



Warwick District Council

Core Strategy
Alternative Sites

Report of Public Consultation

October 2010



1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to summarise the responses to the public consultation in relation to the Core Strategy Alternative Sites held between February 26th and April 9th 2010. The report also outlines the steps that were taken to publicise the consultation. The findings from this report, along with all the responses received will inform the Core Strategy process.

Background

- 1.2 The Council are required to prepare a Core Strategy, which when adopted will update the planning policy framework for the District currently set out in the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011. The preparation process began in 2007 with the identification of the key issues that the Core Strategy will need to address. This included a series of meetings with local and national organisations, agencies and interest groups with an interest in Warwick District.
- 1.3 The Council used this information to prepare an Issues Paper which was the subject of public consultation during November 2007 to January 2008. This was accompanied by a questionnaire which the public were invited to complete. This consultation gave an opportunity for organisations, statutory bodies, businesses, and members of the public to be involved at an early stage of the production of the Core Strategy.
- 1.4 The consultation and responses to the Issues Paper led to the preparation by the Council of the Options for Growth Paper in 2008, and the Preferred Options Paper in 2009. In response to the consultation on the Preferred Options Paper, a number of landowners/developers put forward alternative sites for development. These were new sites that had not previously been considered by the Council through the process. In order for the Council to properly consider these alternative sites before preparing its draft Core Strategy, they were made available for comment and this report summarises the responses received.

2. The Alternative Sites Consultation

- 2.1 The purpose of this consultation was to seek the views of the public and organisations on a number of potential development sites put to the Council by landowners/developers to meet future needs. It was stressed that this consultation did not imply any indication as to the suitability of these sites for development, or of any support for the development of these sites by the Council. The purpose of the consultation was to provide the public and organisations an opportunity to put forward their views on the possible development of these sites before the Council consider whether or not they should be identified within in its draft Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The consultation was supported by a Paper prepared by the Council which included a plan and brief details regarding the sites.

Consultation Details

- 2.3 The consultation was held for a period of 6 weeks between February 26th and April 9th 2010. The consultation was publicised through the following channels:
- Respondents to the consultation on the Preferred Options (over 1,700) were notified by email or letter;
 - An article was included in the Warwick District Focus Magazine which was distributed to every household in the District during March;
 - A similar article was also distributed by Coventry City Council to households within Coventry using the local press;
 - News items on the Council's website with links to a dedicated webpage on the Core Strategy;
 - Press release and advertisements in the local press;
 - Interviews on local radio stations;
 - A briefing session for Town and Parish Councils and Resident Associations prior to the start of the consultation on the 4th February 2010; and,
 - Presentations given by officers at public meetings held across the District during the consultation.
- 2.4 The consultation Paper was made available electronically on the Council's website and in paper form at the Council offices, the Town Hall, the Warwickshire Direct offices in Whitnash, Kenilworth and Lillington, and the Brunswick Healthy Living Centre. Paper copies were sent to all Town and Parish Councils and made available on request to all other organisations and members of the public. Copies were also made available at the public meetings attended by officers.
- 2.5 There were a number of different options available for people wishing to respond to the consultation. The Paper contained a questionnaire in order to enable respondents to structure their responses to the Council in relation to the various strategic objectives. This questionnaire was made available online on the Council's website to enable respondents to input their comments directly into the consultation database. Alternatively, it was available electronically or in paper form for respondents to complete and submit to the Council. Responses could also be made in writing by letter or email.

3. Summary of Responses

3.1 The Council received 2,434 individual responses from 1,099 respondents. The majority of respondents (approximately 70%) have responded by letter, with a proportion using standardised letters objecting to specific sites. The remainder have responded using the questionnaire on the website or via email (approximately 15% used each method). All responses have been read, summarised and, where necessary, input by officers into the consultation database. A summary of all the responses forms part of the report of public consultation and can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/index.php>

3.2 A brief analysis has been undertaken by officers to provide an overview of the nature of the comments received by the Council. This analysis is set out below in relation to the specific questions put forward in the Alternative Sites Paper. However, it should be noted that this summary does not attempt to cover all the points raised by respondents during the consultation and therefore must be read alongside the consultation database on the Council's website referred to above.

3.3 In addition, the Council received a petition from Coventry Conservatives signed by 41 residents opposing Hurst Farm South, Burton Green, with four residents supporting some development. Although not forming part of this consultation, the Council also received 17 objections during the consultation period to the development of Kings Hill, Finham which was a site included within the Preferred Options consultation.

1a. Do you support or object to the development of Kenilworth Wardens Cricket Club, Glasshouse Lane, Kenilworth?

Total No. of Responses	210
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	147
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	46
Total No. of Comments	17

Some of the comments made in relation to the Kenilworth Wardens Cricket Club were:

- It is an extension of the urban area, adding to an existing thriving town rather than overwhelming a small village community;
- The site is close to the A46 making it attractive to commuters. There is good site access from an already existing road network;
- The site appears to consist predominantly of amenity grassland which is of negligible value for biodiversity and the Joint Green Belt Review describes the area as being of low landscape value;
- The significance of the adjacent Stoneleigh Abbey and designated Glasshouse Roman settlement and the potential for further archaeology should be carefully considered;
- It would exacerbate current problems that occur on already congested and dangerous roads and junctions;

- There has already been considerable building in the East of Kenilworth with a large loss of open space. Any further development would lead to the undesirable 'ribbon' encroachment from Coventry;
- The presence of ancient woodland of high biodiversity value is a significant constraint to the potential development given the need for substantial buffer zones;
- Greenbelt should be preserved and there are more appropriate brownfield sites in the district;
- The local infrastructure such as schools and doctors cannot support further development. In addition the site is poorly related to public transport network;
- The Wardens Cricket Club plays an important role in offering recreational facilities for Kenilworth residents. The site should not be redeveloped until the cricket club is relocated to another site;
- The land is adjacent to the A46 and subjected to high noise and pollution levels therefore, is unsuitable for residential use. It is also in close proximity to the HS2 proposed rail route; and,
- The proposal does not meet the strategy set out in the emerging RSS which directs growth to Warwick and Leamington Spa which are identified as a Settlement of Significant Development (SSD) and this designation does not include Kenilworth.

1b. Do you support or object to the development of Woodside Training Centre, Glasshouse Lane, Kenilworth?

Total No. of Responses	193
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	148
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	30
Total No. of Comments	15

Some of the comments made in relation to the Woodside Training Centre were:

- It is an extension of the urban area, adding to an existing thriving town rather than overwhelming a small village community;
- The site is close to the A46 making it attractive to commuters. There is good site access from an already existing road network;
- The site appears to consist predominantly of amenity grassland which is of negligible value for biodiversity and the Joint Green Belt Review describes the area as being of low landscape value;
- A well planned utilisation of land adjacent to Woodside would not detract from the setting of the conference centre and would enable investment and improved employment prospects at this important Kenilworth venue;
- The significance of the adjacent Stoneleigh Abbey and designated Glasshouse Roman settlement and the potential for further archaeology should be carefully considered;
- It would exacerbate current problems that occur on already congested and dangerous roads and junctions;

- There has already been considerable building in the East of Kenilworth with a large loss of open space. Any further development would lead to the undesirable 'ribbon' encroachment from Coventry;
- The presence of ancient woodland of high biodiversity value is a significant constraint to the potential development given the need for substantial buffer zones;
- The Green Belt should be preserved and there are more appropriate brownfield sites in the district;
- The local infrastructure such as schools and doctors cannot support further development. In addition the site is poorly related to public transport network;
- The land is adjacent to the A46 and subjected to high noise and pollution levels therefore, is unsuitable for residential use. It is also in close proximity to the HS2 proposed rail route;
- The proposal does not meet the strategy set out in the emerging RSS which directs growth to Warwick and Leamington Spa which are identified as a Settlement of Significant Development (SSD) and this designation does not include Kenilworth; and,
- Woodside is an asset for the Town and is an attractive building in well maintained grounds. Intensifying development on the site would be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality.

2. Do you support or object to the development of Land at Campion School/ south of Sydenham

Total No. of Responses	260
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	39
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	195
Total No. of Comments	26

Some of the comments made in relation to the Land at Campion School, South of Sydenham were:

- The proposal seems well balanced providing not only housing, but also a new state-of-the-art education facility to serve and benefit several different adjoining communities;
- The site extends the urban area, integrating into already established communities without overwhelming rural areas, and it enhances access to natural habitats;
- It is close to existing good road and public transportation links and is in close proximity to areas of employment and leisure facilities;
- Development will occur on a much appreciated green space between Sydenham and Whitnash, affecting the local wildlife;
- It will be essential to buffer Whitnash Brook, whilst ensuring that adequate connectivity to the wider environment is maintained;
- The watercourse to the west of the proposed site has an associated flood plain. There is concern that development would create an increased flood risk to the area;
- Some local roads, which were not built to carry high levels of traffic, are already heavily congested and dangerous at peak times. Development would exacerbate this problem;
- There is limited accessibility to the site due to the railway line on the Western border;
- Local amenities, in particular schools, are already overstretched and the area could not support another large housing development
- The site is of local, historical and archaeological interest, as it contains Whitnash Brook and the ancient sites of Holy Well and Castle Field; and,

- The entire site is not appropriate for full development. However, there is agreement that development to the bridleway is a more acceptable extension of the urban area as it forms a natural boundary to Sydenham.

3. Do you support or object to the development of Glebe Farm, Cubbington?

Total No. of Responses	904
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	26
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	851
Total No. of Comments	27

Some of the comments made in relation to the development of Glebe Farm, Cubbington were:

- It is a suitable site for development due to it being well served by public transport and in close proximity to a wide range of local services and facilities;
- It is a natural expansion of the urban area and could enhance both Cubbington and Lillington by bringing extra business to local shops;
- The area is often subject to flooding and the sewage system is already at breaking point. Further building will only serve to exacerbate these problems;
- The Green Belt must be protected to prevent the encroachment of Leamington Spa and into the countryside; any development would cause a loss of attractive and accessible countryside;
- There are a number of ecological constraints to the site mainly focussed around the presence of protected species such as bats, badgers and great crested newts. There is also a connected framework of ponds, hedgerows and mature trees throughout;
- The site is on higher ground so there will be visual impact issues. A landscape buffer would be needed to both break up the scale and screen the development from surrounding areas;
- Local services and facilities are struggling to support the community at present and would not cope with the additional demands from extra housing;
- All employment and large retail facilities exist south of the River Leam leading to increased cross town traffic;
- Development would cause extra pressure on the local road infrastructure which is already overloaded and dangerous.
- The current cul-de-sacs are not suitable for access routes;
- Merging Lillington and Cubbington will result in the loss of Cubbington's unique village status, character and separate identity; and,
- Manufacturers, Thwaites, create a certain amount of noise which could cause irritation to prospective residents in new housing adjacent to their factory

4. Do you support or object to the development of Loes Farm, Guy's Cliffe, Warwick?

Total No. of Responses	219
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	23
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	170
Total No. of Comments	26

Some of the comments made in relation to the development of Loes Farm, Guy's Cliffe, Warwick were:

- The area between the bypass and the A429 is a natural infill site to an urban extension with an established community;
- The site is in close proximity to the A46 which allows good access for the M40 and Coventry;
- The A46 creates a physical barrier. It reduces site permeability, and means access to this part of the site would be very difficult;
- The A46 forms a clearly defined edge to the north of the town, breaching this would set a precedent for further urban sprawl;
- Development of this land will have an adverse impact upon the separate identity of Leek Wootton and the village will become a continuation of the urban edge of Warwick.
- The site contains, and is adjacent, to a number of historical features including Gaveston's Cross, Hinton's Nursery, and Guy's Cliffe; in addition part of the site is a registered Park and Garden.
- Part of the site is on a ridge so development therefore would be visually intrusive;
- The well established mosaic of habitats and ecological features are sufficient to make this parcel unfavourable for development;
- The local roads cannot accommodate existing traffic flows, new housing would only exacerbate the congestion problems;
- The area is prone to flooding; and,
- There are no local amenities within walking distance and the site is some distance away from the town centre, employment and other facilities.

5. Do you support or object to the development of Hurst Farm South, Burton Green?

Total No. of Responses	272
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	21
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	222
Total No. of Comments	29

Some of the comments made in relation to the development of Hurst Farm South, Burton Green were:

- Given the proximity of the University, this site could offer significant benefits for the development of student accommodation and other related residential provision, which would release housing for families in other areas;
- The site is a highly valued and used green space with a network of footpaths and bridleways;
- The site is situated in-between four semi natural and plantation ancient woodlands connected by a framework of hedgerows which will need to be retained with sufficient buffers;
- There may be potential issues regarding the proximity to the flood zone;

- The local roads are inadequate for the volumes of traffic especially at peak periods and would not cope with the extra traffic produced by the development;
- Location of the site limits the opportunity for access onto the strategic road network and there is a poor relationship to the public transport network;
- There are insufficient local amenities to support this development;
- Erosion of the Green Belt between Kenilworth and Coventry will result in the loss of identity between very separate conurbations and deliver urban sprawl;
- Development would effectively isolate The University of Warwick within an expanding urban sprawl and curtail its existing semi rural location and easy student access to the neighbouring countryside;
- The major expansion of The University of Warwick is already planned and will create many problems for local residents without any extra development.

6. Do you support or object to the development of Land at Baginton?

Total No. of Responses	226
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	55
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	147
Total No. of Comments	24

Some of the comments made in relation to the development of Land at Baginton were:

- The site is within easy access of Coventry and its facilities;
- The site is well situated for access to the major road network allowing good access to the wider region;
- The site is of low landscape value owing to the airport, business parks and previous development;
- There will be flood plain implications for the site and there is a need to ensure the development doesn't produce any cross catchment transfers;
- The site is sensitive in terms of protection requirements for 'Controlled Waters'. The whole formation is classified as a Principal Aquifer;
- The River Sowe, which passes through the site, is a potential Local Wildlife Site and essential wildlife corridor;
- It is imperative that green infrastructure improvements will need to be incorporated throughout the site;
- Development would cause a loss of Green Belt and result in urban sprawl;
- The proposed site is larger than the existing village which has limited facilities;
- The local roads and major junctions are already congested at peak times and would be unable to cope with the additional vehicles produced by the development;
- There are limited public transport services in the area;
- Could result in the loss of public recreation space including the golf course;
- The area of proposed development includes designated and undesignated historic assets of great significance;
- Development of this site would harm the character of Baginton which currently retains a distinctive village environment.

General Comments (not site specific)

Total No. of Responses	150
Total No. of 'Support' Responses	0
Total No. of 'Object' Responses	116
Total No. of Comments	34

Some of the general comments made were:

- Sites have not been appraised through the SHLAA process;
- There is no mention of sites needing to be assessed through a sustainability appraisal;
- More should be done to ensure brownfield sites are developed before greenfield;
- Development should be dispersed across the district to reduce the burden on infrastructure in specific areas;
- Question the need for additional housing when there are empty properties in the district;
- Villages should remain villages and green belt should be retained to prevent urban sprawl;
- Traffic already a major concern in the district and more development will only exacerbate this; and
- Concern about the loss of valuable, high grade agricultural land at a time when we should be growing our own food in this country.

Local Development Framework



Where possible, information can be made available in other formats, including large print, cassette tape, CD and other languages if required. Tel. 01926 450000.

