Constraints of time and the breadth of debate meant that it was not possible for all the questions raised by the audience to be answered. As promised, please see below a brief response to each of the unanswered questions.

**Why is there not more development proposed in Kenilworth?**

770 new houses are proposed adjacent to Kenilworth at Thickthorn. Like the northern part of Leamington, Kenilworth is entirely surrounded by Green Belt. Whilst there are other potentially suitable sites adjacent to Kenilworth (such as Southcrest Farm to the north of Thickthorn), it was felt that these were sequentially less preferable to the sites put forward in the preferred options. The reasons for this include greater difficulty in improving the transport infrastructure and a significant increase in population for a relatively small town with less good infrastructure and employment opportunities.

**How are empty buildings in the towns being addressed and shouldn’t these be used in preference to Greenfield land?**

The District Council employs an officer with responsibility for bringing empty properties back in to use. This is backed up by an [Empty Homes Strategy](#). Whilst there are empty properties within the District the number is relatively in comparison with many places and as a result has only a marginal impact on the number of homes that need to be developed on newly allocated sites.

**In previous consultations it was proposed that a significant proportion of development could take place on brownfield land. But it is now suggested that we have very little brownfield land available. Why is this?**

The Options Paper (May 2008) assumed that the Core Strategy would need to identify approximately 270 hectares (ha) of land for new housing, of which 90ha would be needed on greenfield land. It should be noted that these figures were based purely on the land required for new housing and did not include any land needed for other supporting uses, such as employment, community facilities, open space, schools, etc. In practice, the land for supporting uses is roughly the same as that required for housing, i.e. the 90ha identified above would in reality be about 180ha in total.

The Options Paper was also produced prior to the completion of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and therefore assumptions had to be made about the amount of brownfield land available based on past trends. The SHLAA is now completed has shown that the brownfield land supply is not as strong as previously thought.

In summary, therefore, the differences in the figures can be explained by the fact that the Options Paper figure did not include the land necessary for supporting uses (such as jobs, schools, etc.) and that the Preferred Options has been informed by the evidence of the SHLAA and the fact that there is more limited brownfield land potential than was previously envisaged.
We have considered whether some existing employment land, which is currently protected, should be allocated for more housing. However we are keen to maintain balanced communities with the availability of jobs broadly matching the working age population. To enable this to happen, we need a variety of employment land to be available and research shows that we do not have a surplus of vacant employment land.

Isn’t there an inconsistency between the Green Infrastructure proposals for improvements to the River Avon Corridor at the same time as proposing a new road link across the River Avon?

The Green Infrastructure proposals can been seen [here](#). Detailed work has not yet been undertaken on the River Avon Corridor, however, it has been identified as an area to explore for Green Infrastructure proposals. Both the Green Infrastructure and the new road link are part of the consultation, so views on this would be welcome. One of the downsides of the new road could be its impact on the river valley, strengthening the case to improve green infrastructure along the River Avon elsewhere. So the two proposals are not necessarily incompatible.

A couple of years ago, a Green Belt study was undertaken. What did it say about the land proposed for development to the north of Leamington?

The joint Green Belt study undertaken in 2009 can be seen [here](#). The allocated land to the north of Leamington falls within land parcels W6a, W6b and W7. Appendix 3 of the report describes the green assessment for each land parcel. W6a and W6b were assessed as being “mid sensitive” and W7 was assess as being “most sensitive”.

In the landscape assessments that have been undertaken how was the land to the north of Leamington graded and how has this been take in to account?

Appendix 11 of the [Joint Green Belt Study](#) looks at the landscape assessment of each parcel of land. The allocated land to the north of Leamington falls within land parcels W6a, W6b and W7. Landscape was one of the factors (but certainly not the only factor) that was taken in-to account in assessing the suitability of sites.

What is included in the Preferred Options to protect the historic and visual wellbeing of Leamington Town Centre – particularly the Fire Station?

The emerging approach to the Built Environment for the New Local Plan is set out in Chapter 10 of the [Preferred Options](#) document and the approach to the Historic Environment is set out in Chapter 11. The document says nothing specific about Leamington Fire Station

What mix of housing will be required in new developments?
The policy approach relating to affordable housing and the mix of housing is set out in Preferred Option PO5 and PO6.

**How is the improvement of biodiversity being incorporated in to the Plan? What mitigation/off-setting will be required?**

The policy approach relating to biodiversity, including off setting requirements is set out in Preferred Option PO15.

**What is the base date/dates used for Traffic Modelling?**

The draft report on traffic modelling is available [here](#). The report does not specify a base date but does refer to “a recent Transport Assessment (TA)”. Once further information is obtained from Warwickshire County Council undertook the transport modelling, this answer will be updated.

**What is the purpose of the Northern Relief Road?**

The concept aims to reduce congestion across Leamington and Warwick, providing better access to the trunk road network for journeys originating in northern Leamington. In particular, it has the potential to relieve traffic along Emscote Road and through Warwick Town Centre by providing an alternative route without going through heavily congested areas. It also has the potential to relieve traffic through Leamington Town Centre by providing a better means of accessing areas to the south of the towns using the A46 and motorway. However, more work needs to be done in relation the Northern Relief Road.

**How will Warwick Hospital be able to cope with the growth proposed when it is already stretched?**

Page 27 of the [Draft Infrastructure Plan](#) sets out some initial thoughts on how the health needs of new and existing communities might be met. More work needs to be done on this, but the Primary Health Care Trust has identified 3 priorities for acute hospital services

- Remodelling services, such as orthopaedic services, to better meet the needs of the elderly
- Developing maternity services at Warwick Hospital to meet increased demand, following the closure of services in Solihull, and the development of a special care baby unit
- Further develop cancer services at Warwick Hospital and possibly also developing some services at Stratford Hospital to bring services closer to more remote areas

Combined with this the PCT are looking at how to provide acute services closer to the home through “community wards”, improved District nursing and the development of a “virtual ward” concept.