.  
The identification of the Limited Growth Villages is based on the criteria in Structure Plan Policy RA.3. The boundaries of the Limited Growth Villages, are drawn to enclose the existing built up areas of the villages and, with the

exception of rural affordable housing under “exception housing” policy, new housing development in the Limited Growth Villages will only be permitted on previously developed land.

I agree that limited infill development within villages which have been washed over by “Green Belt” is acceptable in accordance with a Local Plan settlement policy. In the case of this Local Plan, the settlement policy would only allow the development of previously-developed land within the village envelope to meet local needs.

The site adjacent to Clover Hill is a greenfield site on the edge of the village within the Green Belt. The development of this site for housing would be contrary to national and Structure Plan policy

I do not agree, therefore, that the greenfield site adjacent to Clover Hill is suitable for housing development nor that, as such, the site should be included within the Lapworth/Kingswood Limited Growth Village boundary.

2&3 The purpose of the Village Envelopes is to define the boundary of the built area of the settlement within which limited infilling, according to the spatial policies of the plan, will be appropriate.

Structure Plan Policies GD.3 and GD.5 direct “most” new development to towns of over 8,000 people, firstly, within the existing built up area and then to easily accessible locations adjacent to these towns and outside the Green Belt. “Most” new development is defined as the whole of the migration element as well as an element of local needs which is proportionate to the number of people living in towns. In Warwick, this amounts to a requirement of 420 dwellings to meet the needs of the rural areas between 1996 and 2011. However, by April 2004, 1027 dwellings had already been built in the rural areas and a further 245 dwellings had the benefit of planning permission. For this reason, the Deposit Plan sought to restrict new housing in the rural areas to affordable housing. However, taking into account representations to Policy RAP.2, it is accepted that this policy is too restrictive and that some market housing should be allowed where there is evidence that this meets a local need.

Structure Plan Policies RA.2 and RA.3 direct rural housing to areas within or adjacent to villages according to a hierarchy of settlements based on existing facilities, transport and job opportunities. This hierarchy should be defined in the Local Plan and any development should meet local needs, as identified by the community, and/or support communities.

Structure Plan Policy GD.5 states that greenfield land should only be released for housing where there are no available sources of previously developed land and, in such cases, greenfield sites should only be released within or adjacent to towns with over 8,000 people.

The identification of the Limited Growth Villages is based on the criteria in Structure Plan Policy RA.3. The boundaries of the Limited Growth Villages are drawn to enclose the existing built up areas of the villages and, with the exception of rural affordable housing under “exception housing” policy, new housing development in the Limited Growth Villages will only be permitted on previously developed land. The site at Kingswood Nurseries was excluded from the village envelope because its primary use is a nursery garden and as such it’s use can be described as agricultural which is defined as “greenfield” in Annex C of Planning Policy Guidance 3 (Housing). Similarly, the site at Kingswood Farm is greenfield land.

The villages of Lapworth and Kingswood are “washed over” by the Green Belt designation. National policy on Green Belts in PPG2 allows for infill development

in such villages in accordance with a Local Plan settlement policy. In the case of this Local Plan, the settlement policy would only allow the development of previously-developed land within the village envelope to meet local needs.

The sites at Kingswood Nurseries and Kingswood Farm are greenfield sites on the edge of the village within the Green Belt. The development of these sites for housing would be contrary to national and Structure Plan policy

I do not agree, therefore, that the greenfield sites at Kingswood Nurseries and Kingswood Farm are suitable for housing development nor that, as such, the site should be included within the Lapworth/Kingswood Limited Growth Village boundary. The exclusion of the site at Kingswood Nurseries from the village envelope would not, however, necessarily exclude the possibility of a small affordable housing development under the policy exemptions for rural affordable housing in Policy RAP5.

4. The purpose of the Village Envelopes is to define the boundary of the built area of the settlement within which limited infilling, according to the spatial policies of the plan, will be appropriate.

Structure Plan Policies GD.3 and GD.5 direct “most” new development to towns of over 8,000 people, firstly, within the existing built up area and then to easily accessible locations adjacent to these towns and outside the Green Belt. “Most” new development is defined as the whole of the migration element as well as an element of local needs which is proportionate to the number of people living in towns. In Warwick, this amounts to a requirement of 420 dwellings to meet the needs of the rural areas between 1996 and 2011. However, by April 2004, 1027 dwellings had already been built in the rural areas and a further 245 dwellings had the benefit of planning permission. For this reason, the Deposit Plan sought to restrict new housing in the rural areas to affordable housing. However, taking into account representations to Policy RAP.2, it is accepted that this policy is too restrictive and that some market housing should be allowed where there is evidence that this meets a local need.

Structure Plan Policies RA.2 and RA.3 direct rural housing to areas within or adjacent to villages according to a hierarchy of settlements based on existing facilities, transport and job opportunities. This hierarchy should be defined in the Local Plan and any development should meet local needs, as identified by the community, and/or support communities.

Structure Plan Policy GD.5 states that greenfield land should only be released for housing where there are no available sources of previously developed land and, in such cases, greenfield sites should only be released within or adjacent to towns with over 8,000 people.

The identification of the Limited Growth Villages is based on the criteria in Structure Plan Policy RA.3. The boundaries of the Limited Growth Villages, are drawn to enclose the existing built up areas of the villages and, with the exception of rural affordable housing under “exception housing” policy, new housing development in the Limited Growth Villages will only be permitted on previously developed land.

The villages of Lapworth and Kingswood are “washed over” by the Green Belt designation. National policy on Green Belts in PPG2 allows for infill development in such villages in accordance with a Local Plan settlement policy. In the case of this Local Plan, the settlement policy would only allow the development of previously-developed land within the village envelope to meet local needs.

The land at Broom Hall Lane is greenfield land on the edge of the village within the Green Belt. The development of this site for housing would be contrary to

<p>national and Structure Plan policy I do not agree, therefore, that the land at Broom Hall Lane is suitable for housing development nor that, as such, the site should be included within the Lapworth/Kingswood Limited Growth Village boundary.</p>
<p><b>Recommended revision(s)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No change</li> <li>2. No change</li> <li>3. No change</li> <li>4. No change</li> </ol>

### Topic: Barford Inset Plan

#### Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Object to change to boundary at Little Watchbury  
12/AA Ken & Anne Hope; 52/AH Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council
2. Object to changes at "The Villas", Hareway Lane; Barford Lodge, Church Lane; and land r/o Mill Lane.  
52/AH Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council
3. Village envelope should not include area alongside Sherbourne Nursery  
115/AC Alan Roberts; 52/AH Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council
4. Land at Oldham's Transport should be included within the Village Envelope  
289/AA Taylor Woodrow Devts; 292/AA and 293/AA Oldhams Transport Ltd; 52/AH Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council

#### Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The boundary of "Little Watchbury" was straightened to reflect the more restrictive rural development policies in the Structure Plan. However it is accepted that the boundary would be more precisely defined if it followed the line of the boundary to "Little Watchbury"
2. The purpose of the changes to the Barford Village Envelope boundary is to redefine the fringe of the existing built up area of the village in order to reflect the more restrictive Structure Plan rural housing policies which guide this Local Plan. Structure Plan Policies GD.3 and GD.5 direct "most" new development to towns of over 8,000 people, firstly, within the existing built up area and then to easily accessible locations adjacent to these towns and outside the Green Belt. "Most" new development is defined as the whole of the migration element as well as an element of local needs which is proportionate to the number of people living in towns. In Warwick, this amounts to a requirement of 420 dwellings to meet the needs of the rural areas between 1996 and 2011. However, by April 2004, 1027 dwellings had already been built in the rural areas and a further 245 dwellings had the benefit of planning permission. For this reason, the Deposit Plan sought to restrict new housing in the rural areas to affordable housing. However, taking into account representations to Policy RAP.2, it is accepted that this policy is too

restrictive and that some market housing should be allowed where there is evidence that this meets a local need.

Structure Plan Policies RA.2 and RA.3 direct rural housing to areas within or adjacent to villages according to a hierarchy of settlements based on existing facilities, transport and job opportunities. This hierarchy should be defined in the Local Plan and any development should meet local needs, as identified by the community, and/or support communities.

The identification of the Limited Growth Villages is based on the criteria in Structure Plan Policy RA.3. The boundaries of the Limited Growth Villages, are drawn to enclose the existing built up areas of the villages. With the exception of rural affordable housing under “exception housing” policy, new housing development in the Limited Growth Villages will only be permitted on previously developed land.

The reasons for the changes to the village envelope boundary are as follows:

- a) The Villas, Hareway Lane  
This property is excluded because it relates to development along the south side of Hareway Lane which appear more rural in character than property on High Street.
- b) Barford Lodge, Church Lane  
This property is included as it relates to other properties on Church Lane.
- c) Land adj. The Cottage, Mill Lane  
This area of land was included within the village envelope to regularise and “round off” the boundary to the built up area. However it is open land and could be excluded from within the village envelope.
3. It is agreed that this area of land between 20 Mill Lane and Sherbourne Nursery forms part of a tree belt and should be excluded
4. Part of the Oldhams Transport site is to be compulsorily purchased for the Barford bypass. The remaining site area will be insufficient for the company to carry out its business and will become vacant. The site will therefore be available for redevelopment and a mixed use scheme (housing and employment) is likely to be the most appropriate use of the site. This will allow for an element of employment to be provided as well as providing an opportunity to deliver affordable housing. The viability of an employment scheme is likely to be dependent upon the ability to incorporate an element of market housing. A Village Survey has been carried out and the results will help determine the nature of a scheme. If a satisfactory mixed use scheme is to be viable the development site will need to extend beyond the village envelope as redrawn in the Deposit Plan. It is proposed, therefore to adjust the village envelope boundary around the area of Oldham’s Transport which will become available for development following the compulsory purchase of part of the site for the bypass.

#### **Recommended revision(s)**

1. Change the village envelope boundary to follow the boundary of “Little Watchbury”
2. Exclude the area of land rear of Mill Lane from within the village envelope.
3. Exclude this part of the “tree belt” from within the village envelope
4. Amend boundary to include within the village envelope the area of Oldham’s Transport which will become available for redevelopment following the compulsory purchase of part of the site for Barford bypass

## **Topic: Airport Safeguarding Composite**

### **Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. Plan should state that wind farms are inappropriate anywhere in Warwick District  
*148/BZ Campaign to Protect Rural England*

### **Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised**

1. The Airport Safeguarding Composite Inset Plan indicates the areas where certain types of development proposals will be the subject of consultation with the relevant aerodrome or technical site operator in accordance with ODPM Circular 01/2003. It does not identify types of development which are inappropriate. In terms of wind farms, therefore, proposals for such development in the identified area will be the subject of consultation with the relevant statutory body – either the airport or the operators of the Honiley Beacon Technical Site.  
Government policy in Planning Policy Statement 22 (Renewable Energy) states in paragraph 1 that “Renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily. Regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources.” Policy DP12a of the Plan addresses the issue of renewable energy developments.

### **Recommended revision(s)**

1. No change