

Warwick District Local Plan 1996 - 2011

Topic Response Analysis – First Draft Deposit Version

Topic: DP1 – Layout and Design

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. The Plan should create a better relationship between DP1 and DP5. There is concern that developers will focus more readily on policy DP5, (with the emphasis being on the question of density). There is no mention of the Rock Townsend Study – all developers should be required to read this, and it should be made clear that pastiche buildings are not to be encouraged. *ref: 296/AK CLARA.*
2. Objects to the demolition of family homes for replacement high density development which would affect the character of North Leamington. *ref: 281 /AA Mrs Bernadette Seales.*
3. The policy should prevent the demolition of large homes to be replaced with high density houses (this will be detrimental to the character of north Leamington). *ref: 273/ AA R.H.S. Montanaro.*
4. The policy should preclude high density development where it is out of keeping with the existing built form. *ref: 252/ AA. Dr T L and Mrs M E Dunn.*
5. Policy DP1 is too prescriptive, it does not allow for new development to be significantly different in physical form, urban design, architectural style, scale height, form, or mass to the existing settlement / surrounding buildings. Policy DP1 does not allow for the more efficient use of land required by National guidance. Moreover, DP1 does not allow for radical solutions, new building technology or innovative design. The objector has asked that the criteria are amended as follows with some criteria omitted and some changed. **(a)** *'relate positively to the existing settlement in terms of physical form, patterns of movement and land use'.* **(b)** *'relate well to local topography and landscape features'.* **(c)** *OMIT: criterion (c) duplicates criterion (a) and cannot be justified where existing urban character is undistinguished;* **(d)** *OMIT Criterion (d) duplicates criterion (a) and will result in neo –vernacular pastiche.* **(e)** *No objection.* **(f)** *Omit; criterion (f) duplicates criterion (a) and cannot be justified where surrounding buildings are undistinguished, or where PPG3 requires higher density;* **(g)** *Omit: for the same reason as the objection to (f) above.* **(h)** *omit for the same reason as the objection to criterion (c) above;* **(i)** *'provide adequate open space for the development in terms of quality and quantity'. This is the essential design requirement, which may or may not relate to adjacent open areas. It is not reasonable to require developers to upgrade existing open spaces, unless related to the development;* **(j)** *no objection;* **(k)** *no objection. Finally the last paragraph of Policy DP1 should be amended to read 'development proposals which have a **potentially** significant impact...' ref: 229 /AA Gallagher Estates Limited.*
6. Part (e) of the policy should read: 'enhance and incorporate important existing features into the development', as opposed to retain and incorporate (e.g. existing culverted watercourses can be opened up to be visually more acceptable whilst providing habitat and flood alleviation benefits). *ref: 226/AB Environment Agency.*

7. Suggest that the importance of SPG should be emphasised by much stronger wording and the continued existence and application of current SPG should be clarified. *ref: 223/ AF Kenilworth Town Council.*
8. There is insufficient flexibility in the wording of this policy it stifles innovative design. (quotes para 56 of PPG3 'recognising that new building technologies are capable of delivering acceptable built forms and may be more efficient'). We should rephrase the policy to allow more innovative design, for example to all development proposals where the form , scale and/ or massing maybe different from existing development immediately surrounding, but it is of high quality design. *ref: 220/AB Cala Homes (Midlands) Ltd.*
9. *Development should not be allowed which harms historic distinctiveness or the character of areas of local significance. WDC should protect the Jephson Gardens other listed green sites and Green Belt from intrusion by cycle tracks.* *ref: 195 /AB The Leamington Society.*
10. The term significant should either be removed from this paragraph or the caveat inserted" significant as judged by The Council" in order to leave the decision as to what constitutes significant with the Council. Para 4.16 should be strengthened to require WDC to produce SPG as they know the area better than a future developer. Para 4.7 Where the proposed development involves work other than alteration or extension to existing premises the Council should be required to consult local representative groups, rather than "where it considers appropriate". Para 4.8 The paragraph should be strengthened to read "applicants will be expected to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that their development achieves good layout and design". *ref: 198 / AA John Henderson.*
11. The Plan should address the situation where amended plans are submitted after the granting of planning permission. *ref: 197 /AB Norton Lindsey Parish Council.*
12. Demolishing perfectly good houses to be replaced by more dense developments does not reflect , respect and reinforce local distinctiveness, developments should not be allowed that damage the character of a street (including mature trees) Northumberland Road should be protected by a site specific policy). It is particularly important to protect and strengthen the Regency architecture of Leamington (particularly in the Conservation Area), planning briefs and public consultation should be required for development of any important site. *ref: 195/AB The Leamington Society.*
13. The Council should be required to consult local representative groups, rather than 'only where it considers appropriate'. Para 4.8. This paragraph should be strengthened to read 'applications will demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that their development achieves good design and layout'. *ref: 194 / AA Vernon Lawton.*
14. The Association welcomes the opportunity to take part in pre-application discussions and will expect these to be arranged for all applications which significantly affect the amenity, character or quality of the area or have a significant impact on its infrastructure. *ref:193/AZ Coten End Residents Association.*
15. General support for DP1, however would like to see a cross reference to DP3 in relation to protecting landscape character and distinctiveness. The Council may also wish to refer to documents such as village design statements as sources of advice and guidance. *ref: 187/AB The Countryside Agency (West Midlands Region).*
16. Layout and Design, change to read 'development should harmonise with prominent ridge lines **and** other important topographical and landscape features'.

A new sub paragraph should be added stating that no development will be permitted that intrudes on ridge lines. There is a 'typo' loca should read local. In point (g) the word "used" should be replaced by "to achieve the purposes of paragraphs a) to f)". DP1 (k) the uses of the word "including" would be clearer than using e.g. Design: there should be a specific policy to control the design and amount of signs and other street furniture that can clutter streets, land and developments and detract from desirable openness. Layout and Design there needs to be an acceptable definition of 'significant impact' in the policy. Paragraph 4.6 should state that supplementary planning guidance "will" be produced and specify a target date. 4.6 Landscaping: there should be a fifth bullet point to read – trees and other landscaping within new development sites. *ref: 148/AA and 148/AE Campaign to Protect Rural England (Warwickshire Branch).*

17. Aware of the growing trend of developers to identify and target existing substantial properties and their gardens within L/Spa the Local Plan should note specifically that such proposals are very unlikely to be consistent with the policies DP1 and DP2. *ref: 128 /AA Mr and Mrs Devereux.*
18. This policy should include a reference to car parking as it would affect the layout and design of a development. *ref:109/ AF Warwickshire County Council (Planning Transport and Economic Strategy).*
19. Reference should be made in paras 4.2 – 4.11 to PPG1 and DETR By design document to assist people who may be submitting planning applications. *ref: 109 /AF Warwickshire County Council (Planning Transport and Economic Strategy).*
20. Consideration should be given to the cumulative effect of development and ad – hoc applications on drainage systems within the general area. *ref: 69 / AA. Linda Forbes.*
21. Para 4.8 should be amended to include reference to include decent standards of accommodation in terms of size , daylight and outlook as in paras 5.54 for affordable housing. *ref: 66/AG The Warwick Society.*
22. The demolition and redevelopment of of large buildings would damage areas and be in conflict with objective 2D of the Plan. Residential areas should also be protected from the development of mobile phone masts. *Ref: 44/AA P. Lloyd.*

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. This policy should not be read in isolation and the introduction to this chapter states that the Development policies are 'generic' by nature and that all development proposals should be assessed against them as appropriate. The Rock Townsend Study has particular issues in relation to Leamington Spa and the Conservation Area and is mentioned in DAP10.
2. The demolition of family homes for replacement high density development is not contrary to Government Guidance, such approaches will be considered against a range of criteria involving DP1, DP5 and Conservation Area criteria where relevant. In North Leamington the Conservation Area boundary has recently been extended to assist the protection of a substantial range of quality locations that may have been under threat from 'intensification' proposals.
3. This Policy should be read in conjunction with DP5 and other policies of the plan such as Conservation Area policy where appropriate in making decisions about replacement high density developments. The reasoned justification could (in due course refer to Alan Mayes' emerging residential

design guidance.

4. High density development that is detrimental to an areas character and residential amenity are deterred by details within policies DP2 and DP5.
5. The objector states that this policy is too prescriptive in that it does not allow for innovative design solutions or solutions that are significantly different to existing. I think that this is not the case. The policy clearly states in the reasoned justification that the Council supports the use of imaginative new designs at the right location (para4.11).
6. We could consider changing criterion (e) to read 'enhance' and incorporate for the reasons set out – if you are incorporating existing features into a development the they are being retained.
7. The importance of SPG could be strengthened para 4.16 (reference to emerging guidance on residential design may be relevant).
8. I do not believe that the policy stifles innovative design, it does however ensure that that design can be assimilated successfully into the existing built/natural environment.
9. The policy seeks to ensure that the historic distinctiveness/ important character of areas are maintained. The provision of safe routes for cycling should not prejudice the above and should be designed/ achieved accordingly.
10. This objector would like to see the term significant replaced with 'significant as judged by the Council' whilst I see the reason behind this approach it would not be appropriate to assume the Council could be the final arbiter in all instances of what constitutes a significant impact. WDC intends to produce SPG (this may be done in conjunction with developers – and will involve public consultation as appropriate). Consultation on planning applications has to conform with/ be carried out in line with the general arrangements under the General Development Procedure Order 1995.
11. Where amended plans are submitted after planning permission has been granted the requirements of DP1 will still have to be satisfied.
12. The Leamington Society should take solace from the fact that Conservation areas have been re-surveyed and where deemed necessary expanded to offer more protection against re-development that may compromise the overall character and distinctiveness of quality areas. (Particularly Northumberland Road). The Council is also producing detailed advice (SPG) regarding residential design criteria that will be assessed in conjunction with DP1 and other DP policies in determining planning applications.
13. The Council will consult with appropriate agencies/ parties where appropriate in accordance with the General Development Procedure Order 1995.
14. The Coten End Residents association may or may not be consulted depending on the scale and location of any future developments (see 13 above).
15. Landscape character and distinctiveness are aspects covered by DP3(note the policies of the DP chapter should not be read in isolation.
16. To replace e.g. would imply that this list was exhaustive. " Street Clutter" as defined by the objector refers to highways signage covered by Highway Legislation. In particularly sensitive areas (such as Conservation Areas) the Highways Authority liaises with this Authority. There is no

definitive advice on what constitutes significant impact, however this policy gives us the ability to consider the significance or otherwise of development impacts on a 'case by case' technique. How can we say when supplementary Planning Guidance will be produced and specify a target date?, it is commissioned to react to emerging circumstances/ sites, however we could mention residential design guidance?. Landscaping point is covered by criterion e.

17. I cannot agree with this objection it is fundamentally incorrect in light of PPG3.
18. We have an explicit Policy for car parking(DP8), in any case criterion (k) refers to car parking being well related to development projects.
19. We could refer to the aforementioned documents if thought of particular use / relevance? Perhaps more relevant to refer to PPS1 that has now been issued.
20. The relevant agencies are consulted on planning applications and any infrastructure required is sought at this juncture.
21. Policy DP1 intends to set out basic principles that underpin all development (not just residential). Building Regulations check for basic standards of design to ensure minimum standards.
22. Whilst in some particularly sensitive areas (e.g. Conservation Areas) the loss of large buildings can be injurious, in general terms the demolition of property for redevelopment is not contrary to Government . Mobile phone masts are dealt with by the provisions of this policy and in particular SC8 (Telecommunications).

Recommended revision(s)

1. No change
2. No change
3. The importance of SPG could be strengthened with reference to emerging residential design guidance.
4. No change
5. No change
6. Possible alteration of criterion e) to read 'enhance and incorporate'
7. See response to 3.
8. No change
9. No change
10. No change
11. No change
12. See response to 3
13. No change
14. No change
15. No change
16. See response to 3
17. No change
18. No change
19. Refer to PPS1 as a cross reference.

Topic: DP2 - Amenity

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Objects to para's 4.12 – 4.15 on the basis that they do not see any conflict between the principles of good design and best use of land. They believe that developments that are intrusive and cause serious loss of amenity cannot be described as well designed. Nor can they be deemed efficient use of land because the social costs outweigh the benefits. *ref: 221/AD Kenilworth Society.*
2. The Council should update the Supplementary Planning Guidance referred to in paragraph 4.15 on distance separation and the 45 degree rule to reflect changes in national policy since their original publication. *ref: 220 /AD Cala Homes*
3. This objection is on the basis that the design standards referred to in 5,45 for social housing should be applied to all other housing, setting decent standards of accommodation in terms of size, daylight, open space and outlook. *ref: 199 / BA James Mackay.*
4. This objection is exactly the same as 3. above. *ref: 193 /BA Coten End Residents Association.*
5. Para graph 4.13 – to improve certainty of the policy it should be made clear that this is a definition of “amenity”. To change this “ can be described as “ should be deleted and replaced with “means”. *ref: 148 / AF Campaign to Protect Rural England (Warwickshire Branch).*
6. There is a conflict between this policy and DP5. The statement in 4.28 regarding development land at higher densities confirms this conflict. There is a need to qualify / clarify what the plan intends. Although they acknowledge that DP5, 4.32 goes some way to doing so. *ref: 54 /AD Conservative Group of Councillors.*
7. The policy is vague and relies on subjective considerations. It overlaps with, but is inferior to, the more specific policies set out in DP1 and DP3. The policy should therefore be deleted. *ref: 4 /AD Arlington Planning Services.*

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised.

1. The best use of land requires certain density requirements to be met in line with Government Guidance (PPG3). In attaining particular density requirements in some instances it may be that compromises may have to be made in relation to design outcomes. This can be permitted provided that unacceptable adverse impacts on amenity are not created.
2. The Council is updating its SPG on residential design and as a part of this process distance separation and the 45% rule are being revisited.
3. This objection would like to see the Councils social housing standards applied to all development . It must be noted that these standards are minimum requirements. It is ultimately the function of Building Regulations to police many of the issues raised in this submission.
4. As above.
5. The phrase ‘can be described as’ (para 4.13) is a little vague and open to interpretation. The plan should be more positive with its description of amenity.
6. There can be conflict between preserving amenity and aspiring to meet required densities. The policy is precise in stating that development that creates unacceptable adverse impacts will not be permitted. Acceptable standards

<p>for future uses/ occupiers may still be achievable with certain design concessions.</p> <p>7. This policy is necessary as an extra ‘overlapping’ policy to supplement DP1 and DP3. I accept that it relies on subjective considerations, and that this is necessary in trying to understand /assess the interrelationship between the many different existing and proposed developments (by type and scale) facing the District.</p>
<p>Recommended Revision(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change 2. No change 3. No change 4. No change 5. Change wording of paragraph 4.13 to give a more prescriptive definition of ‘amenity’.

Topic: DP3 – Natural Environment

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. There are concerns as to how the policy addresses the historic environment and landscape character. Although it is acknowledged that there is a need for a succinct and rationalized policy framework it is considered that ‘natural environment’, historic environment and landscape character should be dealt with under separate policies. It is recommended that DP3 is restructured and two separate policies are introduced on historic environment and landscape character. On a detailed wording point the phrase where necessary should be deleted from points (a) and (b). *ref: 302 / AJ English Heritage(West Midlands Region)*.
2. Policy DP3 as currently worded is too prescriptive, it is asked that the criteria of Policy DP3 be amended as follows, with some criteria omitted and others changed. **(a)** ‘Protect and / or enhance where appropriate, existing site features of nature conservation and landscape value’. **(b)** Similarly, amend ‘necessary’ to ‘appropriate’. **(c)** Omit: criterion (c) duplicates DP1 and could be onerous, if for example, landscape character changes by virtue of development. **(d)** Omit: criterion (d) duplicates criterion(i) and (k) of DP1. **(e)** Omit: criterion (e) duplicates criterion (k) of DP1. **(f)** No objection. Finally the word potentially should be added before the words ‘significant impact’ in the final paragraph of DP3. *ref:229/ AB Gallagher Estates Limited*.
3. Objection is raised to this policy on the basis that the wording in the various points should say “ protect and/ or enhance” but should state “protect or enhance”. *ref: 239 /AM Mr. D Austin*.
4. General support for the policy however, it should aim to repair the environmental and ecological damage that has already taken place in the countryside. *ref: 234 /AE Parish Councillor, Sherbourne*.
5. Objects to the wording of criteria (a) and (b) of the policy it is implied that the current wording suggests that features have to be of nature conservation and landscape importance to be protected. DAP3 should be changed to read’ protect and / or enhance existing site features of nature conservation and / or landscape

- value'. DP3 (b) should be amended to read 'protect and/ or enhance features of historical, archaeological and / or geological significance. ref: 226 /AC Environment Agency.
6. Supports DP3, however the policy should be reinforced by the addition of a statement that Section 106 agreements will be used to ensure that future residents/ users of new developments do not undo the landscaping etc that is in the original plan. *ref:221/AE Kenilworth Society.*
 7. English Nature welcomes the references to emerging HBA, Biodiversity action plans etc, it believes the wording of paragraph 4.22 could benefit from improved clarity. EH would like to 4.22 to be altered to read: "The District benefits from a survey of its natural assets, the Habitat Biodiversity Audit and the management and enhancement of the assets identified is now being taken forward in the emerging Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Warwickshire Coventry and Solihull. These will be taken into account when assessing the impact of development proposals on nature conservation interests." *ref: 210 /AG English Nature.*
 8. Objection is raised to this policy on the basis that the wording in the various points should not say "protect and /or enhance" but should state "protect or enhance". *ref :200 /AL Taylor Woodrow Strategic Developments.*
 9. Objects to paragraphs (a) and (b). In order to strengthen these the words "where necessary" should be removed. The character of the Kenilworth Rd/ Beachamp Avenue/ Arlington Avenue and Lillington Avenue area would benefit from the serving of a TPO on the mature trees at these locations; this would then accord with the biodiversity policy implicit in the paragraphs that accompany this policy. The concern about the natural environment would be reinforced if the reference to "local importance" were to be amended to read "local interest". The final line of the paragraph as quoted does not identify the reference to "The Community Plan". The present wording "The Council encourages applicants" should be replaced by "The Council requires applicants" in order to convey the importance attached to the natural environment of an area. *ref: 198/AB John Henderson.*
 10. Objects to Policy para (a) and (b) , the words " where necessary" should be omitted. Para 4.16 should state that tree preservation orders on all existing mature trees would help retain the natural environment within the area bounded by Kenilworth Rd, Binswood Avenue, Arlington Avenue and Lillington Avenue. Para 4.19 – to emphasise the importance of the natural environment of an area this paragraph should be changed to read" The Council requires all applicants to submit landscape information". *ref: 194/AB Vernon Lawton.*
 11. The Countryside Agency's main concern is that the text deals with nature conservation and landscape character in the same breath. Whilst they recognize the relationships between landscape and ecology, the issues are not always the same. In particular para 4.17 relates ecology to the Warwickshire landscape guidelines with no mention of the landscape implications. They also consider that the plan should make it clear how the landscape Guidelines will be used at the more detailed local level to protect and enhance character, in the way they are mentioned as SPG in para 9.16 for Special Landscape Areas. It is also unclear how DP1 and DP3 relate to one another. The Council may wish to consider how the suggested "Character Appraisals" and "Landscape Analysis" will be distinguished; and how both can be derived from the County's study and guidelines. The Plan should – clarify the relationship with policy DP1 and its requirements; distinguish more effectively between landscape and ecological issues; refer to the use of the Landscape Guidelines as Supplementary Planning Guidance to inform decisions. *ref: 187 /AC The Countryside Agency (West*

Midlands Region).

12. Suggests amendments to the wording of Policy DP3 and para 4.16 in relation to geomorphological sites. Para 4.20 needs to be more inclusive of all aspects of the natural environment whilst 4.22 should be changed to more accurately describe the information and projects which should be taken into account(the HBA is only part of the data that is currently available, other projects are currently using the HBA data and expanding it. The following changes are therefore proposed; Policy wording b)... archaeological and geological **and geomorphological** significance". "Development proposals which have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of an area will be required to demonstrate how they comply with this policy by way of a **Nature Conservation and Landscape analysis**". In 4.16; Wildlife habitats, and landscape **and geological features**.... This can be achieved through careful consideration of habitat / landscape design with regard to existing site features and the landscape character, **geology** and ecology of the surrounding area". Para 4.20; "When considering proposals which have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of an area, the Council will expect applicants to produce a nature conservation and Landscape Analysis. "An assessment of the local **geodiversity, biodiversity ecology** and landscape character of the area"; "details of the proposed habitat/ geological/landscape features and how it responds positively to the findings of the assessment. Para 4.22; **"Acknowledge sites of nature conservation interest such as those identified as potential Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, the Habitat Biodiversity Audit, the Emerging Local Geodiversity Action Plan** and the emerging Local Biodiversity Action Plan for Action Plan for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull will be taken into account when assessing the impact of development proposals on nature conservation interests". ref: 150/ AC Warwickshire County Council (*Museum Field Services – Ecology*).
13. Policy DP3 should more explicitly acknowledge the historic dimension of the landscape, the following alterations are suggested. "DP3 Natural **and Historic Environment and Landscape**. "Development will only be permitted quality of its natural **and historic** environment... criterion (b) "Archaeological and geological significance, **and respect the historic character of the landscape**"; Para 4.16"and quality of our environment, **whose character is also the product of long term historical processes**". Para 4.23 **"The results of the programme of Historic landscape Characterisation to be undertaken by Warwickshire Museum will need to be taken into account when assessing the impact of development proposals on the historic landscape"**. ref: 149 /AB Warwickshire County Council (*Museum Field Services – Archaeology*).
14. The following wording changes are suggested, para 4.16 the word "features "is self explanatory and the examples "trees and ponds" are not necessary and should be deleted. Para 4.16 should be reworded to be more prescriptive and in the final sentence we should delete "can" and replace it with **"should"**. Paragraph 4.20, the final bullit point is unclear and would be better if replaced by **"details of arrangements** for the ongoing maintenance...". Paragraph 4.21 topographical error needs correcting "to" between "produce" and "further" should be deleted. ref: 148 /AG Campaign to Protect Rural England(*Warwickshire Branch*).
15. Objection is raised to this policy on the basis that the wording in the various points should not say "protect and / or enhance" but should state **"protect or enhance"**. ref:120/AD Miller Homes (*West Midlands*).
16. This objection is identical to no15 (above). ref:117 /AE Langston Homes Ltd.

17. Policy DP3 e) and para 4.20 should be reworded. DP3 e) should read “integrate the amenity space and proposed **landscape design** into the overall development”. Para 4.20 delete **significant**, as it is difficult to judge what is significant or not. *ref:109 /AW Warwickshire County Council (Planning Transport & Economic Strategy).*

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. Whilst accepting the need for explicit reference to the Historic landscape, it is considered unnecessary to have a separate policy to cover this issue. I accept that the phrase where necessary is unnecessary and should be deleted from criterion a) and b).
2. I do not agree that the suggested alterations set out have any worth / add to the policy in its current format.
3. I believe the policy wording as set out is appropriate.
4. It is difficult for this policy to arrest damage that has previously been done, however in some instances new development proposals may bring forward an opportunity for enhancement works that may address previous issues.
5. These proposed changes would strengthen the policy and should be added accordingly.
6. Section 106 arrangements can be used to agree the arrangement and layout of landscaping features. Once they have been implemented they can be adopted by the Council or maintained privately. Where landscaping is removed or damaged it is the responsibility of the owner to repair it. Enforcement powers can be used to ensure removal contrary to planning approvals does not take place.
7. The reference to the emerging habitat biodiversity audit and the biodiversity plan should be added to the reasoned justification to strengthen the policy
8. Same as objection 3 above I do not feel that this would add to the policy.
9. Deletion of the words where necessary would strengthen the policy, the Council can not require the submission of landscape information in all instances, however where the scale and nature of the development is appropriate this information will be sought.
10. As above (see 9).
11. The Habitat Audit and the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines both recognise features in the District's environment that should be protected. The preservation of landscape character and wildlife habitat are both interlinked/ overlapping objectives. Landscape character is protected by reference to the necessity to produce a landscape analysis, criteria c) of the policy is to be strengthened to cover landscape character.
12. This submission has a range of proposed textual alterations that should be added to the policy and reasoned justification to improve its robustness/ clarity.
13. A series of wording changes are suggested by the County Councils field services section, they are most relevant particularly with regard to historic landscape matters.
14. The objection suggests a range of minor text changes that would add to the policy and reasoned justification.
15. Same as objections 2 above.
16. Same as objection 2 and 15 above.
17. I do not consider these changes to have any particular worth as there is no definitive description of 'significant' in the guidance. It is for the applicant and the Council to determine each case and its relative significance in relation to the particular details/proposal for consideration.

Recommended revision(s)

1. Strengthen reference to the historic landscape, also add to title of policy.
2. No change
3. No change
4. No change
5. Add the suggested wording put forward by the Environment Agency.
6. Add the reference to the emerging habitat and biodiversity action plan to the reasoned justification.
9. Delete where necessary from criterion a) and b) of the policy.
10. See response to 9.
11. Make a specific criteria in the policy to refer to landscape character (see c)
12. Add County Council Ecology units wording changes to both the policy and the reasoned justification.
13. Add the text changes as suggested.
14. Add the suggested changes as set out in the objection.
15. No changes
16. No changes
17. No changes

Topic: DP4 - Archaeology**Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. Supports DP4 but it is suggested that the policy should be strengthened through the identification of more recent sites of interest i.e. the World War Two sites used for gas decontamination at Pipers Lane (Site of Former Engineering Works) and Youth Club / Community Hall at St John's Church (Cllr. Spencer Harrison ref: 53/AA).
2. Object on the grounds that the policy should adopt a more flexible approach to development on archaeological remains as set out in Para 16 of PPG16 (Cala Homes ref: 220/AE).
3. It is suggested that the word 'exceptional' should be removed from the first sentence of Para 4.25 to acknowledge that archaeological remains of local interest are widespread and as such only those of national importance might take precedence (Gallagher Estates ref: 229/AE).
4. Support the inclusion of a policy relating to archaeology within chapter 4: however a number of issues are raised with regard to the general approach of the policy (English Heritage ref: 302/AL).
 - The clarity of the wording of criteria a) should be improved.
 - In accordance with Paragraph 3 of PPG16 it is suggested that criteria b) should be amended to require that where development affecting features of local or regional importance is acceptable mitigation will be sought preferably through the in situ preservation of these remains. Where this is

not feasible development should make provision for the recording or excavation of remains prior or during development.

- Object to a lack of clarity in the type of archaeological recording and investigation required prior to the determination of a planning application or as part of any conditions attached.
- The policy should include a reference encouraging interpretation and educational opportunities.

5. Object that the wording of the policy does not adequately articulate its intention or government guidance and is less detailed than the policies contained within the adopted local plan (Warwick Field Services Archaeology ref: 149/AC).

- Policy should not be isolated from other DAP policies relating to the historic environment in chapter 9.
- Object that the requirement to request archaeological evaluation prior to determination (in accordance with PPG16) has been diluted in DP4 through its inclusion in the reasoned justification rather than the policy wording.
- The reference in criteria a) to the definition of scheduled monuments on the proposals maps is misleading and should be reworded as these are defined by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
- Object that the policy no longer refers to the Council's intention of securing the management and maintenance of archaeological sites or encouraging accessibility or interpretative facilities.

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. This is a matter which should be directed to the County Council archaeological unit or to English Heritage as appropriate. The local plan will reflect and respect any designations made by these organisations.
2. In accordance with PPG16, DP4 seeks to resist the loss of nationally listed sites and adopt a more flexible approach to sites of local or regional importance. The removal of the word 'exceptional' in Para 16 of PPG16 (See below) will reinforce this approach. See also the comments below concerning the re-drafting of the policy.
3. It is agreed that in accordance with Para 16 of PPG16 the word exceptional should be removed. This will acknowledge that in the case of proposals affecting locally or regional important sites the benefits of development will generally outweigh the disadvantage rather than being the exception.
4. In response to this objection and to that by Warwickshire County Council (see below) I agree that the policy would benefit from a significant re-drafting that should address all of the objections raised.
 - A re-wording would improve the clarity of criterion a).
 - Para 4.23 notes that in accordance with government guidance there is a presumption in favour of the preservation 'in situ' of nationally important archaeological remains. This should be extended to include where

<p>appropriate sites of local or regional importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I agree that it may be beneficial to clarify the type of archaeological information required prior to determination. • Para 4.27 of the reasoned justification states that the Council in conjunction with English Heritage and The National Trust will encourage the provision of interpretative facilities. It is considered unnecessary to further expand this. <p>5. See comments on 4 above. The wording of DP4 seeks to incorporate all of the key issues previously considered in the four archaeology policies in the adopted local plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designated area policies contained in Chapter 9 relate to specific areas identified on the proposals maps whereas DP4 is intended to apply across the district. It should be noted that the same level of protection is provided irrespective of where the policy is located within the Local Plan. • I agree that this could be included within the policy. • It is agreed that this may lead to confusion and as such the sentence should be reworded. • Para 4.27 of the reasoned justification states that the Council in conjunction with English Heritage and The National Trust will encourage the provision of interpretative facilities. It is considered unnecessary to further expand this.
<p>Recommended revision (s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change 2. See amended policy proposed. 3. See amended policy proposed 4. See amended policy proposed 5. See amended policy proposed

<p>Topic: DP5 - Density</p>
<p>Summary of matters raised in objections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy would encourage developments involving the replacement of existing family homes with high density residential developments of flats. This type of development can have a detrimental effect on the character of low density residential environments and should be discouraged. Residential densities should reflect existing character. <i>79/AB Matthew Rhodes; 89/AA M & C Hughes; 164/AA Jeremy Foster; 171/AC Portland Place Residents Association; 189/AD Warwickshire Gardens Trust; 198/AC John Henderson; 199/BB James Mackay; 210/AH English Nature; 223/AH Kenilworth Town Council; 255/AA J T Cashman; 266/AB Warwick Town Council; 275/AA M Kensler; 282/AA David Marr</i> 2. There should be a separate policy for residential density and the policy should give examples of those locations where higher densities would be appropriate. <i>110/AA Government Office for the West Midlands</i>

3. The policy conflicts with Policy DP1
223/AH Kenilworth Town Council; 233/AC Tanya Newby
4. The policy lacks clarity. It should state more clearly what is meant by “best use”
4/AE Arlington Planning Services; 148/AH CPRE (Warks Branch); 189/AD Warwickshire Gardens Trust; 193/BB Coten End & Emscote Residents Association; 199/BB James Mackay; 221/AG Kenilworth Society
5. The policy should make clear the circumstances when an exception to the requirement to make best use of land would be appropriate.
201/AO House Builders’ Federation; 221/AG Kenilworth Society
6. Paragraph 4.29 should make it clear that the density guideline relates to net density.
201/AO House Builders’ Federation
7. Requirement in para 4.31, for applicant to demonstrate why a high density cannot be achieved, should be deleted
201/AO House Builders’ Federation
8. The word “exceptional” in paragraph 4.31 should be deleted
189/AD Warwickshire Gardens Trust; 193/BB Coten End & Emscote Residents Association; 194/AC Vernon Lawton; 198/AC John Henderson; 199/BB James Mackay; 275/AA M Kenser
9. The policy should be deleted as the issues are covered in Policy DP1
219/AA Deeley Properties Limited
10. The figure of 60% in paragraph 4.29 is out of context and unreferenced.
233/AC Tanya Newby
11. High density developments can be harmful in villages. The policy should make clear that density is considered alongside quality of design
148/AH CPRE
12. The policy should state that a minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare should be achieved on suitable sites.
109/AO Warwickshire CC (PTES)

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. Policy DP1 will ensure that the character of areas, or good quality design, is not compromised in the implementation of DP5. The explanatory memorandum could clarify the relationship between density, design and the character of areas
2. The policy could reflect government policy in PPG3 more accurately by including a section specifically on housing density. This could give examples of appropriate housing densities in general circumstances (not less than 30 dwellings per hectare); and in more sustainable locations, such as town centres, (50+ dph).
3. The conflict is seen to exist where, on the one hand, Policy DP5 seeks “higher

	<p>densities” and, on the other hand, Policy DP1 seeks to protect the character of areas. PPG3 makes it clear that local planning authorities should seek to reconcile these two potentially conflicting objectives by seeking high standards of design and layout which respects the townscape and landscape of the wider locality. The policy and explanatory memorandum could make this clearer (See 1)</p> <p>4. The explanatory memorandum does not define “best use” but the suggestion is made in para.4.29 that this means developing at increased densities and, as far as residential development is concerned, developing at densities of more than 30 dwellings per hectare. The Warwickshire Structure Plan states in Policy H.3 that Local Plans should minimise the amount of greenfield land needed for new housing development by maximising the use made of sites through increased housing densities by good design and layout. Paragraph 4.3.9 of the Structure Plan states that Districts should consider the ways in which they will deliver increased housing densities. The policy could clarify the locations where higher densities will be appropriate and the explanatory memorandum should make clear that “best” is defined as making efficient use of land by developing at appropriate densities whilst achieving a high standard of design and layout.</p> <p>5. Paragraph 4.31 states that exceptional circumstances will be when high density would “compromise the character of the area or standards of residential amenity”</p> <p>6. Agreed. Add “net” to paragraph 4.29.</p> <p>7. It is not unreasonable or impractical to require the applicant to demonstrate why a lower density is appropriate. This may be due to physical site constraints, the character of adjacent development or the existence of natural features of acknowledged importance which it is necessary to protect.</p> <p>8. Agreed that “exceptional” could be deleted.</p> <p>9. The issues of density and making the best use of land are not covered in Policy DP1.</p> <p>10. It is not considered necessary to fully reference the figure of 60%. Details of the pre-deposit consultation exercise can be obtained from the District Council on request.</p> <p>11. A village location may be an instance where a lower density would be appropriate depending upon the character of the area. This possibility is covered in paragraph 4.31</p> <p>12. See 2.</p>
	<p>Recommended revision(s)</p> <p>1-4 Add to policy: & “In the case of residential developments, the following net densities should be 12 achieved unless such a density would compromise the character of the area or the standards of residential amenity: a) In town centres and near to public transport interchanges in urban areas, a net density of no less than 50 dwellings per hectare b) Elsewhere, a net density of no less than 30 dwellings per hectare”</p> <p>In paragraph 4.28 delete last sentence from “Developing...”.</p> <p>In paragraph 4.29, add the following sentence after “...30 dwellings per hectare” : “Further, government guidance advises local planning authorities to seek greater</p>

intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility such as city, town, district and local centres or around major nodes along good quality public transport corridors". Delete "Furthermore".

In paragraph 4.30 delete second and third sentences and insert " For the purposes of this policy, a development which makes the "best use of land" is one which achieves firstly, a density that is commensurate with the efficient use of the land and, secondly, a high standard of layout and design which is in keeping with the character of the locality. Within town centres, higher density developments will be appropriate as these will help to support the objective of reducing dependence on the private car and increase the patronage of public transport. In terms of design and layout, higher densities in town centres are more likely to reflect the existing character of the locality. The application of the minimum densities in the policy may not be appropriate in certain circumstances, for example, conversions to residential use in mixed use buildings."

Delete paragraph 4.31 and insert : "The Council accepts that there may be instances where development at the minimum densities does not make best use of the land due to, for example, particular site constraints or the character of the locality. In such circumstances, the applicant will need to demonstrate why the appropriate minimum density cannot be achieved before permission will be granted."

5. No change
6. In the second sentence of 4.29 insert "net" before "density".
7. No change
8. See change to 4.31 above
9. No change
10. No change
11. No change

Topic: DP6 – Access

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Support policy but comments that the construction of a cycle and pedestrian route parallel to Ashford Road, linking Tachbrook Road to the NW corner of the playing field would meet the requirements of Para 4.36 and should be incorporated on the Leamington and Warwick Urban Inset Map (Bishops Tachbrook Parish Council ref: 135 AG). It is also noted that the development of playing fields on Harbury Lane breaches DP6 a) and b) (Bishops Tachbrook Parish Council ref: 135 AG).
2. As a positive step to reduce CO₂ council workers should be given exaggerated bicycle allowances to and from work exceeding that allowed for the use of the motor car (A Moore ref: 156 AA).
3. For 'decided' development sites a long term view should be taken on the

<p>intended road structure to prevent segmented development which stagnate traffic movement and blocks future link roads (A Moore ref: 156 AA).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Para 4.35 should include a direct reference to the impact of traffic on immediate surroundings such as local schools or other community facilities (John Henderson ref: 198 AD). 5. To reinforce amendments suggested to DP10 Para 4.32 should be expanded to refer to the provision of access to and from new development (Environment Agency ref: 226 AE). 6. Objects to the convoluted phraseology used within the policy which needs to be revised (Sherbourne Parish Council ref: 234 AF).
<p>Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The local plan provides the planning policy framework for new development across the district. The provision of specific cycle and pedestrian routes would be considered and set out through Warwickshire Local Transport Plan. Until the defined routes of any proposed cycle and pedestrian corridors are finalised it would be inappropriate to include these on the proposals maps. 2. Council employees are not reimbursed for travel to and from work by any means of transport. The council has produced a Travel Plan which sets out the council's objectives for the use of public transport by its employees. For example a pool of bikes is available for loan by employees. 3. For significant development sites the main points of access are fixed in the earliest stages through consultation with the Highways Agency and Warwickshire County Council and are set out through the development / framework brief. 4. The impact of traffic on the immediate surroundings such as local schools or community buildings would be dealt with elsewhere in the plan through DP7 which considers Traffic Generation. 5. It is agreed that in order to comply with PPG25 which requires development to provide safe access to and from sites Para 4.32 should be amended as suggested by the Environment Agency. 6. It is not considered that the wording of the policy is unclear and requires revision. In the absence of any suggested alternative wording by the objector it is proposed that no changes are made.
<p>Recommended revision (s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No changes required. 2. No changes required. 3. No changes required. 4. No changes required. 5. Expand first sentence of Para 4.32 to refer to the provision of access <u>to and from</u>

- new development.
6. No changes required.

Topic: DP7 – Traffic Generation

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Object on the grounds that the policy does not recognise 'rural car dependency' (Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council ref: 52 AC).
2. The following comments were made in relation to the floor space thresholds set out in paragraph 4.39 for the requirement of a transport assessment:
 - **Office development** - the threshold should be reduced to 1000 sq m (The Warwick Society ref: 66/AJ, CPRE ref: 148/AJ) or 500 sq m (Coten End Residents Association ref: 193/BD, James Mackay ref: 199/BD).
 - **Residential development** - the threshold should be reduced to 20 dwellings (CPRE ref: 148/AJ, Coten End Residents Association ref: 193/BD, James Mackay ref: 199/BD) or 9 dwellings (Action 21 Transport Group ref 298/AB)
 - **Retail development** - the threshold should be lowered to 200 sq m (Coten End Residents Association ref: 193/BD, James Mackay ref: 199/BD).
 - **Industrial** – the threshold should be lowered to 1000 sq m (Coten End Residents Association ref: 193/BD, James Mackay ref: 199/BD).
 - **Warehousing** – the threshold should be reduced to 2000 sq m (Coten End Residents Association ref: 193/BD, James Mackay ref: 199/BD).
 - Thresholds should be included for leisure use developments (Warwick Castle ref: 122/AE). It should be made clear that the policy relates to all leisure use developments (CPRE ref: 148/AJ).
3. Policy should not seek to reduce the impact of traffic generation but instead ensure that developments reduce traffic or are traffic neutral (Coten End and Emscote Residents Association ref: 193/BC, James Mackay ref: 199/BC, The Warwick Society ref: 66/AH).
4. The policy should be more strongly worded to limit traffic generation to an absolute minimum and encourage other modes of transport (CPRE ref: 148/AJ).
5. The second part of the policy should clarify when a transport assessment is required (CPRE ref: 148/AJ).
6. The meaning of paragraph 4.40 should be clarified (CPRE ref: 148/AJ).
7. Object on the grounds that it is unrealistic to expect that major developments have no adverse impact on traffic generation in the vicinity of the site – (reword Deeley Properties Ltd 219/AB)
8. Policy should make it clear that Transport Assessments or Travel Plans will only

usually be required for major developments that will have an impact on the highway network. In addition policy should be amended from 'significant road traffic movements' to 'significant adverse road traffic impacts' (Cala Homes 220/AF).

9. Policy should define what is meant by the term 'significant' when used within the policy (Sherbourne Parish Councillor ref: 234/AG).
10. It is considered that the policy does not give sufficient protection to the Highways Agency and trunk roads within the district. It is requested that an additional paragraph is added to the policy to refer to the need for consultation with the Highways Agency (Highways Agency ref: 257/AB) – see paragraph in objection.
11. Policy should relate to all residential development of 9 or more units and office development over 150 sq m. Policy should use Section 106 agreements to improve the current traffic situation by contributing towards out of town parking, improved bus routes and other facilities (Warwick Town Council ref: 266/AD).
12. Paragraph 4.41 should exclude the use of 'speed humps' as traffic control measures (Clara ref: 296/AH).
13. Paragraph 4.42 should be reworded to require travel plans for 'sole residential developments' (Action 21 Transport Group ref: 298/AB).
14. Low car housing should be included in all large scale residential development e.g. Bedzed scheme – Beddington Zero Emission Development (Mr. S Peter ref: 301/AA).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. Policies within the local plan aim to direct new development, where possible to the most sustainable locations with more services in order to reduce the need to travel. It is acknowledged however that in some instances development is located within less accessible locations such as rural areas and this can mean users are more dependant upon the private car. To reflect this DP7 considers proposals on individual merit.
2. Paragraph 23 of PPG13 states that where development will have significant transport implications, transport assessments should be submitted alongside the planning application according to thresholds set out at a regional level. This assessment should demonstrate that the proposed development positively contributes to the objectives of the Local Transport Plan. The thresholds in Para 4.39 are in accordance with those set out in Para 2.1.1 of Transport and Roads for Developments: The Warwickshire Guide 2001. Transport assessments are also required for developments which form part of a larger development requiring access to a common transport corridor or where the location could have a significant impact on transport. In order to allow consistency across the county it is not considered appropriate to amend these thresholds.

It is more difficult to provide an area threshold for leisure development as the standard use and level of intensity can significantly differ between uses. For

example a golf course located on a large site may yield less traffic generation than a smaller site hosting a sports centre. On this basis the submission of a transport assessment would not be required for all leisure use proposals but would be considered on a case by case approach. Notwithstanding this it may be beneficial to provide more detail to the circumstances where a transport assessment will be required for leisure development.

3. It is unreasonable to expect new development to reduce traffic or be traffic neutral and as such DP7 seeks to provide the planning framework to minimise the impact of new development on traffic generation. It is acknowledged however that some circumstances may present the opportunity to reduce traffic such as with the development of brownfield land where the new use may generate less traffic than the previous use.
4. DP7 seeks to resist development which will result in significant traffic movements unless appropriate measures can be implemented to mitigate against the impact. For proposals which are likely to cause significant traffic generation the council would require the submission of a travel plan which would set out the measures to be implemented including the provision of public transport. The policy is intended to form part of a package of policies (DP6 Access and DP8 Parking) which aim to limit traffic generation and promote the use of alternative methods of transport.
5. Paragraph 4.39 of the reason justification sets out the thresholds where the submission of a transport assessment will be required for different types of development.
6. Para 4.40 requires transport assessments for development which may have a significant traffic impact on the road network but would not fall (in terms of size) within the thresholds set out in Para 4.39. In accordance with regional standards set out in Para 2.1.2 of Transport and Roads for development: The Warwickshire Guide 2001 this may include development which is part of a large outline application or development brief but falls under the threshold for that type of development.
7. The policy does not expect major development not to have any adverse impact on traffic generation but seeks to minimise the impact and mitigate against the effects. It is recognised that there are instances where the economic and social benefits of development may justify a material increase in road traffic providing every effort has been made to minimise the impact of this.
8. DP7 requires the submission of transport assessments and travel plans for major development in accordance with thresholds set by the County Council. It is not considered that the policy needs to be reworded.
9. In the context of this policy significant traffic generation would be determined by the County Highways department on the basis of the location and nature of the proposed development.
10. It is council policy in accordance with PPG13 to consult with the Highways Agency for proposals which are likely to have an impact on trunk roads within the

district. It may be beneficial to include a reference to this within the reason justification.

11. The policy is applicable to all development proposals. The thresholds in Para 4.39 indicate the circumstances where the submission of a transport assessment is required for development. It is agreed that Section 106 agreements can be used to secure improvements to transport infrastructure identified as part of transport assessments and travel plans. These would be negotiated on an individual case basis and do not need to be set out in the local plan.
12. The County Council Highways department are responsible for the implementation of traffic control measures within the district. The type of measure used is dependent on the nature and location of the road and is not a matter which would be determined through the local plan.
13. The development of sole residential dwellings would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the transport system and as such to require the submission of a travel plan would be inconsistent with local and national planning guidance set out in PPG13.
14. Although the contribution that low car housing can make to the delivery of sustainability objectives is acknowledged it would be uneconomical to expect this type of housing to be included in all large scale residential development.

Recommended revision (s)

1. Amend the final bullet point in Para 4.39 to state "Leisure use developments that result in significant traffic generation".
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. Add new sentence to Para 4.40 to state 'In appropriate circumstances the council will consult the Highways Agency for proposals which are likely to have an impact on the trunk road network'.
11. No changes required
12. No changes required
13. No changes required
14. No changes required

Topic: DP8 - Parking

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. The use of the word 'excessive' in Para 4.44 should be clarified (Mr. S O Peter ref: 301/AA).
2. The meaning of criteria a) should be clarified and it should be explained what measures can be taken to support it (Mr. S O Peter ref: 301/AA, Sherbourne Parish Councillor ref: 234/AH, Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council ref: 52/AD)
3. Policy is inflexible as it does not indicate that parking standards may be exceeded in any circumstance. This is contrary to paragraphs 54 and 56 of PPG13 which recognise that there may be circumstances where it is appropriate to exceed maximum parking standards (Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ref: 225/AC).
4. Future SPG on parking standards should allow flexibility to recognise the differing requirements across the district (Kenilworth Town Council ref: 223/AK).
5. It is considered that limited provision for off street car parking will result in more on street car parking which will compound existing problems. Criteria c) should be amended after 'highway safety' to state 'detrimental to the amenities of existing residents' (Kenilworth Society ref: 221/AJ).
6. In paragraph 4.46 the words 'will be exceptional' should be substituted for 'may be exception' (Kenilworth Society ref: 221/AJ).
7. It is suggested that it would not be advisable to restrict parking in rural areas to the same extent as in urban areas (WRCC ref: 213/ AE).
8. Object on the grounds that the policy is too weak to ensure priority is given to sustainable means of transport. Restricting parking alone is insufficient and should be accompanied by steps to facilitate other modes of transport (James Mackay ref: 199/BE, Coten End and Emscote Residents Association ref: 193/BE).
9. Object that Para 4.44 is counterproductive in terms of new development in urban areas as restricted car parking will increase pressure for on-street car parking (John Henderson ref: 198/AE, Vernon Lawton ref: 194/AD).
10. Object that the policy is 'anti-car' and raise a number of queries / issues related to this (The Leamington Society ref: 195/AC):
 - What are the 'realistic, safe and easy alternatives' (4.38)?
 - What public transport is available after dark?
 - How is unnecessary car use defined and by whom?
 - What are excessive levels of car parking?

- How is on-street parking detrimental to public safety?

11. Object to the statement 'parking provision below the maximum levels will be appropriate in most instances' – the standard should be the maximum and developers should have to justify any alternative (The Leamington Society ref: 195/AC).
12. Object on the grounds that DP8 is in conflict with Para 52 of PPG13 as maximum levels of car parking for broad classes of development should be included in the local plan (Government Office for the West Midlands ref: 110/AB, West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium ref: 228/AL).
13. It is suggested that a new paragraph is inserted to promote the use of private car parks at offices and retail stores by the general public at periods of under use (The Warwick Society ref: 66/AK).
14. Object with the general principle of deliberately restricting all parking provision to limit car use (Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council ref: 52/AD).

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. Within this policy the term excessive is used to relate to levels of car parking which would significantly encourage the use of the car as the primary mode of access discouraging the use of public transport. In general, development which proposes levels of car parking above the standards set out in Annex D (Maximum Parking Standards) of PPG13 would be considered inappropriate.
2. Criteria a) seeks to ensure that new development does not encourage unnecessary car use through the provision of levels of parking which are excessive (see above) relative to the location and nature of the proposal.
3. The aim of DP8 is to ensure levels of car parking in new development do not encourage reliance on the private car and promote sustainable transport choices. However, it is accepted that Para 54 and 56 of PPG13 allows the local authority to adopt a less restrictive approach to the application of parking standards under certain circumstances. To reflect this, proposals seeking to implement higher standards would be considered on an individual case by case basis.
4. The content of the SPD would seek to acknowledge the different parking issues across the district and set standards for the provision of car parking relating to broad categories of development.
5. Whilst it is acknowledged that limiting the provision of off street parking may result in increased pressure for on street parking this approach is consistent with government guidance set out in PPG13 which seeks to encourage a modal shift to reduce reliance on the private car. It should be noted that the impact of new development on the amenity of existing residents would be considered elsewhere in the plan through policy DP2. In addition the use of resident parking schemes by the County Council may limit the impact.

6. It is not considered that there would be any merit in amending this sentence.
7. Each proposal would be considered against the criteria set out in the policy on individual merit, in particular criteria b) which gives regard to the nature and location of the proposed development.
8. It is agreed that restricting parking alone is not sufficient and as such DP8 is one of a number of policies within the local plan (DP7, DP6, SC3, SC4 and SC10) which together aim to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport and reduce reliance on the private car.
9. See response to point 5.
10. Policies in the local plan can only seek to encourage a style and form of development which promote the implementation of public transport. It is the responsibility of the Public Transport Authority (WCC) and local transport operators to provide and subsidise specific routes. In the context of this policy excessive parking is used to refer to levels of car parking which would encourage unnecessary car use. For major applications the council would consult with the County Council highways department who determine the levels of on street car parking which may be likely to constitute a risk to public highway safety.
11. The impact of applying minimal parking standards is acknowledged and it is agreed that it would be more appropriate to apply the maximum as standard and expect applicants to justify providing levels below this. The policy should be reworded to state that proposals providing maximum standards will be acceptable in most instances however the Council will seek where appropriate to encourage levels below this.
12. It is accepted that PPG13 requires parking standards to be set out within the Local plan however at this stage it is not possible to do this. The council has set out in the Local Development Scheme its intention to produce SPD detailing Parking Standards. In addition parking standards are set out at a regional level in the Warwickshire Structure Plan (Appendix A).
13. Although the council would support such initiatives the local plan is not the appropriate document to detail these. The Warwickshire Transport Plan would set out these measures.
14. Each proposal would be considered against the criteria set out in the policy on individual merit and appropriate levels on car parking would be negotiated based on factors such as the nature and location of the proposed development.

Recommended revision (s)

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.

11. Delete the last two sentences of Para 4.46 and replace with 'Proposals which meet maximum levels of parking will be appropriate in most circumstances. However, the council would encourage parking below maximum standards where it can be demonstrated that this is appropriate'.

12. No changes required.
13. No changes required.
14. No changes required.
15. No changes required.

Topic: DP9 - Pollution Control

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. The justification should refer to an Environmental Assessment and pre-consultation with infrastructure providers
109/AE Warwickshire County Council (PTES)
2. The term "sensitive receptors" should be defined/clarified
148/AK CPRE (Warwickshire Branch); 226/AF Environment Agency
3. Policy should state that new development will not be allowed within 400 metres of a bad neighbour use.
154/AG National Farmers' Union
4. Policy should be re-worded so that the latter part of the sentence applies to all pollutants not just soil contamination. Re-word the last sentence in paragraph 4.50 to include "controlled waters" and substitute "or" for "and".
226/AF Environment Agency

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. A reference to Environmental Statements could be made
1. Agreed that the term "sensitive receptors" could be defined more clearly.
2. Policy DP2 covers amenity in terms of "disturbance or intrusion" Examples of these could be extended to include include different types of pollution.
3. Agreed that the policy wording could be misconstrued.

Recommended revision(s)

1. Add to end of paragraph 4.52: "Where an Environmental Statement is required, the Council will expect any issues referred to in this policy to be addressed. In the case of an outline application, the Environmental Statement should be submitted at the outline stage."
2. Amend the definition of "sensitive receptors" in paragraph 4.50 to: "These are defined as features prone to damage from pollution, e.g. land, the use of other land, public health, controlled waters, general amenity and the natural environment"
3. Amend examples of disturbance or intrusion in paragraph 4.13 to read "Examples of disturbance or intrusion include: air, radiation or light pollution; loss of privacy or outlook; visual intrusion and noise disturbance."
4. Re-word policy as follows: "Development will only be permitted which does not give rise to soil contamination or air, noise, radiation, light or water pollution where the level of discharge, emissions or contamination could cause harm to sensitive receptors"

Topic: DP10 - Flooding**Summary of matters raised in objections.**

1. The areas of flood risk should not be shown on the Proposals Map as they will be outdated within plan period
226/AG Environment Agency; 198/AF John Henderson
2. The floodplain map is ill-defined and erroneous in the Sherbourne area
234/AK Antoinette Gordon
3. No development should be allowed in the flood plains
234/AK Antoinette Gordon
4. The policy should be re-worded to include a set of criteria which are applicable to development in every location and the policy should make clear that flood risk assessments should be appropriate to the scale and nature of the development proposed.
226/AG Environment Agency
5. Plan fails to identify "areas of high flood risk".
198/AF John Henderson
6. The policy fails to address redevelopment proposals involving existing buildings.
126/AA 2nd Warwick Sea Scouts

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The Environment Agency has indicated that it will now support the inclusion of areas of flood risk on Proposals Maps. However a sentence could be inserted in the reasoned justification explaining that the boundaries are indicative only and applicants should check with Environment Agency for any changes to the areas.
2. As above
3. Government guidance in PPG25 and the Environment Agency accept that some types of development are appropriate in areas at risk of flooding provided that certain criteria can be satisfied. Flood Risk Assessments will be required and if these demonstrate that the development will exacerbate existing flooding problems or give rise to new flooding problems, either on or off-site, then planning permission will be refused.
4. Amend the policy and reasoned justification, in line with advice from the Environment Agency, to include a set of criteria which will be applied to all development in areas of flood risk.
5. The areas of high flood risk can be identified on the Environment Agency's flood zone maps. This could be stated in the reasoned justification.
6. Policy should clarify the fact that "development" includes "redevelopment".

Recommended revision(s)

1. Amend Proposals Map to include up to date boundaries of flood risk areas provided by the Environment Agency.
2. See change to paragraph 4.59 in 4. below
3. No change
4. Change Policy DP10 as follows:
Development in areas at risk of flooding will only be permitted where the following criteria are fully met:
 - a) the type of development is appropriate to the level of flood risk associated with its location;
 - b) it can be demonstrated that no suitable alternative sites are available in an area of lower risk;
 - c) it is provided with the appropriate minimum standard of existing flood defence (including suitable warning and evacuation procedures) which can be maintained for the lifetime of the development;
 - d) it does not impede flood flows, does not increase the flood risk on site or elsewhere, or result in a loss of floodplain storage capacity;
 - e) it would not be subject to regular flooding;
 - f) the site is not required for washland creation as part of the overall flood defence strategy for the river catchments;
 - g) in the case of dwellings proposed in high risk areas, it is evident that safe, dry pedestrian access would be available to land subject to lesser risk; and
 - h) in the case of essential civil infrastructure in low to medium risk areas, access must be guaranteed and it must be capable of remaining operational in times of emergency due to extreme flooding.

Applicants will be required to demonstrate how they comply with this policy by way of a Flood Risk Assessment, appropriate to the scale and nature of the development proposed, where the development is:

- I. within a river floodplain as defined by the Environment Agency's indicative flood zone maps or those held by the Council's Land Drainage Engineers;
- II. within or adjacent to any watercourse;
- III. adjacent to, or including, any flood bank or other flood control structure;
- IV. within an area where there may be drainage problems;
- V. likely to involve the culverting or diverting of any watercourse; or
- VI. of such size and nature relative to the receiving watercourse/drainage system that there could be a significant increase in surface water run-off from the area

Change the last sentence of paragraph 4.53 to read:

"This can be an issue wherever flooding occurs, be it fluvial or where inadequate provision is made for surface run-off."

Change the second paragraph 4.54 to read:

"It aims to control development in areas of risk from flooding and those that could increase the risk of flooding. It advocates the need for a risk based approach to proposals for all development and sets out a sequential test to assist with such an approach. "Development" refers to all types of development including redevelopment, changes of use and conversions."

Change the last sentence in paragraph 4.55 to read:

"The test will be applied with priority given for development of sites in lower flood risk areas, i.e. directing development away from high risk flood areas."

In paragraph 4.56, delete first sentence and change the second sentence to read:

"In accordance with PPG25, the policy recognises the exceptional need in some circumstances for infrastructure within the functional floodplain, for example British Waterways operational depots or Environment Agency flood control installations. Where the location is essential to the development proposed, e.g. water-based recreation uses or agriculture, permission will be granted provided that the applicant can demonstrate that they strictly comply with this, and any other relevant, local plan policy."

Change the first sentence of paragraph 4.57 to read:

"In applying the sequential test, it is acknowledged that extensive areas of built development fall in the high risk areas and that the reuse of previously-developed land may be needed to avoid economic stagnation". In the final sentence, delete "criteria e) and f)" and insert "criteria c), d), and g)".

Change paragraph 4.58 from the third sentence to:

"It will inform the planning decision and may identify appropriate design and mitigation methods. Failure to provide an appropriate flood risk assessment could constitute a reason for the refusal of planning permission. The Council will consult the Environment Agency and its own Land Drainage Engineers on any development proposals which affect floodplains or could exacerbate the risk of flooding in any way. Extensive culverting of any watercourse will be resisted and the opening up of culverts will be encouraged wherever possible. Culverting requires the prior formal consent of the Environment Agency as do any works in, under, over or within 8 metres of a main river. Their views will guide the decision as to whether this policy has been satisfied when determining a planning application."

Change paragraph 4.59 to read:

“The Environment Agency is the land drainage authority for main rivers and has produced indicative flood zone maps for these watercourses. These maps are based upon the approximate extent of flooding within a 1% annual probability of occurrence for rivers or, where this is greater, the highest recorded flood event. The maps represent the best information available at the time, but are indicative only and should be used as a basis for consultation rather than decision making. Applicants are advised to refer to the Environment Agency for the most up-to-date indicative flood zone maps to identify any changes. These maps will also enable applicants to identify areas of high flood risk. The floodplains of all other watercourses are not yet available and therefore applicants are asked to contact the Local Authority Drainage Engineers, who are the Land Drainage Authority for non main rivers, to check the location of the nearest watercourse to their development site.”

5. See change to paragraph 4.59 in 4. above
6. See change to paragraph 4.54 in 4. above.

Topic: DP11 - Drainage

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Policy should state that justification should be given by applicant if sustainable drainage systems are not incorporated into the scheme.
226/AH Environment Agency
2. Each development should be carefully considered with particular reference to areas in Kenilworth identified by Severn Trent as areas in need of improvement.
223/AN Kenilworth Town Council
3. The incorporation of sustainable drainage systems is only possible where mechanisms can be agreed for their adoption by the relevant public body.
201/AF House Builders Federation
4. Applicants should be required to demonstrate to the approval of the Council and the Environment Agency how they comply with the objectives of this policy.
198/AG John Henderson
5. Policy should state who enforces the policy
156/AB Alan Moore

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. Amend policy to require justification to be given if it is not possible to incorporate sustainable drainage systems.
2. This will be considered by Severn Trent at the planning application stage
3. The policy allows developers to provide alternative means of drainage, when sustainable drainage systems cannot be incorporated, provided that this does not give rise to flooding or other problems.
4. This requirement is already incorporated into the policy. Either sustainable drainage systems will be incorporated, or, if not, an alternative satisfactory

<p>drainage system will need to be demonstrated.</p> <p>5. Paragraph 4.64 states how the Council will work with other agencies to enable surface water drainage to be controlled as near to the source as possible.</p>
<p>Recommended revision(s)</p> <p>1. Amend first section of policy to read: “Development will be required to incorporate sustainable drainage systems which provide for the disposal of surface water. Where this is not possible, it will be necessary to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) why it is not possible to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, and b) that an acceptable means of surface water disposal is provided which does not give rise to flooding or environmental problems” <p>Amend the first sentence of paragraph 4.61 as follows: Insert “increasing” before “.demand for water supplies..”</p> <p>2. No change 3. See 1 above 4. No change 5. No change</p>

Topic: DP12 - Energy Conservation

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Suggestions for rewording the policy to more accurately reflect good practice such as a particular adopted policy in the London Borough of Merton UDP.
298/AA Action 21
2. Policy should reflect Planning Policy Guidance 22
262/AC Warwick and Leamington Spa Green Party
3. Part d) of the policy mistakenly implies that recycled materials have a reduced energy input.
220/AC Cala Homes
4. No justification for the requirement to promote the use of recycled materials **produced locally**.
220/AC Cala Homes; 142/AC A.C. Lloyd Ltd; 141/AA Parkridge Homes; 138/AA Laing Homes Midlands
5. Suggests that energy efficiency/ conservation in new homes is best achieved through the Building Regulations.
201/AG House Builders Federation
6. This, or a separate policy, needs to encourage the development of proposals for generating renewable energy in appropriate locations
168/AD Advantage West Midlands
7. Spelling of “principal”
148/AL Campaign to Protect Rural England (Warks Branch)
8. The policy lacks flexibility. The need to balance the requirements of a number of policies should be made explicit in the policy itself

*142/AC A.C. Lloyd Ltd; 141/AA Parkridge Homes; 138/AA Laing Homes
Midlands*

9. Para 4.69 should be extended to include domestic property extensions and minor developments.

79/AA Matthew Rhodes

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The policy in the London Borough of Merton's UDP is noted. This policy included the requirement, for all new non-residential developments over 1,000 sq m, to generate 10% of their power from renewable energy sources. PPS22 states that local planning authorities may include policies in local development documents that require a percentage of the energy to be used in new residential, industrial or commercial developments to come from on-site renewable energy developments. The need to increase the proportion of energy from renewable resources is government and regional policy. I agree, therefore, that there may be instances in Warwick District where on-site renewable energy developments may be appropriate and justified.
2. PPS 22 (Renewable Energy) was introduced in August 2004 and the companion guide "Planning for Renewable Energy" followed in December 2004. PPS 22 recommends in paragraph 7 that local planning authorities set out in their local development documents the key criteria by which applications for renewable energy developments will be judged. The guidance in paragraph 8 allows local planning authorities to require certain new developments to provide a proportion of their energy requirements from on-site renewable energy developments. Paragraph 18 states that local planning authorities should positively encourage small scale renewable energy schemes to be incorporated into new developments and some existing buildings. I agree that in order to comply with this new guidance two new policy areas should be addressed, namely, the criteria for consideration of applications for renewable energy projects and the positive encouragement of small scale renewable energy developments. New policy on Renewable Energy is required.
3. The use of recycled materials saves on landfill costs and the costs of producing new materials in terms of natural resources, energy costs and transportation.
4. The use of materials produced locally is given only as a suggestion because this reduces transportation costs further but this could be deleted. It is accepted that the authority cannot **require** the use of recycled materials. However it would be reasonable to encourage the use of such materials and to expect developers to provide justification where materials with a high energy input are used. See also 3. above.
5. The issue of energy conservation in homes is relevant to both Planning and Building Regulations. The layout and orientation of buildings to make best use of solar gain is a legitimate planning consideration. Regional Spatial Strategy Policy EN2 states that development plans should include measures to minimize energy demands from development by encouraging the use of sustainable construction techniques, best practice in energy efficient design and the orientation of buildings to maximize passive solar gain. Structure Plan Policy GD.1 states that one of the overriding purposes of the plan is to provide for a pattern of development which conserves resources of land and energy, including

<p>minerals and water, and makes maximum use of renewable energy resources. It is accepted, however, that the authority cannot require the use of materials with a “reduced energy input”. However it would be reasonable to expect developers to provide justification where materials with a high energy input are used. Reword sub-section d) of the policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. In the light of PPS22, it is agreed that the plan should encourage the development of proposals for generating renewable energy in appropriate locations. See 1. above. 7. Correct spelling of “principle” to “principal”. 8. This is made clear in paragraph 4.71 and I do not consider that it is necessary to incorporate this statement into the policy itself. 9. It is not accepted that minor developments such as domestic extensions should consider the incorporation of sustainable forms of energy production.
<p>Recommended revision(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add new Policy DP12 a: <p>DP12a Renewable Energy Developments</p> <p>A. Planning permission will be granted for developments which generate energy from renewable resources where they do not have an unacceptable impact on:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) local amenity including visual intrusion, noise, dust, odour and traffic generation; b) public health and safety; c) townscape and/or landscape character; d) the natural environment; or e) interests of archaeological or historic importance <p>In the case of all applications for renewable energy projects, the following will apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) the wider environmental and economic benefits of the proposals will be a significant material planning consideration; and ii) provision should be made for the removal of the facilities and the reinstatement of the site should it cease to be operational. <p>In the case of large scale renewable energy projects, there should be community involvement in developing the proposals.</p> <p>B. In appropriate residential and non-residential developments, including conversions, the Council will require 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be produced on site from renewable energy sources.</p> <p>4.71a The Government's energy policy is set out in the Energy White Paper. This aims to put the UK on a path to cut its carbon dioxide emissions by some 60% by 2050, with real progress by 2020, and to maintain reliable and competitive energy supplies. The development of renewable energy, alongside the improvements in energy efficiency and the development of combined heat and</p>

	<p>power, will make a vital contribution to these aims. The Government has already set a target to generate 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. The Government's planning policy in PPS22 "Renewable Energy" states that local development documents, such as local plans, should include policies to promote and encourage the development of renewable energy resources. Further guidance is given in the Companion Guide to PPS22.</p>
4.71b	<p>The West Midlands Energy Strategy sets a target of at least 5% of electricity to be generated from renewable means by 2010. This lower target reflects the lower baseline in the region and the potential. Regional Planning Guidance recognises the fact that if energy targets are to be met it is important that development plans incorporate policies to help facilitate the realisation of the energy generation potential of renewable resources. The Structure Plan promotes the maximum use of renewable energy resources.</p>
4.71c	<p>Warwick District Council is a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change and as such is committed to encouraging all sectors of the community to achieve a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to provide opportunities for the development of renewable energy developments.</p>
4.71d	<p>The objective of this policy is to provide clear criteria for consideration of development proposals for renewable energy developments and to promote the use of small scale, on-site, renewable energy technology in developments. For the purposes of this policy, renewable energy covers those energy flows that occur naturally and repeatedly in the environment – from the wind, the fall of water, the sun and also from biomass. In Warwick District, the energy sources which have most potential include solar energy, wind and biomass.</p>
4.71e	<p>Development proposals for renewable energy projects may include both large scale, commercial plant supplying to the local distribution network, or "micro-generation scale" plants supplying a specific building, site or community. The nature and significance of developments will vary according to the scale, the primary source of renewable fuel, the technology used and the location. Commercial scale plants are likely to use wind or biomass. Micro-generation scale plants may make use of a variety of fuels and technologies.</p>
4.71f	<p>In the operation of this policy, the effect on amenity, public health and safety, landscapes, townscapes and the natural and historic environment will be weighed against the economic and environmental benefits of the scheme. Applications should include arrangements for the reinstatement of the site, should the operation cease, and in the case of large scale projects should engage in active consultation with local communities before any planning application is submitted.</p>
4.71g	<p>Many renewable energy projects will be inappropriate development in the green belt. Careful consideration will be given to the visual impact of the scheme on the openness of the green belt and developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm if the project is to proceed.</p>
4.71h	<p>Government guidance allows local plans to require some new developments to</p>

provide a percentage of their energy requirements from on-site renewable energy developments. In Warwick District this requirement will be applied to “appropriate” developments which will include those developments where the installation of micro generation equipment is viable given the type of development proposed, its location and design. Such equipment could include photovoltaic cells, solar panels, solar powered water heating, energy from wind turbines in small clusters and energy from biomass. Where, in the case of an appropriate development, it is claimed that micro generation equipment is not viable, developers will be required to demonstrate why this is the case. The Council will produce a Supplementary Planning Document giving further guidance on the implementation of this policy.

2. See 1. above.
3. Delete “produced locally” in sub-section d).
4. As above.
5. No change
6. See 1. above.
7. In second sentence of paragraph 4.68 delete “principle” and insert “principal”.
8. No change
9. No change

Topic: DP13 - Crime Prevention

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Objects to the suggestion in the reasoned justification that the most appropriate layout and design for achieving crime prevention may conflict with the objective of achieving good design.
27/AA Warwickshire Police
2. The design of security lighting should produce minimal light pollution.
115/AA Alan Roberts
3. The policy should be extended to include the need to ensure that development does not create opportunities for crime or anti-social activity to adjoining sites.
122/AD Warwick Castle
4. The policy reacts to crime rather than attempt to foster design which minimises the likelihood of crime.
193 BF/Coton End and Emscote Residents Association; 199/BF James Mackay

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. The potential conflict referred to may, for instance, be that the optimum layout and/or design in terms of minimising the opportunities for crime may not necessarily produce the visual effect which would best reflect the character of the area, secure an accessible development or produce an optimum density. Paragraph 4.76 is not suggesting that the need for a design for a safe environment is a lower priority than other requirements. In most cases it will be possible to produce a layout and design which satisfies all requirements.
2. Light pollution is dealt with in Policy DP9 (Pollution Control)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The policy is aimed at minimising the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour generally not just within the development site. Paragraph 4.72 refers to the “surrounding environment”. 4. Sub-sections a) - c) of the policy refer to positive aspects of design which aim to minimise the opportunities for, or likelihood of, crime.
<p>Recommended revision(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change 2. No change 3. No change 4. No change

Topic: DP14 - Accessibility and Inclusion

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. Paragraph 4.79 should make specific reference to children’s play spaces.
37/AA Sport England
2. The policy duplicates Part M of the Building Regulations and should be deleted.
201/AH House Builders Federation
3. The inclusion of the word “inclusion” is not appropriate in the policy.
213/AF Warwickshire Rural Community Council

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. Agree that specific reference could be made to children’s play spaces
2. The Building Regulations are primarily concerned with the design of buildings and the entrance to buildings. The scope of this policy is much wider in that it refers to all aspects of the development and accessibility in relation to all sectors of the population. Further it would not be appropriate to ignore issues of accessibility at the planning stage on the basis that it is dealt with later by the Building Regulations.
3. The aim of the policy is to promote social inclusion in terms of access to, and use of, new developments and facilities. Policy SC1 deals with inclusive communities in terms of securing a mix of housing in new developments.

Recommended revision(s)

1. At the end of the second sentence of paragraph 4.79 add “and children’s play spaces”
2. No change
3. No change

Topic: Chapter 4 Omissions

Summary of matters raised in objections.

1. The local plan should include a requirement for developers to provide links off-site from developments to the existing footpath network (7/AB – Ramblers Association)
2. The local plan should include a policy to encourage safe road crossings (7/AD – Ramblers Association)
3. The local plan should include a policy on renewable energy and renewable technologies and this should set minimum standards (24/AA – DTI, 2623/AD – Warwick & Leamington Green Party)
4. The local plan should include a policy to require decent standards of accommodation in terms of daylight, size and outlook (66/AF - The Warwick Society)
5. This chapter should include a policy to steer development to certain locations (109/AK – Warwickshire County Council)
6. The local plan should include a policy to encourage developers to provide space and facilities for waste recycling and composting in residential developments (109/BC – Warwickshire County Council)
7. The local plan should designate land in the Green Belt as safeguarded for future housing (158/AG – Tyler Parkes Partnership)
8. The local plan should include policies on extensions and replacement dwellings to cover the whole district similar to those in rural areas covered by RAP3 and RAP4 (221/BB – Kenilworth Society and 223/AY – Kenilworth Town Council)
9. The local plan should include a policy to deal with water conservation (226/AJ – Environment Agency)
10. The local plan should include a policy to control home working (234/BB – Mrs. A. Gordon)
11. The local plan should include a policy that prevents the demolition of high quality housing and its replacement with high density housing (248/AA – Mr and Mrs Oliver, 249/AA – D. Shakespeare)
12. The local plan should include separate policies on landscape character and historic environment (302/AK – English Heritage)

Response of Head of Planning & Engineering to matters raised

1. It is reasonable to ask contributions from new developments for footpath and cycleway improvements, but only where these are directly related to the development in question. Sustainable transport improvements are covered in policy SC10, however this focuses more on public transport improvements. A reference to footpath and cycleway connections is made in paragraph 5.22 however this should be amplified in SC10 and I accept that such an amendment is appropriate.
2. Whilst the aspiration to create safe crossing points for major roads is a good one, this is an issue better dealt with by the County Council in their role as highway authority. It is of course the case that there are no major development proposals in the local plan that could, of themselves, generate the need for an additional crossing point of the type asked by the objector.
3. I would agree that a policy for renewable energy is appropriate and one has been included to address these objections (see DP12).
4. Issues concerned with standards of accommodation in terms of daylight, size and

outlook are properly dealt with under existing policies of this local plan (such as DP1 and DP2) or by building regulations.

5. It is recognised that whilst the local plan has a core strategy, this is not a “spatial strategy” as such. Although the local plan does set clear planning policies for urban and rural areas, there is nowhere where this strategy is clearly set out. The appropriate place to do this would be in the core strategy.
6. I recognise that draft PPS10 (Planning for Sustainable Waste Management) and the Regional Planning Guidance both support measures to promote better waste management. Although this is essentially a matter of detailed design I agree that it would be helpful to include it within planning policy. An additional criterion is therefore recommended for inclusion within policy DP1.
7. There is no requirement to amend the Green Belt boundary at this time to allow for long term housing needs beyond the local plan period. There is no need for green field land to be released for housing up to 2011, and the policies of the Regional Planning Guidance clearly indicate a reduction in house building in Warwick District after this time up to 2021. Even if new green field sites are required, there are non Green Belt sites to which consideration should also be given. Under these circumstances, it is not expected that there is any need for significant amendments to the Green Belt for the foreseeable future.
8. It is not considered that policies RAP3 and RAP4 should be applied to both urban and rural areas. The policies deal with specifically rural issues; the effect of any extension or redevelopment on the open character and appearance of the countryside. As such the policies draw considerable support from PPG2 in respect of Green Belt areas. The circumstances are not the same in urban areas where there is, generally speaking, a more positive view towards new development provided that all appropriate safeguards are in place. The local plan has sought to do this through policies DP1 and DP2 (in particular).
9. Water conservation is an important issue, however one that cannot in all cases be dealt with through the planning system. The objection asks that a policy be included to require the incorporation of water efficiency measures and the achievement of a secure water supply. These are matters that cannot be required by the Council as planning authority. Other issues suggested by the objection (such as recycling of surface and domestic water) are covered by policy DP11.
10. The local plan is generally supportive of home working (objective 3A – reducing the need to travel) however it is recognised that this can cause problems in certain situations. It is considered however that where potential adverse impacts can occur from home working proposals, these can be adequately dealt with under other policies of the local plan (such as DP1, DP2, RAP10, etc).
11. The local plan contains a number of policies that seek to ensure that in any development and redevelopment proposals, a high quality of design and layout is achieved that complies with government requirements. These matters are dealt with particularly in policies DP1, DP2 and DP5. The Council is aware of the framework of Government policy that regulates the extent to which it can control development. Any controls over development are best dealt with through existing policies, and I do not believe that it would be appropriate to include a policy specifically to resist all demolitions of “high quality houses”.
12. This matter is better addressed under a similar objection made by English Heritage to policy DP3.

Recommended revision(s)

1. Amend policy SC10 to include references to footpath and cycleway improvements where these can be justified by the development.
2. No change
3. See change to policy DP12.
4. No change
5. Amend the core strategy to include a spatial strategy.
6. Amend policy DP1 to meet this objection.
7. No change
8. No change
9. No change
10. No change
11. No change
12. No change.