

## Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011

### Topic Response Analysis – First Deposit Version

#### Topic: Chapter 3 Introduction.

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

1. All objectives should be given equal weight to give priority to enhancing the natural environment. (148/AB – CPRE)
2. The core strategy should set out the overall approach to the distribution of development (187/AA – countryside Agency)
3. The reference to sustainable development in para 3.4 should be aligned to that in para 1.7. (193/AP – Coten End and Emscote Residents Association, 199/AP – James Mackay)
4. The wording of paragraph 3.6 should reflect Government advice more closely and particularly reflect the “polluter pays” principle. (193/AQ – Coten End and Emscote Residents Association, 199/AQ – James Mackay)
5. Paragraph 3.6 should give greater emphasis to the integration of the strategy’s objectives (302/AA – English Heritage)

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

1. Para 3.6 makes it clear that the local plan strategy attaches equal weight to all objectives. The Sustainability Appraisal remarked on this as one of the strengths of the local plan.
2. I agree that the local plan would benefit for a spatial strategy. This has been included in this chapter.
3. I do not agree that there is any inherent inconsistency between the references to sustainable development in the two paragraphs. The four objectives used in the core strategy are identical to those identified by government as the basis for sustainable development in PPS1.
4. I do not agree that there is any conflict between paragraph 3.6 and the governments understanding of sustainable development as set out in PPS1. Paragraph 5 of this document states that the aims of sustainable development “*should be pursued in an integrated way through a sustainable, innovative and productive economy that delivers high levels of employment, and a just society that promotes social inclusion, sustainable communities and personal well being, in ways that protect and enhance the physical environment and optimise resource and energy use.*” The approach of the local plan is wholly consistent with this approach.
5. I agree that it would be helpful to make clear that integrating the policies is an aim both of Government policy and of this local plan. This would be in accordance with paragraph 5 of PPS1 quoted above.

##### Recommended revision(s)

1. No change
  2. A spatial strategy has been included in this chapter.
  3. No change
  4. No change
- The words “and integrating” will be included in para 3.6.

**Topic: Objective 1A****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. There should be a 10 year supply of land identified for employment development and the new Regional Planning Guidance should be taken into account in extending the end date of the Plan (T&N Ltd – 256/AE)

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

1. The local plan fully meets the requirement for employment land in the period up to 2011. Beyond this time, more work is required at a regional and sub regional level to identify the amount and location of further employment land.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. No change

**Topic: Objective 1B****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

No objections received

**Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised****Recommended revision(s)****Topic: Objective 1C****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. The objective conflicts with the over-riding aim of achieving sustainable development by dispersing employment and increasing the need for car travel. (193/AR – Coten End & Emscote Residents Association, 199/AR - James Mackay)

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

1. Government policy is clear that local planning authorities should be supportive of well conceived proposals for farm diversification. This objective, and the policies that follow, seek to maintain a balance between the needs of farms, protection of the countryside and the wider aims of sustainable development.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. No change

## **Topic: Objective 1D**

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

1. It is not sufficient to rely on windfall housing sites to meet Structure Plan targets. Sites should be allocated for housing development. (117/AC – Langstone Homes, 120/AB – Miller homes, 132/AA, - KB Benfield Group Holdings, 170/AE – M. Wood, 200/AN – Taylor Woodrow, 239/AJ – D. Austin)
2. The objective should allow the Structure Plan target to be exceeded only by affordable housing. (66/AE – Warwick Society)
3. The housing land situation should be updated and conformation given that the Structure Plan target will be met (201/AN - HBF)
4. The objective should include a reference to protecting established residential areas (223/AB – Kenilworth Town Council)
5. A target for affordable housing should be integrated into this objective. (228/AD – West Midlands RSL consortium)
6. The local plan should identify land up to 2016 and not rely solely on windfall sites (240/AC - Wimpeys, 256/AE – T&N Ltd)
7. The objective should discourage the demolition of properties that add to the character of established residential areas (263/AA – C Wilson)

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

1. We have evidence (as set out in appendix 2) that there is no requirement for further allocations to be made to meet Structure Plan targets. It is therefore sufficient to rely on windfall sites in this local plan.
2. It is probably not helpful to view affordable housing as something which could be permitted once the Structure Plan target for new houses has been “exceeded”. Exceeding housing targets within Warwick District, whether for affordable or market housing, would undermine the wider planning and housing strategy set out in the Structure Plan and Regional Planning Guidance. The role of planning policy is to set down a broad framework of policies within which decisions on individual planning applications can be made. It is not its role to set hard targets beyond which no housing at all should be permitted. Having said that, then clearly the Council should take action when there is a danger that housing targets are likely to be exceeded (as is now the case in Warwick District). In doing this, it is appropriate to weigh the degree to which housing targets are being exceeded against other objectives such as the need to provide affordable housing.
3. I agree that the housing situation should be brought up to date. Appendix 2 will include figures for up to April 2004 and the text here will refer to this.
4. This objective is simply looking at meeting housing needs. Other objectives seek to protect amenity and the character of areas – in particular objectives under aim 2. Paragraph 3.6 states that the objectives should complement each other, and it may be confusing to try to make specific cross references.
5. Notwithstanding the above comment, I agree that it would be appropriate to link this objective with 4A (making housing available and affordable to all). The issue of a target of affordable housing is better dealt with under objective 4A.
6. Reference in these objections is made to a ministerial statement dating from July 2003 which refers to councils “providing” for a 10 year supply of housing land. I

<p>believe that there is no justification for allocating sites up to 2016 for two reasons. Firstly, the process of disaggregating the housing figures in the Regional Planning Guidance has not been undertaken and therefore there is no certainty what Warwick District's requirement will be up to 2016. Secondly, we have evidence that our current policies (relying as they do on windfall sites) will continue to bring forward adequate sites to meet the general level of any requirements made of us. There is a difference between "allocating" sites for a 10 year period and "providing" for such sites. We believe that the policy framework in the local plan does provide for an adequate level of continued supply of housing sites up to 2016, to the extent that this figure is known at the moment. These policies will need to be reviewed once the disaggregation of Regional Planning Guidance housing figures is known. There is therefore no need to make allocations beyond 2011 at the present time.</p> <p>7. See the comment on 4 above.</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. Amend paragraph 3.11 to update information to 2004.</li> <li>4. No change</li> <li>5. Amend paragraph 3.11 to include a reference to affordable housing.</li> <li>6. No change</li> <li>7. No change</li> </ol>

<p><b>Topic: Objective 1E</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mention should be made of the use of upper floors for affordable housing in town centres (228/AE – West Midlands RSL Consortium)</li> </ol>
<p><b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policies in the local plan do support the use of upper floors of premises in town centres for housing (TCP11 and 12). The objectives in the core strategy seek to give a broad overview of the priorities of the local plan as a whole and as such it is felt that it would be inappropriate to include this level of detail in this section.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Recommended revision(s)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No change.</li> </ol>

<b>Topic: Objective 1F</b>
<b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b>
No objections were made to this section.
<b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b>
<b>Recommended revision(s)</b>

<b>Topic: Objective 1G</b>
<b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy does not fully reflect an understanding of “sustainable tourism”. This concept involves ensuring that the needs of visitors are met without undue impact upon either local communities or the environment. The objective could also refer to enhancing the environment. (196/AH – National Trust)</li> <li>2. It is not clear how this objective will be achieved. (168/AB - AWM)</li> <li>3. It may be unreasonable to require tourism related developments in rural areas to be accessible by public transport (154/AB - NFU).</li> </ol>
<b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I agree that paragraph 3.15 could be expanded to reflect this more holistic view of sustainable tourism.</li> <li>2. There are several policies in the local plan that relate specifically to tourism related developments including UAP7 (Directing new tourism development – urban areas), UAP8 (Directing new visitor accommodation) and RAP16 (Directing new tourism development – rural areas). Policy UAP7 in particular has been amended to make its role and purpose clearer.</li> <li>3. It is recognised that, in accordance with government policy, there may be cases in rural areas where tourism-related developments may be acceptable in locations not realistically accessible by public transport. The policies of the local plan reflect this, and the text of paragraph 3.15 should be amended to reflect this.</li> </ol>
<b>Recommended revision(s)</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revise paragraph 3.15 to include the broader definition of sustainable tourism.</li> <li>2. No change</li> <li>3. A minor amendment is proposed to the last sentence of paragraph 3.15.</li> </ol>

## **Topic: Objective 2A**

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

1. Whilst the use of previously-developed land is supported, there is a need to bring forward development on green field sites. (117/AD – Langstone Homes, 120/AC – Miller homes, 220/AM – Miller homes, 239/AL – D. Austin)
2. The text should include a definition of previously-developed land. (1/AA – Warwickshire Wildlife Trust)
3. The positive approach to developing on previously-developed land is supported, however care must be taken to protect land of nature conservation value which happens to be previously-developed land. (150/AA – Warwickshire County Council – museums), 210/AA – English Nature)

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

1. The Council does not consider that there is any requirement for identifying green field land for development. Notwithstanding this, the objective does not prohibit the use of green field sites and so if there was to be a need for development that could not be met on previously-developed land then a green field site could be developed that accorded with the core strategy.
2. Whilst this issue is discussed later in the local plan, I agree that it would be helpful to include such a definition here – relating to annex C of PPG3.
3. It is recognised in PPG3 annex C that there some previously-developed land has ecological value. However, I agree that it would be helpful to clarify this point through an amendment to paragraph 3.16.

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

1. No change
2. Include definition of previously-developed land in paragraph 3.16.
3. Amend paragraph 3.16 to include reference to land of nature conservation.

## **Topic: Objective 2B**

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

1. The objective should embrace wider environmental concerns identified in PPG12 and guidance on Sustainability Appraisals. In particular, reference should be made to sustainable drainage systems, soil quality and dereliction. (226/AA – Environment Agency)
2. The objective should include a reference to geological features (210/AB – English Nature, 150/AB – Warwickshire County Council (Museum Field Service))
3. The objective should include a reference to opportunities that may exist for off-site compensation in addition to mitigation measures (210/AB – English Nature, 1/AB – Warwickshire Wildlife Trust)

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

1. Some of the issues raised in the objection are better dealt with under the proposed additional objective “to limit and reduce the impact of climate change”. However, some other points could be added to the objective to give more meaning to it.
2. I agree that a reference to geological features would be appropriate and in keeping with later policies.
3. I agree that a reference to compensation measures would be appropriate and in keeping with later policies.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. Include additions to paragraph 3.18 to refer to enhancing the natural environment.
2. Include additions to paragraph 3.18 to refer to geological features.
3. Include additions to paragraph 3.19 to refer to compensation measures.

**Topic: Objective 2C****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. The objective should reflect the broader definition of the historic environment including both designated and non-designated sites and areas (302/AD – English Heritage, 223/AD – Kenilworth Town Council, 189/AB – WDC Independent Group)
2. The objective should make explicit reference to buildings owned by Warwick District Council (195/AA – Leamington Society)
3. The local plan should be more supportive towards the use of Article 4 Direction Orders and conservation area statements (193/AU – Coten End & Emscote Residents Association, 199/AU – James Mackay)
4. There is concern that the objective is not supported by adequate policies later in the local plan (189/AB – Warwickshire Gardens Trust)
5. Reference should be made to archaeological sites (149/AA – Warwickshire County Council Archaeology)
6. The objective should include a more positive statement towards the role of tourism in protecting the historic environment (122/AF – Warwick Castle)

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

1. I agree that a reference to non statutory sites and areas would be appropriate.
2. The policies of the local plan should properly be applied to all land and buildings, irrespective of ownership. Any commitment by the council to maintain its buildings should properly be included in other documents such as the corporate strategy or community plan.
3. Article 4 Direction Orders are included in paragraph 9.41 and should properly be considered in this section. I would agree that a reference to conservation area statements would be helpful and suggest that the place for this would be under policy DAP10 which gives more detail on the protection to be given to conservation areas.
4. This objection is actually not one to this objective but to the policies that follow.

<p>These are considered separately in the relevant section of this report.</p> <p>5. I agree that a stronger reference to archaeological sites would be helpful. The objector suggests that more details should be provided on the measures that will be taken to protect such features, and I suggest that these are more appropriately dealt with elsewhere.</p> <p>6. There is already an objective supporting tourism and recognizing its importance to the economy. It is not considered that a further reference is needed here.</p>
<p><b>Recommended revision(s)</b></p> <p>1. Amend paragraph 3.20 to include a reference to non statutory sites and areas.</p> <p>2. No change</p> <p>3. No change</p> <p>4. No change</p> <p>5. Amend paragraph 3.20 to include a reference to archaeological sites</p> <p>6. No change.</p>

<b>Topic: Objective 2D</b>
<p><b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b></p> <p>1. There is a suggestion that there is a “one size fits all” approach to protecting the character and setting of towns and villages. ((54/AC – WDC Conservative Group)</p>
<p><b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b></p> <p>1. I do not feel that the objective does suggest a “one size fits all” approach. The objective has been amended however to reflect its re-worded Sustainability Appraisal definition and this provides an opportunity to ensure that issues of separate identity, individual character and distinctiveness are noted.</p>
<p><b>Recommended revision(s)</b></p> <p>1. Amendment made to objective to clarify this point.</p>

<b>Topic: Objective 2E</b>
<p><b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b></p> <p>1. The objective is supported however the words good design should be substituted for excellent design throughout. (148/AC – CPRE)</p>
<p><b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b></p>



1. I agree that it would be consistent to use the word excellent wherever relevant.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. Amend good with excellent wherever relevant.

**Topic: Objective 3A****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. The objective is supported however it is considered that there will be the need for additional development to meet the needs of rural areas. (117/AA – Langstone Homes, 239/AN – D. Austin)
2. The objective should recognise that farm diversification proposals cannot be on public transport routes. (154/AC – NFU)
3. The objective is supported however the local plan is criticized for not having a policy to achieve this. (193/AU – Coten End & Emscote Residents Association, 199/AU – James Mackay)
4. There are no criteria for measuring the impact of development upon those living in town centres. (191/AC – R. Richmond)

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

1. It is considered that the local plan does include appropriate policies to provide for meeting needs in rural areas and there is an objective in this core strategy to promote this (1C). I would agree, however, that it would be appropriate to include a reference to rural areas under this objective.
2. This point is recognised, however does not relate to reducing the need to travel, only to offering alternatives to the car (as covered in objective 3B).
3. I consider that many of the policies in the local plan work together to achieve this. In particular I would point to policy DP5, SC9, UAP1-3, TCP1-5, RAP5, RAP7 and SSP1.
4. The local plan contains policies to ensure that the amenity of residents is protected, and that development is carried out in a manner that can be supported by local infrastructure (see all the DP policies). Whilst I agree that it is important that planning policies should protect those living in town centres (particularly as Government policy urges us to encourage this), this should not be a reason for not generally encouraging residential development in town centres and other sustainable urban locations.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. Amend paragraph 3.25 to include a reference to rural areas.
2. No change.
3. No change.
4. No change.
- 5.

### **Topic: Objective 3B**

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

1. Restrictions against the private car can only be considered in urban areas where alternatives are available. Recreational cycling could be encouraged on minor roads. (234/AA – A. Gordon)
2. The objective should be more proactive towards proposals to improve public transport facilities and requiring that major travel generating developments are located and designed so that they are accessible by a sustainable means of transport. (193/AU – Coten End & Emscote Residents Association, 199/AU – James Mackay)

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

1. I agree that rural areas raise particular issues regarding sustainable travel choices and that there will be occasions where urban solutions will not work as easily in rural areas. Nevertheless, the objective is looking at how sustainable travel choices can be maximized across the district and this will mean focusing development, wherever possible, in suitable urban locations and encouraging improvements in public transport wherever possible.
2. I agree that the objective could be more positive in promoting public transport, mindful of the fact that the district council is not a public transport authority. We must work with other agencies to improve public transport services, but do have a role in facilitating public transport infrastructure and new transport interchanges.

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

1. No change
2. Amend paragraph to make a more positive reference to supporting public transport.

### **Topic: Objective 3C**

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

1. The objective supports proposals for renewable energy however the local plan needs a policy to provide criteria. (168/AC – Advantage West Midlands)
2. The policy should be more proactive towards energy efficient measures. (148/AD – CPRE)
3. The reference to “high quality” agricultural and should read “best and most versatile” in accordance with Structure Plan policy. (148/AD – CPRE)
4. Landscape is a resource that should be protected and reference should be made here. (148/AD – CPRE).

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

1. I would agree, and a new policy has been included to specifically address this issue (DP12a).
2. The local plan could not “require” that more energy efficiency measures are incorporated as suggested by the objector. Present Government policy only allows to encourage such measures. Policy SC12 (energy conservation) goes as far as it can by requiring applicants to demonstrate the reasons if they are unable to comply with the policy.
3. I agree that this change of wording would be helpful.
4. I agree that it would be helpful to make this reference.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. No change – but see new policy DP12a.
2. No change.
3. Amend paragraph 3.29 as indicated.
4. Amend paragraph 3.29 as indicated.

**Topic: Objective 4A****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. The objective should recognise the role played by mixed use developments in securing affordable housing. (228/AG – West Midlands RSL Consortium)
2. The objective should include a target for affordable housing. (228/AG – West Midlands RSL Consortium)

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

1. I would have no objection in principle to mixed use developments which include affordable housing. This objective does not preclude this option, and indeed paragraph 3.26 promotes mixed use schemes.
2. I agree that including a target would be helpful and one is now included in policy SC9 (affordable housing). A reference to this could be made in this objective.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. No change
2. amend paragraph 3.31 as indicated.

**Topic: Objective 4B****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. The Council should support the development of “lifetime” homes (homes that are suitable for different generations of families at the same time, including provision for the disabled) as a proportion of all new homes built in the district across all tenures.

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

1. I agree that the Council should wish to promote “lifetime” homes, however it would be difficult at the present time to require that a percentage of homes are built to this standard. Nevertheless, a reference to this here, and also in policy SC1, would be helpful.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. Amend paragraph 3.32 and policy SC1 in line with above comments.

**Topic: Objective 4C****Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. There are other means open to the Council for promoting the health and well being of communities; for example providing footpaths and cycleways, providing a range of local shops and services, etc. These should be added to the local plan.  
(193/AY- Coten End & Emscote Residents Association, 199/AY – James Mackay)

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

1. I agree that it would help a broader understanding of this objective to include reference to other means of promoting a healthy lifestyle.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. Amend paragraph 3.33 as suggested above.

<b>Topic: Objective 4D</b>
<b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b>  No objections were made to this section
<b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b>
<b>Recommended revision(s)</b>

<b>Topic: Objective 4E</b>
<b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b>  No objections were made to this section
<b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b>
<b>Recommended revision(s)</b>

<b>Topic: Chapter 3 Omissions</b>
<b>Summary of matters raised in objections.</b>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aims 1 and 4 should include a reference to higher education and the high technology corridors. (107/AA – University of Warwick)</li> <li>2. The local plan should include a statement about the use and renovation of empty properties (262/AG – Warwick and Leamington Green Party)</li> <li>3. Landscape character should be acknowledged as a separate objective in view of its multi faceted character. (302/AC – English Heritage)</li> <li>4. The local plan should include an objective to support and improve existing and new leisure uses. (303/AA – Racecourse Holdings Trust)</li> </ol>
<b>Response of Head of Planning &amp; Engineering to matters raised</b>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would agree that a reference to higher education and the high technology corridors as identified in the RSS would be helpful. This is best placed within the spatial strategy to the local plan.</li> <li>2. The local plan already encourages the use of vacant buildings through objective 2A and paragraph 3.16. It is not felt that any further reference is necessary.</li> <li>3. I consider that the various objectives of the core strategy, when read together, do give adequate recognition of, and protection to, the various aspects of landscape character, including historic landscapes. However, to underline the point, a reference to “historic landscapes” in objective 2C would be helpful.</li> <li>4. Supporting and improving existing and new leisure uses is not an end in itself, however its aim is to provide facilities for the health and wellbeing of the local community and to help maintain the overall economic prosperity of the district. The</li> </ol>

core strategy already makes reference to both of these aims (objectives 1A and 4C) and it is not considered that any further references are required.

**Recommended revision(s)**

1. Include within the spatial strategy a reference to both the High Technology Corridors and the University.
2. No change
3. Amend objective 2C to refer to historic landscapes.
4. No change