

Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011

Topic Response Analysis – First Deposit Version

Topic: CH 10 OM – Chapter 10 Omissions

Summary of matters raised in objections.

Housing

1. **Oldhams, Barford** – Site should be considered as an exceptions site for affordable housing (Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Council ref: 52 AG).
2. **Kingswood Nurseries** – Site should be allocated for residential development. (Mr. and Mrs. G Bull ref: 118/AF, Bloor Homes Ltd ref: 119/AF, J Masters ref: 112/AB).
3. **Former Council Depot, Norton Lindsey** – Site should be allocated for housing development (Langstone Homes Ltd ref: 117/AU).
4. **Woodside Farm, Whitnash** – Land adjacent to farm should be allocated for residential development (Thomas Bates and Sons Ltd ref: 153/AC).
5. **Howes Lane, Stoneleigh** – Site should be allocated for residential development (Mrs. E Brown ref: 167/AB).
6. **South West Warwick** - Site should be allocated for housing development (Taylor Woodrow ref: 200AA).
7. **Land at Golf Lane** - Site should be allocated for residential development (David Wilson Homes ref: 227/AC).
8. **Land at Milverton** - Land should be allocated as a sustainable urban extension to Leamington Spa to meet housing needs (George Wimpey ref: 240/AD).
9. **Land at Leek Wootton** - Land should be allocated for affordable housing development, cross subsidised by market housing (Warwickshire Police ref: 288/AG).
10. **Campion Hills, Lillington** - Land should be allocated for residential development and taken out of the green belt (H E Johnson ref: 290/AB).

Employment

1. **Sydenham Industrial Estate** - Uses on the site should be limited to those within use class B1. (J Norris ref: 247/AA, Robyn Dorling ref: 172/AA, W Halliday ref: 173/AA, Dr J M Corbett ref: 174/AA, Graham and Ellen Spencer ref: 175/AA, K Galley ref: 176/AA, Arne Haugerud ref: 177/AA, Robert Bell ref: 178/AA, Anne Oliver ref: 179/AA, Mrs J Masters ref: 180/AA, Melanie Willetts ref: 181/AA, Pauline Urwin ref: 182/AA, Angela Corbett ref: 183/AA, Mr R G and Mrs B Dee ref: 184/AA, Miss Karen Hales ref: 185/AA, Patrick Wilson 186/AA).
2. **Land between Rowley Road and A45** - Land should be safeguarded for the future employment needs of Coventry (Coventry City Council ref: 243/AB).

Mixed Use

1. **Oldhams, Barford** - Site should be allocated for mixed use development (Taylor Woodrow Ltd ref: 289/AB, Oldhams Transport ref: 293/AB).

2. **Montague Road, Warwick** - Land should be allocated for mixed use development (Warwickshire County Council ref: 104/AA).
3. **Dalehouse Lane / Common Lane** - Site should be allocated for mixed use development (Mr. D and Mrs. M A Hunter ref: 166/AB, Kenilworth Society ref: 221/BG).
4. **Land at Queensway** – Land should be allocated for mixed use development. (Deeley Properties ref: 219/AE).
5. **Lower Heathcote Farm** - Land should be allocated as an 'area of search' for mixed use development post 2011 (Gallagher Estates Ltd ref: 229/AH).
6. **Land Southwest of Radford Semele** - Land should be allocated for mixed use development (T & N Limited ref: 256/AF).
7. **Stratford Road, Warwick** - Land should be allocated for mixed use development (George Wimpey UK Ltd ref: 291/AD).

Community Uses

1. **Queens Sq, Warwick** - Land should be safeguarded for community / leisure uses (A Butcher ref: 218/AA).
2. **Shire Hall, Warwick** - Hall and adjoining law courts should remain in community / public use (Warwick Town Council ref: 266/AM).
3. **Charter Bridge Meeting Hall** - Plan should include site specific proposal for the redevelopment of the meeting hut (Warwick Sea Scouts ref: 126/AC).

Leisure/Recreation Uses

1. **Oaklands Farm** - Land should be allocated for leisure and recreation development including a marina (Mr. R Butler ref: 279/AA).
2. **Land between Charles St Bridge and Coventry Road Bridge** - Plan should provide for the development of this land as a marina (Warwick Town Council ref: 266/AN).

Other

1. **River Avon and River Leam** - Plan should safeguard an extension to the navigation network of the Upper Avon and recognise the potential of these rivers for navigation, tourism, recreation and leisure. (E Rose, A.I.N.A ref : 102/AA, D Newton Evans ref: 21/AA, British Waterways ref: 294/AD, A Butcher ref: 218/AD, Peter Webb ref: 169/AA, Guy Morgan ref: 165/AA, Andrew Guest ref: 23/AA, Ian Hunter ref: 125/AA, D Fitzhenry ref: 160/AA, Mrs A Higgins ref: 98/AA, J D Berrington ref: 101/AD, A N Estherby ref: 94/AA, D J Bezzant ref: 95/AA, David Higgins ref: 96/AA, Robert Mulgrue ref: 91/AA, William Worrall ref: 92/AA, F B Atcheson ref: 93/AA, Mrs M L Holroyd ref: 81/AA, J F Holroyd ref: 80/AA, Roger Clay ref: 88/AA, M C Burman ref: 90/AA, D Cottrell ref: 65/AA, National Association of Boat Owners ref: 73/AA, Brian Holt ref: 74/AA, Mark Bennett ref: 82/AA, I.W.A.A.C ref: 61/AA, I.W.A ref: 60/AA, Bancroft Cruisers ref: 51/AA, R G Braithwaite ref: 33/AA, Dr D N F Hall ref: 31/AA, Dudley Matthews ref: 32/AA, Peter Jones ref: 22/AA, R Harrison Lower Avon Navigation Trust ref: 8/AA, Geoffrey Holroyde ref: 3/AA).
2. **Warwick Castle Park** - There should be footpath access for the public through the site (Ramblers Association ref: 7/AC).

3. **Warwick Castle** - Plan should safeguard the line of the extension of the millennium path along the river Avon past this site (Stratford-upon-Avon Canal Society ref: 30AA).
4. **Tachbrook Road / Harbury Lane** - There should be provision for a new cycle /pedestrian way to link Tachbrook Rd to a new playing field on Harbury Rd (Graham Leeke ref: 45/AB).
5. **Park Farm, Banbury Road** - There should be provision for a new cycle /pedestrian way to link Tachbrook Rd to a new playing field on Harbury Rd (J Cockburn ref: 151/AA).
6. **Warwick Racecourse** - Plan should include policy to enable the improvement and development of facilities on the site (Racecourse Holdings Trust ref: 303/AK).

Major Sites.

1. **University of Warwick** - Plan should include specific policy dealing with development at this site. (Kenilworth Society ref: 221/BF, Kenilworth Town Council ref: 223/BG, West Midlands Planning and Transportation Sub-committee ref: 157/AA, Coventry City Council ref: 242/AL, University Of Warwick ref: 107/AB).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised Housing

1. **Oldhams, Barford**

The Oldhams site is a large employment site currently in use as a removals vehicle depot. Part of the site is required for the Barford bypass and will be compulsorily purchased for this use. The company has indicated that it will be looking to relocate the business as the remainder of the site will be inadequate to serve its needs.

Planning Policy Guidance 3 (Housing) states in paragraph 18 that rural exception sites "should be small, solely for affordable housing and on land within or adjoining existing rural communities which would not otherwise be released for general market housing" As a medium sized brownfield site, this site does not fall within the definition of a site which would be suitable for an exception site i.e. a small site which would not normally be released for housing. Revised Policy RAP2 allows for housing development on previously-developed land within the Limited Growth Villages where there is evidence that the development meets a local need.

2. **Kingswood Nurseries**

The housing land situation at 1st April 2004 shows that the sum of completions since 1996 and commitments at 1st April exceeds the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings between 1996 and 2011 (See Table in 4. below). This Plan does not therefore seek to increase the supply of housing by allocating sites for housing. Furthermore, should land be required for housing, there are brownfield sites in more sustainable locations in the urban areas of Leamington, Warwick and Kenilworth which more successfully meet the aims of Planning Policy Guidance 3 (paragraph 32) in terms of the allocation and release of housing for development.

There is no evidence of any other planning reasons why the site should be

allocated such as the ability to meet a rural housing need as demonstrated in an up-to-date housing needs assessment.

3. Former Council Depot, Norton Lindsey

This site was granted planning permission on 3rd December 2004 by the First Secretary of State following an appeal against the refusal of planning permission.

4. Woodside Farm, Whitnash

Updated information on the supply of housing land demonstrates that sufficient land can be identified to meet the needs of the district up to 2011 without allocations of housing land in the local plan. More specifically, the sum of completions between 1996 and 2004 and commitments at April 2004 already exceeds the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings between 1996 and 2011:

Meeting The Structure Plan Requirement 1996 – 2011	
	Dwellings
A Total Completions 1996-2004	6115
B Commitments at 01/04/04	
Dwellings under construction	745
Dwellings with outstanding permission	1107
Allocated sites with permission subject to S106	520
Other commitments	686
Total Commitments	3058
C Completions and Commitments at 01/04/04	9173
D Balance to be provided 2004-2011	0

Since 1996, development on windfall sites has averaged 327 dwellings per annum. If this trend continues, this would increase the supply of housing by 2289 dwellings between 2004 and 2011. This would increase capacity from the current commitments of 3058 dwellings to 5347 dwellings. Furthermore, should land be required for housing, there are brownfield sites in more sustainable locations in the urban areas of Leamington, Warwick and Kenilworth which more successfully meet the aims of Planning Policy Guidance 3 (paragraph 32) in terms of the allocation and release of housing for development.

5. Howes Lane, Stoneleigh

This site is located on the edge of the built up area of Coventry City and is located within the Green Belt.

Updated information on the supply of housing land demonstrates that sufficient land can be identified to meet the needs of the district up to 2011 without allocations of housing land in the local plan. More specifically, the sum of completions between 1996 and 2004 and commitments at April 2004 already

exceeds the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings between 1996 and 2011 (see Table in 4. above). Furthermore, should additional housing land be required, the site search sequence in PPG3 would be followed. This starts with the re-use of previously-developed land and buildings within urban areas followed by urban extensions.

6. **South West Warwick**

Land at the site known as South West Warwick is identified as a "Major Housing Allocation" in the adopted Local Plan. Policy (LW) H2 allocates the site for "major housing provision" to accommodate 1100 dwellings. The policy states that a development brief will ensure satisfactory development and provision of infrastructure and other facilities directly related to the development and will establish a coordinated approach to development of both housing and adjoining employment land. A development brief was carried out jointly with the developers with full public consultation and was agreed as a basis for development in March 2000. The brief included amended boundaries for the housing and employment land to reflect land use changes in order to move housing away from the southern corridor adjacent to the A46 which would be subject to unacceptable levels of noise. The revised boundary of land committed for housing on the Proposals Map of the Revised Plan includes this land use change between housing and employment. The land is identified as "committed" as opposed to "allocated" because planning permission has either been granted or has been agreed subject to a Section 106 agreement. It is anticipated that outline planning permission will have been granted on the whole site by the end of 2005.

7. **Land at Golf Lane**

The Council does not accept that the plan should identify reserve, suitable sites for potential housing development. At 1st April 2004, sufficient dwelling sites could be identified where there was a high level of certainty that development would be implemented. In addition to completions since 1996, these dwelling sites include dwellings under construction; dwellings which had not been started but which were located on sites where development had commenced; dwellings on sites where development had commenced since April or where site clearance/preparation was at an advanced stage; and dwellings on greenfield allocated sites carried forward from the adopted local plan.

Sites Completed and Under Construction and Large Sites at an Advanced Stage of Implementation April 2004	
	Dwellings
Completed 1996-2004	6115
Under Construction at April 2004	745
Not Started (but located on sites where development has commenced):	
<i>South West Warwick</i>	92
<i>Regent Hotel</i>	88
<i>King Edward VII Hospital</i>	126
<i>South Sydenham</i>	124
<i>Bread & Meat Close</i>	80
Sites at an Advanced Stage (development commenced since	

April or site preparation underway): <i>Pottertons</i> <i>Pipers Lane</i>	294 43
Outstanding Greenfield Allocated sites (with permission subject to S 106 Agreement): <i>South West Warwick</i>	520
Total	8,227

This table demonstrates that the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 is very likely to be exceeded within the plan period to 2011 and there is no need to allocate further sites for housing development in the plan.

8. Land at Milverton

This site is located on the northern edge of the built up area of Leamington Spa at Milverton and is located within the Green Belt.

Updated information on the supply of housing land demonstrates that sufficient land can be identified to meet the needs of the district up to 2011 without allocations of housing land in the local plan. More specifically, the sum of completions between 1996 and 2004 and commitments at April 2004 already exceeds the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings between 1996 and 2011 (see Table in 4. above). Furthermore, should additional housing land be required, the site search sequence in PPG3 would be followed. This starts with the re-use of previously-developed land and buildings within urban areas followed by urban extensions.

9. Land at Leek Wootton

The sites at Leek Wootton are greenfield sites located on the north western edge of the village of Leek Wootton within the Green Belt and in a Special Landscape Area.

Updated information on the supply of housing land demonstrates that sufficient land can be identified to meet the needs of the district up to 2011 without allocations of housing land in the local plan. More specifically, the sum of completions between 1996 and 2004 and commitments at April 2004 already exceeds the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings between 1996 and 2011 (see Table in 4. above). Furthermore, should additional housing land be required, the site search sequence in PPG3 would be followed. This starts with the re-use of previously-developed land and buildings within urban areas followed by urban extensions.

PPG3 allows for the allocation of small, rural, greenfield sites for affordable housing to meet an identified local housing need. However, it does not allow for the allocation of a mixed development of market and affordable housing. In the case of Leek Wootton there is no evidence of local housing need. This is required to justify the exceptional allocation of land for affordable housing.

10. Campions Hills, Lillington

The site at Campions Hills is located on the north eastern edge of Leamington Spa at Lillington, within the Green Belt.

Updated information on the supply of housing land demonstrates that sufficient land can be identified to meet the needs of the district up to 2011 without allocations of housing land in the local plan. More specifically, the sum of

completions between 1996 and 2004 and commitments at April 2004 already exceeds the Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings between 1996 and 2011 (see Table in 4. above). Furthermore, should additional housing land be required, the site search sequence in PPG3 would be followed. This starts with the re-use of previously-developed land and buildings within urban areas followed by urban extensions.

Employment

1. Sydenham Industrial Estate

The Sydenham Industrial Estate is an area where B1, B2 and B8 uses have been established for many years. The area lies close to a residential area to the north of the canal and this proximity has been a cause of concern to local residents. Whilst I fully understand their concerns, I do not consider that a policy should be included to regulate the uses there for the following reasons. Firstly, the majority of the uses already operate within the B2 use class and as such any restriction would not apply to them. The Council could not prevent new B2 operators taking over units which currently have the benefit of a B2 consent. Secondly, the Council does have both planning powers to regulate new B2 activities where these have an impact upon the residential amenity of nearby homes. The Council does, in all appropriate cases, consult with environmental health colleagues on relevant applications and wherever necessary will regulate new (or expanded) uses where there is an issue of potential nuisance or pollution. We will, for example, require that buildings are designed to minimize noise pollution and will impose limits on hours of operation in appropriate cases. Thirdly, even in cases where no planning permission is required for a development, the Council's environmental health powers are used where there is evidence that unacceptable levels of noise or other nuisance are being created.

2. Land north of Coventry airport

The issue of "land north of Coventry airport" being taken out of the Green Belt and identified for employment use was considered at the Examination in Public to the Warwickshire Structure Plan in 1999. At that time, it was decided not to take the land out of the Green Belt since the land performed a valuable function in Green Belt terms. Since that time, this situation has not changed and furthermore, the Council has found other land to meet its employment land needs. There is therefore no need to identify the land for employment purposes. To take the land out of the Green Belt would, in my opinion, be a strategic change to the Green Belt that should only be made through the Structure Plan (now RSS).

Mixed Use

1. Oldhams, Barford

The site is the subject of a planning application which will be determined before the examination of the local plan at a public inquiry. A mixed use of employment and housing would be acceptable provided it can be demonstrated that the housing element meets a local need and that the employment floorspace is of sufficient size to compensate for some of the loss of the existing employment land and balances the additional housing.

2. Land at Montague Road

Part of the land that is the subject of this objection is previously-developed land and the County Council proposal contained in application W20031242 for an employment use on part and housing use on the rest would be acceptable in principle. Regarding the remainder which is green field land, the Council would not support the development of this land for housing.

3. Dalehouse Lane/Common Lane, Kenilworth

This is an employment site that is protected in the adopted local plan and also under policy SC2 in the draft local plan. The Council has received objections from other parties requesting that the land be retained in employment use. In view of the amount of employment land available in Kenilworth I consider that as a first priority the land should be retained in employment use if at all possible. There is no reason in principle why a new B class employment use could not be found for the site that would be appropriate given the site's proximity to residential uses. If this is found not to be the case, then policy SC2 would allow the site to be redeveloped for another use. I am of the view, however, that as a starting point the local plan should be seeking to retain the site in employment use.

4. Land at Queensway, Leamington Spa

Many of the above comments on the site at Dalehouse Lane in Kenilworth could also be applied to this site. In addition, this site is an allocation in the local plan and therefore its redevelopment for employment uses is important if the Council is to meet its requirement for industrial sites set out in the Structure Plan.

5. Lower Heathcote Farm

The objector accepts that there is unlikely to be any need for any further land releases beyond those set out in the local plan in the period up to 2011. Nevertheless, they ask that the local plan considers the need beyond this time and identifies the above site as an "area of search". I consider that such an action would be premature at the present time. The RSS does not set a level of employment land provision for districts (or even at a county level) however it does require that some types of employment provision need to be made at the sub-regional level. To begin to suggest that a particular area of land would be available for employment use to meet some of this requirement would be premature pending the necessary work to establish (a) the amount and type of any future employment uses in the sub-region and (b) the preferred location of these.

6. Land south west of Radford Semele

For reasons set out elsewhere, it is not considered that there is any requirement to identify further land for either housing or employment purposes in this local plan. To identify this land, even for longer term growth up to 2016, would be premature.

7. Stratford Road Warwick

The proposed land for a mixed use development lies within the current Area Restraint Designation. It is intended to defend the existing boundaries in light of their strategic importance and the fact that the plan has not had to react to new

growth requirements by allocating new land for housing purposes. The site is not permanently protected by this designation and the Areas of Restraint can be reviewed as and when pressure for development is sufficient to warrant a re-evaluation of such areas as part of a wider 'search' for sustainable new growth alternatives. It is currently premature to instigate such a site evaluation in light of current growth requirements.

Community Uses

1. **Queens Square Warwick**

The land at Queen Square should be the subject of a disposal strategy based on a range of considerations (including its future use for open space/ community uses). The outcome of an audit of open space and recreational facilities that will be produced by the Councils Leisure and Amenities Dept will do much to inform this possibility. It is unlikely that a private developer would provide the facilities the objector would like to see, and it remains questionable as to whether the District Council would be able to finance the building/ provision of such facilities at this location. In light of the above it is probably premature to allocate this land for a specific useage.

2. **Shire Hall Warwick**

Warwick Town Council would like to see a firm policy requiring the law courts and Shire Hall to remain in community and public use in the event that the site and their existing buildings become available. Whilst it is difficult to interpret their definition of 'community and public use' it must be noted that the site is currently within a protected employment area and any future development aspirations (if the site became available) would have to accord with this designation as it is important for the future of the town centres vitality and viability.

3. **Charter Bridge Meeting Hall**

The objection requests a site specific policy to enable the re-development of the Sea Scouts Hall on St Nicholas Park. I do not feel that this proposal is of a sufficient order as to merit such a policy. This proposal would be best addressed via a planning application approach and would be assessed against the relevant policies within the Plan. There are several issues to be addressed notwithstanding the Area of Restraint designation, flood plain issues would be important.

Leisure and Recreation Uses

1. **Oaklands Farm.** The objector would like to see this land allocated for a marina/ leisure uses(public house /restaurant) and a hotel. The site is within the Green Belt and would have to demonstrate the very special circumstances for setting aside this designation. As there is no strategic requirement / pressure for this form of development it would be best assessed by the submission of a planning application with the relevant detail/ supporting evidence to enable a judgement on its merits or otherwise to be made.

2. **Land between Charles Street Bridge and Coventry Road Bridge.** Warwick Town Council would like to see this area allocated for a marina. The land in question is already designated as a protected employment area and forms part of the District's employment land portfolio. A development for a marina (a sui generis use) would have to provide sufficient evidence to substantiate the need and the setting aside of employment land requirements. As such the appropriate

level of detail to support this eventuality would best provided by a full planning application.

Other

1. **River Avon and River Leam.** A variety of objectors have expressed a desire for the Local Plan to safeguard the 'corridor' of the River Leam and River Avon to enable the development of a navigation between Stratford and the Grand Union Canal via the river system. The project would require massive engineering works involving a significant change to the current river network (the introduction of locks to by-pass weirs/ dredging and the canalisation of the upper Leam to accommodate boat traffic. This project was the subject of a scoping report prepared in the mid 1990's that sought to identify the range of issues that an environmental assessment would have to address. The Upper Avon Navigation Trust have failed to submit such an assessment for this Council to determine its position for or against such a proposal. In the interim the project was put to Warwickshire County Council where Members determined that it should not be supported / given County Council backing. In light of the lack of strategic support and the volume of objections to this proposal (plus the reluctance to forward an environmental assessment for consideration) it is not considered that this project should merit the safeguarding of a corridor for the purposes of boat traffic. A planning application with full supporting evidence (an EA) would appear the most likely way forward if this proposal were to be pursued.
2. The local plan is not the appropriate document to propose / allocate the provision of footpath access through Warwick Castle Park. The local plan does however provide the planning framework to consider such proposals when these are brought forward. It is more appropriate to set out detailed public access routes / initiatives within the Local Transport Plan following liaison between Warwickshire County Council as the transport authority and the land owner. The provision of public access may also be included through planning obligations negotiated as part of new development. For example changes proposed to policy SC10 make provision for contributions to be sought in appropriate circumstances towards footpaths.
3. See response to representation 2
4. It would be inappropriate to include specific cycle ways within the local plan until defined routes are known and there is specific commitment to achieving these from Warwickshire County Council. Policy SC4 (Para 5.20) sets out the council's commitment to supporting the development of cycle and pedestrian facilities and it is intended that the local plan will provide the planning framework through which detailed proposals can come forward.
5. See response to representation 4.
6. I do not consider that further development at the racecourse will raise any development issues which cannot be dealt with by existing policies in the Plan, in particular, the Development Policies and Designated Area Policies. This is particularly so since in the changes to Proposals Map 2, the racecourse buildings have been removed from the Area of Restraint.

Major Sites

1. University of Warwick

I agree that there should be a policy dealing with the future development of the University. Following discussions with the University and the Government Office for the West Midlands, we consider that the most appropriate response is to designate the site as a “major developed site in the Green Belt” in policy SSP2. The policy has therefore been amended to reflect this.

Recommended revision (s)

Housing

1. No changes required.
2. No changes required.
3. No changes required.
4. No changes required.
5. No changes required.
6. No changes required.
7. No changes required.
8. No changes required.
9. No changes required.
10. No changes required.

Employment

1. No changes required
2. No changes required

Mixed Uses

1. No changes required
2. No changes required
3. No changes required
4. No changes required
5. No changes required
6. No changes required
7. No change required

Community Uses

1. No changes required
2. No changes required
3. No changes required

Leisure and Recreation Uses

1. No changes required
2. No changes required

Other

1. No changes required.

2. No changes required.
3. No changes required.
4. No changes required.
5. No changes required.
6. No changes required. However see changes to Proposals Map 2 where the racecourse buildings are removed from the Area of Restraint.

Major sites

1. Amend policy SSP2 to include University of Warwick as a major developed site in the Green Belt.

Topic: SSP1 – Employment Allocations

Summary of matters raised in objections.

Comments were made to the policy generally, to individual sites allocated, and to additional sites that were not allocated in this policy.

General

1. The policy should refer to “employment generating uses as well as those within use classes B1, B2 and B8.

Site A

1. The site should be extended to include additional land to the east and west in the ownership of Rail Property Ltd (159/AE – Rail Property Ltd).
2. The reference to 4,100 sq.m. should be deleted as this issue should be addressed as part of a planning application (159/AE – Rail Property Ltd).
3. The policy should be flexible to allow for small scale ancillary retail and service uses to come forward as part of a mixed use scheme (159/AE – Rail Property Ltd).
4. The allocation should recognise the opportunity that may be created for moving the railway station to the north side of the railway line. (148/AT - CPRE)
5. The site should allow for the potential for additional car parking to serve the station (6AD – Chiltern Railways, 159 AE – Rail Property Ltd)

Site C

1. The site should not be allocated solely for employment use but for a mix of uses comprising food, retail, office and community land uses (219/AD – Deeley Properties).

Site E

1. The land east of Ansell Way should not be allocated in view of the planning application for housing (66/AY – Warwick Society).
2. Paragraph 10.10 should make reference to the known flooding problems in the area from the Saltisford Brook (226/AT – Environment Agency).
3. A traffic assessment will be required arising from this development (257/AG – Highways Agency).

Site G

1. A traffic assessment will be required arising from this development (257/AG –

Highways Agency).

Site H

1. In view of the subsequent granting on appeal of a planning application for housing on this site, this allocation should be deleted (223/BD – Kenilworth Town Council, 221/BG – Kenilworth Society).
2. The ecological issues associated with this site should be noted (150/AH – Warwickshire County Council (Museums))

Additional sites

1. In addition to site D (land rear of Homebase) an additional site to the east of Princes Drive and immediately north of the Leamington to Warwick railway line should be allocated for employment use (205/AD - Fords).
2. The policy should identify further large sites (which may be green field). The Plan should be supportive of businesses wishing to expand their present site (111/AA – The Chamber).
3. The land identified in the local plan will not provide adequate land to meet the Structure Plan requirements and therefore land at Gallows Hill (currently green field land within the rural area) should be allocated for further employment land (245/AA – Hallam Land Management).
4. Further land east of Stratford Road and the Aylesford School in Warwick (currently green field land within the rural area and within an Area of Restraint) should be allocated for further employment development (291/AA – Wimpeys).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

General

1. The purpose of this policy is to identify land to meet the Structure Plan requirement for employment land within use classes B1, B2 and B8. This site is suitable for this use and other policies of the local plan control the location of other uses (notably retail use class A1) and leisure (D2)).

Site A

1. If the owner is confident that further land is available for employment uses then this should be added to the site area. The small parcel of land to the east however is shown for further car parking and should therefore not be added to the site.
2. Agreed. The reference comes from a previous planning brief for the site and may be superseded by a future planning application.
3. Whether any other uses are permitted within this site should be a matter for a planning application to consider. The principle use of the site should be for employment (B1, B2 or B8 uses).
4. The area of land referred to in the objection is the Quicks garage site to the east of this site. The owner of this site has actively sought other uses in the past (housing) and it is thought unlikely that the site would be secured for a new railway station without significant public investment. A new station could be built on this site, however, without preventing this site coming forward for employment use.
5. The alternative allocation of this site for additional parking is not supported. This site can play an important role in delivering employment uses in a sustainable location close to the town centre.

Site C

1. The site offers a major employment opportunity within the urban area.

Consideration of any retail potential will be made against other policies of this Plan, however the principle of this site remaining for employment uses remains appropriate.

Site E

1. The land allocated for employment development will be adjusted to take account of any relevant planning permissions.
2. A reference to known flooding problems would be appropriate.
3. The need for a traffic assessment should also be noted in the policy.

Site G

1. The need for a traffic assessment should also be noted in the policy.

Site H

1. Agreed. The granting of the planning appeal means that the allocation must now be deleted.
2. The ecological comments are therefore not relevant in this context.

Additional sites

In view of the employment land figures contained within appendix 1, it is considered that no further land is required to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Therefore, no further land allocations will be made. Should additional land be required, first consideration will be given to brown field land within the urban area in accordance with the strategy in the Structure Plan.

Recommended revision(s)

1. Amend boundary of site A as shown on the attached plan and change site area accordingly.
2. Amend paragraph 10.5 to remove reference to the floorspace figure.
3. Amend the boundary of site E to take account of any existing planning permissions.
4. Amend paragraph 10.10 to refer to known flooding problems and the need for a traffic assessment.
5. Amend paragraph 10.12 to refer to the need for a traffic assessment.
6. Delete site H and amend policy accordingly.

Topic: SSP2 – Major Developed Sites

Summary of matters raised in objections.

General

1. It has been requested that for clarity the policy be re-titled: "Major developed sites in the Green Belt" (Government Office for the West Midlands).
2. Reference to nature conservation issues relating to all sites should be made (150/AJ – Warwickshire County Council – Museum Field Service).
3. There is objection that no reference to providing affordable housing has been made (228/BP – West Midlands RSL consortium).

Stoneleigh Business Park

1. It is not clear regarding Stoneleigh Business Park whether housing would be acceptable as part of any redevelopment (195/AM – Leamington Society).

Leek Wootton Police HQ

1. The reference to the Leek Wootton Police HQ should be amended to refer to protecting the parkland which is recognised elsewhere in the local plan as being of local interest. (37/AG – Sport England)
2. The boundary of the site should be amended. (288/AC – Warwickshire Police Authority)

Former Honiley airfield

1. There is objection to the designation of Honiley airfield and concern about the scale of potential development there (109/AD – Warwickshire County Council).
2. The owners support the designation but request that the boundary be amended. (297/AB – Prodrive)

Other sites

1. The following additional sites have been proposed as Major Developed Sites:
 - Haseley Business Centre (113/AA – IM Properties)
 - the Abattoir on Rouncil lane Kenilworth (124/AA – Farm Fresh)
 - Woodside Management Training Centre 147/AB – Sundial Conferences)
 - North Leamington School. (220/AO – Cala)
2. An objection has also been made from the University of Warwick, asking that development be permitted on their site (107/AB – University of Warwick).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The policy should be re-titled for clarity (GOWM).
2. It is recognised that all the MDS's contain features of importance for nature conservation. However, a cross reference could also be made to many other policies (eg: DP1, DP4, DP5, DAP3, etc). Furthermore, the user guide makes clear how policies interrelate. Therefore, in the interests of brevity, no cross reference is felt to be required.
1. Stoneleigh Business Park has been given planning approval for a business re-use. The change in title of the policy will make this clear.
1. Police HQ – Leek Wootton. PPG2 states that MDS's should be defined according to "the present extent of development". The present boundary here is therefore considered appropriate. A cross reference to the locally listed parkland (para. 9.51) would be helpful. There is already a reference to protecting the sports pitches.
1. Honiley. It is accepted that a minor boundary amendment should be made to reflect the extent of development on the site in accordance with PPG2. The designation is still considered to be appropriate.
2. It is not considered that any part of paragraph 10.15 is unclear. This follows guidance in PPG2.
3. The re-titling of the policy should make it clear that housing is not suitable on these sites.

Other sites

1. In terms of proposing additional sites under this policy, annex C of PPG2 does not specify either a minimum size for a site to be eligible to be considered as a “major development site” nor is it prescriptive about the range of uses. Comments on each of the proposed sites are as follows:-

- **Haseley Business Centre:** This is an appropriate MDS in accordance with PPG2. The extent of the built development is approximately 0.7 ha and the boundary has been drawn to reflect this.
- **Abattoir, Bannerhill Farm, Rouncil lane:** This site is a former farm which was approved originally in 1978. Both this original permission, and a significant extension approved in 1993, were justified as a departure from Green Belt policy for particular reasons (the closure of less satisfactory premises in Kenilworth town centre). This makes it different from other Major developed sites in the local plan. Furthermore, it is of a smaller scale (1.3 ha) than other sites. For these reasons, it is not considered suitable for MDS designation.
- **Woodside Business Centre.** This site has operated as a training centre for many years, previously by Courtaulds and more recently by the Sundial Group, and does meet the criteria as an appropriate MDS in accordance with PPG2. This site has been granted considerable extensions over recent years and there was a view when the last application was granted that the site had reached the end of its development potential. Giving the site MDS status now does not necessarily signal a change in approach, since PPG2 contains strict criteria against which all MDS infill or redevelopment proposals must be considered. Unless a future applicant can demonstrate that there is further development potential there without compromising Green Belt objectives, then even MDS status would not be opening the door for further development. Allocating the site as an MDS would therefore be appropriate, notwithstanding its relatively small size (1.5 ha).
- **North Leamington and Manor Schools.** PPG2 makes it clear that educational uses are appropriate as MDS's and therefore this site should be included. The area of buildings on the site extends to approximately 2.5 hectares.

It should be noted that in relation to any of these (or previously allocated) MDS's, the allocation of these sites does not mean that in the event of the site owners wishing to redevelop them for another use, this will necessarily be approved. A proposal, for example, to redevelop a redundant MDS for housing would still be subject to all other relevant policies of the local plan.

With regard to the objection from the University of Warwick (107/AB), this was not originally a request to be defined as a MDS but that a policy should be made to permit development on their site. Having discussed the matter with both the University and the Government Office, it is considered that an MDS designation is the most appropriate way to respond to this objection at the present time.

Recommended revision(s)

1. The policy should be re-titled “Major developed sites in the Green Belt”.
2. Leek Wootton Police HQ - Paragraph 10.19 will include a cross reference to policy

- DAP13 and the local list of parks and gardens.
3. Honiley - A boundary change to the inset map for this site will be made.
 4. The following sites need to be included within the policy:-
 - Haseley Business Centre, (0.7 ha)
 - Woodside Management Training Centre (1.2 ha)
 - North Leamington and Manor Schools (1.9 ha).
 - University of Warwick (42 ha)

Topic: SSP3 – Stoneleigh Park

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. There is objection to substantial new development in this location. The policy could encourage this. (10/AB – Bubbenhall PC, 193/BT – Coten End and Emscote Residents Association, 199,BT – J. Mackay, 304/AA – Stoneleigh & Ashow JPC).
2. The policy would allow inappropriate development in the Green Belt (148/BR - CPRE). There should be clarification of the scale of development allowed at Stoneleigh Park (242/AK – Coventry CC, 244/AA – Warwickshire Fire Service).
3. Development beyond that allowed in the policy should not be supported (66/AZ – Warwick Society, 304/AA - Stoneleigh & Ashow JPC).
4. There is a contradiction between the policy and paragraph 10.23 (157/AC – West Midlands Planning & Transportation).
5. There should be a reference to the historic park within which the site is set (302/BO – English Heritage).
6. Transportation issues such as highway access (257/AH – Highways Agency) and rail (6/AE – Chiltern Railways) need to be considered.
7. The phrase “the well being of the countryside and its inhabitants” needs clarifying (242/AD – Coventry CC).
8. There is no reference to the site being within the Green Belt or Special Landscape Area (304/AA - Stoneleigh & Ashow JPC).
9. Para. 10.25 should make reference to “other rural activities” (154/AR).
10. The Highways Agency requested that it be consulted on any proposals for the site (257/AH – Highways Agency).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The principle of Stoneleigh Park as a major developed site in the Green Belt is established de facto in the adopted local plan. Development that accords with this status and with the relevant annex in PPG2 is appropriate development and should be supported.
2. The proposals at Stoneleigh Park have moved on since the draft plan was produced last year. The RASE has abandoned plans to produce a planning brief and has now submitted an outline planning application setting out the key elements of its proposals.
3. A cross reference to the nationally listed parklands of both Stoneleigh Abbey and Stoneleigh Deer Park (para. 9.51) would be helpful.
4. It is recognised that as with other MDS’s, a wide number of policies could be cross referenced. These include highway access and rail issues. Whilst it would be appropriate to refer to highway access as the planning application makes specific reference to this, in the interests of brevity, no other cross referencing is felt to be

<p>required. The user guide makes clear how policies interrelate.</p> <p>5. The phrase “the well being of the countryside and its inhabitants” is expanded upon at length in the Royal Charter of the RASE. In the interests of brevity, a further cross reference to this only is proposed.</p> <p>6. Stoneleigh Park does not lie within a Special Landscape Area however is abutted by SLA to the north. This should be clarified in the text.</p> <p>7. The Highways Agency have been consulted on the current planning application. There is not felt to be any requirement to state this in the local plan.</p>
<p>Recommended revision(s)</p> <p>1. The references to the “Open Countryside Initiative” and the planning brief have been deleted, and replaced by references to the current planning application.</p> <p>2. A reference is being specifically made to the new access proposed for Stoneleigh Park by the new application.</p> <p>3. The relationship between the site and the both the listed parklands and the SLA’s is clarified.</p> <p>4. A further cross reference to the Royal Charter is made to explain the phrase “the well being of the countryside and its inhabitants”.</p>

Topic: SSP4 – Safeguarding Land for Kenilworth Railway Station

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Support but it is suggested that an additional sentence is added to refer to the proposed site being the most sustainable location relative to the town centre (CPRE ref: 148 BS).
2. Object on the grounds that the effect of providing a transport interchange at the new station should be included in the policy (i.e. It will be necessary to reroute the transport corridor and relocate the transport interchange at the station. It is unclear whether land for the interchange has been included). (Kenilworth Town Council ref: 223 BE).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. I am of the opinion that paragraph 10.29 already refers to this, as it states that the site is ‘centrally located, close to the town centre and has good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists’.
2. The County Council has reported in the Warwickshire Local Transport Plan Annual Progress Report 03/04 that work is ongoing to explore the necessary infrastructure improvements required for the development of the new station at Kenilworth. The district council will continue to work with the County and acknowledges the benefits of providing access by bus where this can be successfully delivered. Whether this involves the relocation of the existing transport interchange or the creation of an additional interchange at the station will not be clear until more detailed plans are known.

Recommended revision (s) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No changes required.2. No changes required.

Topic: SSP5 – Safeguarding land for Warwick and Leamington Park & Ride

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. The case for developing a park and ride site in this or any location has not yet been adequately made (193/BU – Coten End and Emscote Residents Association, 199/BU – J. Mackay, 266/AH – Warwick Town Council)
2. There is concern that the proposed location of the Park & Ride will increase traffic levels in the local area and in particular Bishops Tachbrook (34/AB – P Hitchin, 68/AA – D Eggby, 135/AD – Bishops Tachbrook PC)
3. A better site for the Park & Ride would be at:-
 - Greys Mallory (11/AA – R Vickers, 109/AV – Warwickshire County Council, 114/BK – Whitnash Town Council, 250/AA – A & J Day, 285/AA – Warwick Gates Residents Association)
 - North or west of Warwick and Leamington (45/AC – G Leeke)
 - Warwick Parkway station (212/AA - IBM)
 - Site immediately south of the roundabout at Lower Heathcote Farm (229/AG – Gallagher Estates)
4. Protection should be given to this sensitive “Area of Restraint” (66/BA – Warwick Society, 114/BK - Whitnash Town Council, 148/AO - CPRE)
5. The measures for dealing with archaeological remains are insufficient (149/AF – Warwickshire County Council (Museums))
6. The site allocated for a Park & Ride site should be allocated for a training centre (104/AD – Warwickshire County Council (Property Services)).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The allocation of a site for Park & Ride in the local plan has followed considerable feasibility work that has been undertaken by the County Council following the inclusion of the proposal in the Local Transport Plan. The scheme has been deemed to be viable provided it is effectively implemented.
2. The concerns over the location proposed are legitimate. At the time of drafting the local plan, the advice that the District Council had received from the County Council was that all of the 5 potential sites (which were clustered around the Heathcote and Greys Mallory roundabouts) were of equal benefit as a Park & Ride site. Subsequent to this, further evidence has been provided that has shown a clear preference for sites around the Greys Mallory roundabout in terms of (a) creating a viable Park & Ride scheme and (b) taking the most number of cars off local roads.
3. The further analysis carried out by the County Council shows a clear preference for a site at Greys Mallory. Sites adjacent to the Heathcote roundabout (including the site allocated in the first draft local plan) do not offer the same benefits as noted above. The other sites referred to by objectors have been dismissed at the present time as part of the earlier work in establishing the viability of a Park & Ride scheme for Warwick District. In view of this, it is recommended that the site allocation be amended. However, rather than identify a single site adjacent to the Greys Mallory roundabout, it is proposed that an “area of search” be identified for a Park & Ride adjacent to the roundabout. This area would cover all possible sites abutting Greys Mallory (including the two evaluated by the County Council). It recognises that whilst the County Council supports one site at the present time, other sites may

<p>prove more suitable in the long term, particularly once issues of landscaping and land assembly are considered further.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. In view of the response to 3 above, the previous allocation will be deleted and the area of restraint boundary left unchanged. 5. Policy DP4 considers archaeological remains. It is considered that this policy is adequate for covering any concerns relating to this allocation. 6. There is no case for identifying the allocated site for any other use. Its identification as a Park & Ride site in the First Deposit Version does not, in my view, take away from its value and importance otherwise as an area of restraint.
<p>Recommended revision(s) That the site identified in policy SSP5 be deleted and replaced by an “area of search” for a site at Greys Mallory.</p>

Topic: SSP6 – Safeguarding Land for Barford Bypass
<p>Summary of matters raised in objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The problem of the bypass passing through Sherbourne Conservation Area should be resolved (CPRE ref: 148 BT). 2. Object to the last sentence of the Para 10.36 on the grounds that the proposal is not supported by Sherbourne or Wasperton Parish Councils (Sherbourne Parish Councillor ref: 234 BA).
<p>Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal for Barford Bypass was submitted prior to the Sherbourne conservation area being identified. At the public inquiry in September 2003 the impact of the proposal on adjacent conservation areas was brought up for discussion and the inspector decided that it was not a matter for him to determine but instead should be addressed through discussions between the County and District authority. 2. For accuracy the reference to the Joint Parish Council should be deleted. Policy should also be amended in order to reflect the current status of the proposal.
<p>Recommended revision (s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No changes required. 2. Delete final sentence of Para 10.36.

Topic: Policy SSP7 – Coventry Airport

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Policy should not allow any further development at the Airport (10/AA, 71/AA, 251/AB).
2. Policy should not allow for development that could be better met at alternative airports (300/AA).
3. Policy should not allow any further (scheduled) flights (148/BU, 196/AA).
4. Policy should reduce the number of flights, particularly at night, and the noise impact (10/AA, 251/AB).
5. Policy should reflect the Government's White Paper "The Future of Air Transport" and the emerging Regional Planning Guidance (1/AE, 36/AA).
6. Policy should bring the operation of the Airport under control in terms of aircraft movements (10/AA, 300/AA).
7. Policy should make reference to the need for improved public transport services to serve any development of passenger services (10/AA).
8. Policy should make reference to additional traffic impact and the need for a Traffic Assessment (257/AJ).
9. Policy should make reference to airspace and air traffic issues (36/AA).
10. Policy will create pressure for development within the Green Belt (66/BB).
11. Policy should only allow development which does not cause any further harm to the environment or local residents (70/AA, 135/AA, 260/AC).
12. Policy should make clear what 'acceptable' levels of environmental, surface access and amenity impact are (193/BV, 195/AO, 196/AA, 199/BV, 300/AA, 304/AC).
13. Policy should also allow for employment uses on part of the site allocated on the Proposals Map (243/AA).
14. Reasoned justification should acknowledge that development could affect a wider area than nearby communities (54/AN, 221/BH, 223/BF).
15. Reasoned justification should include measures controlling permitted development (148/BU, 300/AA).
16. Reasoned justification should make reference to balancing the economic benefits with environmental and social costs (195/AO, 300/AA).
17. Reasoned justification should consider the environmental effects of all airport development in the Region, including Birmingham (223/BF).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. It is not considered appropriate for this Local Plan to restrict all further development at the Airport in the absence of any impact assessment and in light of the policy context at the National, Regional and County level.
2. There is no reference within the policy context at the National, Regional or County level which requires only development at Coventry Airport which cannot be provided elsewhere.
3. It is not considered appropriate for this Local Plan to deny any further activity at the Airport in the absence of any impact assessment and in light of the policy context at the National, Regional and County level.
4. The policies of this Local Plan cannot arbitrarily impose any restrictions on flights

<p>at the Airport.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Policy SSP7 has been amended to reflect National and Regional Policy. 6. The policies of this Local Plan cannot arbitrarily impose any restrictions on flights at the Airport. 7. Policy SSP7 has been amended to reflect public transport considerations. 8. Policy SSP7 has been amended to reflect the need for a transport assessment. 9. Policy SSP7 has been amended to reflect airspace issues. 10. Policy SSP7 does not apply to land within the Green Belt. It is not certain that this policy will create pressure for development within the Green Belt. However, any such proposals that come forward in the future would have to be considered on their merits at that time against the Green Belt policy. 11. The intent of Policy SSP7 is not to allow development that would cause any harm to the environment or local residents without appropriate mitigation or compensation. 12. In the absence of any detailed assessment or consultation, it is not possible to state precisely what is an acceptable level of environmental impact. Such an exercise can only be done in the context of a development proposal being brought forward by the Airport and then considered by the Council. 13. The policy does not preclude the development of this land for employment uses. 14. Reasoned justification amended to reflect this fact. 15. The policies of this Local Plan cannot remove permitted development rights. 16. There is requirement to balance economic benefits and social and environmental costs is undertaken within the policy. 17. Policies of other development plans address the environmental effects of development at Birmingham International Airport and need not be repeated in this Local Plan. 	<p>Recommended revision(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change 2. No change 3. No change 4. No change 5. Policy amended to respond to this point 6. No change 7. Policy amended to respond to this point. 8. Policy amended to respond to this point 9. Policy amended to respond to this point 10. No change 11. No change 12. No change 13. No change 14. Policy amended to respond to this point 15. No change 16. No change 17. No change
---	---

Topic: SSP8 – Hatton Country World
Summary of matters raised in objections. 1. The prohibition on further retail development implies that other types of development will be permitted. This is not appropriate on a Green Belt site (148/BV - CPRE).
Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised 1. This policy was deliberately restricted to defining retail uses because policies to control other uses are covered elsewhere in the local plan and in existing planning approvals issued to Hatton Country World. Paragraph 10.45 outlines some of those policies. Other uses are covered under all relevant Rural Area Policies. It is therefore considered that in the interests of brevity, there is no need for further references in this policy.
Recommended revision(s) None.