

## Revised Development Strategy Consultation 2013

### Summary of Representation relating to villages

#### Part 1: Summary of planning considerations put forward through the consultation

Consultation Comment	WDC Response
<b>General Comments</b>	
If villages closest to the urban area are Primary Service Villages, this could result in them being subsumed in to the urban area in due course	Preventing coalescence remains a key part of the Council's strategy. For example, the Tach Brook Country Park seeks to provide a permanent limit to the southern expansion of the towns
If the overall housing requirement were reduced to around 5400, then allocations to village could be reduced or removed	The housing requirement for the District is being reviewed through the Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment. If the housing requirement changes significantly as a result of this, then the potential to change allocations to villages can be explored
The village categorisation is inconsistent for instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barford has better services than Bishops Tachbrook, yet is a secondary service village</li> <li>- Shrewley and Hatton have similar facilities to Lapworth, but are secondary service villages</li> </ul>	The village categorisation has been prepared using a sound methodology which is set out in the village hierarchy report. Some villages (such as Barford) inevitably fall close to the boundary between two categories.
More development should be provided on brownfield sites and sites adjacent to the urban areas (such as the sites to the south of Warwick, Whitnash and Leamington)	The Council has explored how to maximise brownfield development and will continue to do so. However, there is a limited range of sites within Warwick District. The majority of new housing is therefore proposed for edge of urban sites
A greater proportion of housing should be directed to village locations	Any additional allocation to villages will need to be carefully justified and is likely to be difficult to achieve in green belt villages and other villages with significant landscape issues and site availability
Empty properties should be used in preference to new developments	There are insufficient long-term empty properties to make a significant impact on the District's housing requirement. The Council has a strategy which aims to bring empty properties back in to use and where possible these have been accounted for in the housing requirement
<b>Bishops Tachbrook</b>	
The proposals for 100-150 are far in excess of the requirement for around 14 homes identified in the village housing needs survey	The proposals for 100-150 are not purely to meet indigenous housing needs of the village, but include an element of village expansion which aims to support the wellbeing of village services and aims to provide for the growth of the District through encouraging thriving villages with mixed populations.
Artificially high housing numbers will result in more migration and	The overall housing numbers for the District are designed to accommodate projections for

commuting	migration. However we are seeking to limit commuting by ensuring that the number of jobs and number of people of working-age remain broadly in balance
The level of housing proposed would damage the identity and character of the village and would result in urban sprawl	Urban sprawl will be minimised by ensuring that the separate identity of the village is maintained and by selecting appropriate sites (in terms of landscape etc.) for the expansion of the village. The character of the village may change, but with careful development, site selection and investment in infrastructure, this should be minimised
The level of housing proposed would place an unreasonable and unmanageable strain on local infrastructure (school, doctors, roads etc)	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Bishops Tachbrook sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
Local roads will not be able to cope with this level of development, particularly when consider in in combination with other proposals in the RDS. This will lead to traffic congestion.	The Strategic Transport Assessment indicates that local roads will be able accommodate the additional traffic subject to mitigation measures being introduced
Oakley Wood Road is already dangerous with traffic travelling at excessive speeds. The additional housing will exacerbate this problem	See above
The existing sewer system in the village does not cope and until this system is improved there should be no further development in the village	See comments on infrastructure above
Access from the village to the A452 would need to be improved (e.g. a roundabout) if the proposals went ahead	See comments on infrastructure above
Impact on light and noise pollution	There is likely to be some impact on light pollution, however this will need to managed through the planning application process which will require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
Increased air pollution to the detriment of air quality	A study looking at the impact on air quality within Town centres has been commissioned. Locally to Bishops Tachbrook, it is not anticipated that air quality will reach unacceptable levels. However, if an EIA suggests this might be an issue, this would need to be addressed through the Planning Application process.
Increased water run-off causing increased flooding	There are no strategic flood risk issues associated with development in and around Bishops Tachbrook. Any local issues will need to be addressed through the Planning Application process.

Increased levels of crime and increased fear of crime	It is not anticipated that housing development in and around Bishops Tachbrook will have a significant impact on crime levels in the village
Loss of high quality, fertile agricultural land	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. However the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not give this sufficient weight to allow this issue to restrict housing delivery, especially in areas outside the green belt
Loss of biodiversity (habitats, trees etc)	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. Specific issues will need to be addressed through applications when the Council will seek to apply a biodiversity offsetting policy.
Damage to the beautiful landscape south of Warwick and Leamington	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites.
Risk that the proposals will lead to coalescence of settlements	The selection of sites immediate adjacent to the settlement will take account of this issue.
<b>Cubbington</b>	
Support Cubbington as one of the most sustainable villages to accommodate additional development	Approx 75 homes are proposed for Cubbington. This is below the RDS proposals due to substantial environmental and landscape restrictions
The village could support the scale of development proposed without detriment to the character, appearance and functioning of the village	Approx 75 homes are proposed for Cubbington. This is below the RDS proposals due to substantial environmental and landscape restrictions
<b>Hampton Magna</b>	
The level of housing proposed is excessive for the village and is not justified. A lower level for the District (such as 5400) would not require development in villages	The proposals for 100-150 are not purely to meet indigenous housing needs of the village, but include an element of village expansion which aims to support the wellbeing of village services and aims to provide for the growth of the District through encouraging thriving villages with mixed populations.
The houses are not needed to meet local needs and will be used by London commuters	See above
Existing infrastructure will not be able absorb the number of new homes being proposed for the village including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budbroke School is at capacity even taking account of current expansion</li> <li>- The road through the village is</li> </ul>	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Hampton Magna sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.

<p>already busy being used as a “rat run” to Warwick Parkway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The station and its facilities are at capacity</li> <li>- The GP practice</li> </ul>	
<p>Accessibility to the village is restricted by the railway bridge which could cause congestion</p>	<p>Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be accommodated</p>
<p>Birmingham Road and Hampton Road are already congested. These proposals will exacerbate that</p>	<p>Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be accommodated</p>
<p>The proposed level of development will damage the rural character of the village</p>	<p>The character of the village may change, but with careful development, site selection and investment in infrastructure, this should be minimised</p>
<p>Exceptional circumstances for development in the green belt has not been justified when non-green belt sites are available</p>	<p>A paper setting out the justification for releasing green belt has been prepared as part of the village sites preferred options proposals</p>
<p>The justification for development in villages relates to “sustaining” local facilities and services. Yet local facilities are already thriving and are at capacity</p>	<p>This is part of the justification and although some services may be doing well, additional housing will continue to support services in the longer term. Evidence suggests for instance that growth could support a more viable and convenient bus service.</p>
<p>Additional traffic is likely to cause more road safety problems in the area</p>	<p>Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.</p>
<p>The level of housing proposed will undermine community cohesion by unbalancing the social mix</p>	<p>The proposals will provide a mix of housing types and will seek maintain a strong local mix, including providing greater opportunities for younger people to continue to live in the village.</p>
<p>The proposals would damage the countryside and rural landscape</p>	<p>This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites.</p>
<p>The potential to develop between Gould Rd and Daly Avenue would be detrimental to the local house values and their residential amenity</p>	<p>The Revised Development Strategy does not propose specific sites. Specific sites will be proposed in a further consultation once all options have been fully assessed.</p>
<p>Flooding is already an issue, particularly on Birmingham Road. Additional development will make this issue worse.</p>	<p>There are no strategic flooding issues which entirely prevent development around the village. Local issues including infrastructure issues will need to be addressed with the infrastructure provider through an application.</p>
<p>This scale of building in and around the village will have a detrimental effect on wildlife</p>	<p>This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. Specific issues will need to be addressed through applications when the Council will seek to apply a biodiversity offsetting policy.</p>
<p>Loss of high quality, fertile agricultural land</p>	<p>This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not</p>

	carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. However the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not give this sufficient weight to allow this issue to restrict housing delivery
Brownfield and urban sites should be used in preference to rural greenfield sites	The Development Strategy seeks first to bring forward brownfield sites. However there are not enough sites to meet the District's housing need. The vast majority of the housing requirement will be met in and adjacent to the main urban areas.
Internet access in the village is already slow and is unlikely to be able to cope with additional demand	The potential to upgrade broadband infrastructure will be explored as development proposals are finalised
The proposals will erode the gap between the village and Warwick and could lead to coalescence	This depends on which site(s) are selected. Whilst it is possible that the existing gap between the settlements could be narrowed, the Strategy will still seek to avoid coalescence between settlements.
Additional housing in and around the village would make the ongoing provision of the bus service more viable and would potentially enable a less circuitous route to be provided to the village	This is consistent with the argument that development could help support existing facilities and services.
<b>Kingswood (Lapworth)</b>	
The level of housing seems excessive for a relatively small community, and this level of housing is not required to meet local needs. A local housing needs survey suggests 6 houses are required. The increase in houses is approximately 39%, yet the policy seeks to grow primary villages by around 20%	The proposals for 100-150 are not purely to meet indigenous housing needs of the village, but include an element of village expansion which aims to support the wellbeing of village services and aims to provide for the growth of the District through encouraging thriving villages with mixed populations. The proposals represent an increase in the number of households by between 26% and 39%. It is recognised that the upper end of this percentage is likely to be excessive for this settlement.
Existing infrastructure will not be able absorb the number of new homes being proposed for the village including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilities in the village are limited and would not cope</li> <li>- The school is full</li> <li>- Public transport is inadequate (trains are infrequent; no buses)</li> <li>- GP facilities</li> <li>- Lack of children's play areas</li> <li>- Lack of mains gas service</li> </ul>	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Kingswood sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
Exceptional circumstances for development in the green belt has not been justified when non-green belt sites are available	A paper setting out the justification for releasing green belt has been prepared as part of the village sites preferred options proposals
Congestion is already an issue and	Advice from transport experts at the County

will get worse (eg Station Lane; Old Warwick Road)	Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.
Increased traffic levels on small country lanes cause concerns about road safety	Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.
There are few employment opportunities in the village. Development should be located near employment.	This point is accepted
There is a lack of clarity about what area is covered by Kingswood (Lapworth) as it appears to cover part of Rowington parish	The description does include part of Rowington Parish and this will be clarified in future publications. The proposals are focused on the settlement of Kingswood even though they cross the boundaries of two parishes
Depending on which site(s) are selected there could be issues with regard to flooding, noise pollution and light pollution	These issues will be addressed in assessing specific planning applications
Lapworth should not be a primary service village as it is remote from many services (including emergency services) due to its isolated location.	The scoring relating to population, demographics, character, facilities and services has been applied in a consistent way to all rural settlements. This indicated that Kingswood can be justified as a Primary Service Villages.
Development should be spread across Lapworth Parish rather than concentrated on Kingswood.	It is more sustainable to locate development close to existing services and facilities
There are issues relating to property subsidence in the area due to the presence of natural springs. This makes it unsuitable for development.	Noted. Further work will be done to check this before sites are finalised
Flooding is already an issue during and following heavy rainfall. Kingswood Brook is in a flood risk area. The proposals are likely to exacerbate this as natural soak-away will be reduced.	Any sites within strategic flood risk areas will not be proposed. Any specific local issues will need to be addressed through the Planning Application process.
Brownfield and urban sites should be used in preference to rural greenfield sites	The Development Strategy seeks first to bring forward brownfield sites. However there are not enough sites to meet the District's housing need. The vast majority of the housing requirement will be met in and adjacent to the main urban areas.
The proposals would change the rural character and social make-up of the village especially of affordable housing is included.	The character of the village may change, but with careful development, site selection and investment in infrastructure, this should be minimised. Affordable housing would be included with the hope that this would help local residents remain in the area
Loss of biodiversity (habitats, trees etc)	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. Specific issues will need to be addressed through applications when the

	Council will seek to apply a biodiversity offsetting policy.
Loss of high quality, fertile agricultural land	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. However the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not give this sufficient weight to allow this issue to restrict housing delivery.
Kingswood includes a number of listed buildings. The setting and character of these will be damaged by the scale of new development	The impact on listed buildings and conservation areas has been considered as part of the overall site appraisal process. One of the sites in Kingswood has been discounted, partly due to impact on the setting of a listed building.
<b>Radford Semele</b>	
The proposals will add to congestions, particularly accessing the A425. In particular the access on to Southam Road from School Lane is not suitable	Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.
Infrastructure could not cope with this scale of development including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School</li> <li>- Health provision</li> <li>- Utilities (eg sewerage system)</li> </ul>	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Radford Semele sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
The proposals are likely to extend the village envelope either encroaching in to the gap between Leamington and village or extending in open countryside	All site options have been subject to a landscape assessment. Proposed sites will take account of the impact on the landscape and coalescence
Any new development would need to be of appropriate layout and design to fit in with existing densities and character.	Agreed. This will be assessed as part of any planning application process
<b>Barford</b>	
This level of development is disproportionate. Development should be limited to meeting local needs (eg up to 3 houses per annum)	The proposals for 70-90 are not purely to meet indigenous housing needs of the village, but include an element of village expansion which aims to support the wellbeing of village services and aims to provide for the growth of the District through encouraging thriving villages with mixed populations.
The village has already been subject to inappropriate, high-density development to the detriment of the village's character	Sites will be selected to minimise the detrimental impact on the village's character, including in relation to historic environment of the village
Barford is being used as a "rat run". This will get worse with new development causing congestion and safety concerns (eg exiting Fulbrook	Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.

Lane on to the A429.	
Barford is an historic village that has grown organically over many centuries. Its historic assets should be protected. Such a large increase in will damage this historic character	Sites will be selected to minimise the detrimental impact on the village's character, including in relation to historic environment of the village
The proposals will have a detrimental effect on the rural character of the village.	Sites will be selected to minimise the detrimental impact on the village's character, including in relation to historic environment of the village
Infrastructure could not cope with this scale of development including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Power supply</li> <li>- Waste water provision</li> <li>- The school is full</li> <li>- Lack of GP services</li> </ul>	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Barford sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
Parking in the village is already difficult. More development will make this worse.	Parking will be provided in association with any new development
There is no significant employment in Barford. This means Barford will be a commuter village and will result in extra traffic and congestion	This point is accepted, however the village is fairly well located to access the employment areas to the south of Warwick
The proposals would have a negative impact on the ecology of the area.	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. Specific issues will need to be addressed though applications when the Council will seek to apply a biodiversity offsetting policy.
40% affordable housing in rural areas is too high as confirmed by the local housing needs survey.	Studies show that there is a need for affordable housing in rural areas and across the District. To meet the District's affordable housing need, approximately 40% of new dwellings need to be affordable
Development should be in keeping with the village design statement and should be brought forward incrementally (phasing required) to allow better integration.	The potential to phase development over the plan period will be explored
The village's facilities do not need more growth to support their ongoing viability	In line with other villages Barford has witnessed a decline in young people and ageing of the population. If this trend continues in many village locations it may result in a reduction in the viability of certain types of facilities – particularly those supporting younger residents.
<b>Baginton</b>	
The proposals for a sub-regional employment site within the Greenbelt are unacceptable, will have a negative impact on the village and exceptional circumstances have not	The Gateway application is subject to call-in by the Secretary of State. This issue will be considered as part of that. In relation to the Local Plan a sub-regional employment is being commissioned



been justified.	
The proposed number of houses is excessive for the size of the settlement and takes no account of the housing needs survey which suggested 20 additional dwellings for the village.	The proposals for 100-150 are not purely to meet indigenous housing needs of the village, but include an element of village expansion which aims to support the wellbeing of village services and aims to provide for the growth of the District through encouraging thriving villages with mixed populations.
The outcomes of Baginton Parish Plan and Housing Needs survey should be used to shape the proposals for the village	The proposals for 100-150 are not purely to meet indigenous housing needs of the village, but include an element of village expansion which aims to support the wellbeing of village services and aims to provide for the growth of the District through encouraging thriving villages with mixed populations.
This is an historic village. Its heritage and character should be protected	Sites will be selected to minimise the detrimental impact on the village's character, including in relation to historic environment of the village
Any housing development should be accommodated without impacting on the green belt. Exceptional circumstance for green belt releases have not been justified	A paper setting out the justification for releasing green belt has been prepared as part of the village sites preferred options proposals
The village does not have the infrastructure to support this level of development. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GP services</li> <li>- School</li> <li>- Transport</li> <li>- Shops</li> </ul>	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Radford Semele sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
The proposals are supported and preserve the integrity of the community	Noted
<b>Burton Green</b>	
The proposals will lead to coalescence, contradicting the Council's stated policy	Sites will be selected with a view to minimising impact on coalescence
The proposals are supported and preserve the integrity of the community. Indeed the village could accommodate additional housing over and above that proposed	Noted, however the services available in the village and site capacity place a ceiling on how much development is appropriate in the village
<b>Hatton Park</b>	
Birmingham Road has significant road safety issues and cannot take any more development	Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.
Birmingham Road is already congested and the additional traffic will add to this congestion problem. The proposals would also add to congestion on the estate.	Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.
Storm drains on Birmingham Road	Noted. This will need to be considered in any

regularly flood and the proposals will make this situation worse	planning application proposals affecting this area
The green belt should be protected. Exceptional circumstances have not been justified for releasing green belt land	A paper setting out the justification for releasing green belt has been prepared as part of the village sites preferred options proposals
Services and infrastructure in Hatton Park are unsuitable to support further development without providing improvements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- schools,</li> <li>- shops</li> <li>- health services</li> <li>- recreational facilities</li> <li>- facilities for children</li> <li>- allotments</li> </ul>	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to hatton Park sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
The proposals are likely to have a negative impact on the canal environment which is a tourist attraction	Impact on the enjoyment and ecology of the canal will be considered in site selection.
Depending on which site(s) are proposed, there could be an impact on flooding	Impact on flooding will be considered in site selection.
There would be benefits for a small development for elderly people	Noted
The ecology in the area should be protected	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites. Specific issues will need to be addressed though applications when the Council will seek to apply a biodiversity offsetting policy.
The impact on the community at Hatton Terrace would be significant	The level of significance will be dependent on which sites are selected. The impact on existing dwellings will be assessed.
More development in this areas could increase the demand for bus services to enable a critical mass to be achieved	This is consistent with the argument that development could help support existing facilities and services.
There are no suitable sites in and around Hatton Park to support development	A detailed assessment of potential sites has been undertaken to assess suitability
There are some suitable sites to support development around Hatton Park	A detailed assessment of potential sites has been undertaken to assess suitability
Hatton Park is not a sustainable location for development due to the poor provision of facilities. This would put further pressure on the road network	At the time of undertaking the work on village facilities and services, Hatton Park had a regular bus service (every 30 minutes) with a journey time of 15 minutes to travel to Warwick. The village is also located near Warwick Parkway Railway Station. The public transport infrastructure provides a good alternative to private car use. It is acknowledged that the settlement could benefit

	from an enhanced range of services, including an improved shop facility.
The proposals would damage the rural setting of the settlement	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites.
The proposals will impact on the vistas from the public footpath running north west from Hatton Park	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites.
Depending on the site(s) proposed, there could be an impact on high quality agricultural land	This is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites.
There is no information on which specific sites are being proposed	The site specific consultation will follow later in 2013
<b>Leek Wootton</b>	
Development here will reduce the gap between Kenilworth and Leamington leading to coalescence	This is an important issue and sites will be selected to minimise the impact on this
An increase of 21% in the village housing stock is significant. The infrastructure in the village such as the school would be stretched for instance	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Leek Wootton sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
The proposals will lead to increased traffic levels and congestion	Advice from transport experts at the County Council suggests that the development proposals can be safely accommodated.
Access to supermarkets will involve travelling through Warwick, leading to further congestion.	In some village locations, people take advantage of internet shopping to purchase groceries from supermarkets rather than add to local congestion levels.
Sites adjacent to the A46 would be inappropriate due to noise pollution and traffic safety	This will be taken in to account in selecting sites
The proposals have the potential to enable a viable local shop to be supported. Leek Wootton is the largest village in the District without shop.	This is consistent with the argument that development could help support existing facilities and services.
The village should no longer be washed over by green belt as the built up area makes no contribution to the openness of the green belt.	This will be assessed in considering a new green belt envelope for the village
The proposals would support the long term viability of the school which currently includes a significant intake from outside the village	This is consistent with the argument that development could help support existing facilities and services.
The proposals are supported and preserve the integrity of the	Noted

community	
The site at the Police Headquarters would be appropriate	This site will be assessed for suitability alongside other sites
The site adjacent to the Golf Club would be suitable	This site will be assessed for suitability alongside other sites
90 houses for the village is supported but should be spread over several sites	This options will be assessed in selecting the most appropriate location(s) for development
<b>Other Rural Settlements</b>	
<b>Hatton Green:</b> Concern about the potential for certain sites to impact on the character of the village, the road network, road safety, flooding and ecology.	These factors will be taken in to account in assessing site suitability
<b>Hatton Green:</b> There is potential for up to 90 houses in the village and the village envelope should be amended accordingly	This will be considered as part of the site assessment process
<b>Norton Lindsey:</b> Support for Norton Lindsey being classified as a Feeder Village	Noted
<b>Norton Lindsey:</b> Norton Lindsey has sufficient services and is of sufficient size to be classified as a secondary service village, which in turn would provide the potential reduce allocations to other villages	The assessment undertaken in the village hierarchy report suggests that Norton Lindsey does not have the services or the critical mass to accommodate substantial levels of growth
<b>Old Milverton:</b> Old Milverton should be classified alongside very small village and hamlets. It is not suitable for significant development due to its size, character, road network, access to services and role within the green belt	The assessment undertaken in the village hierarchy report suggests that Old Milverton is of size to be considered a small/feeder village
<b>Shrewley Common:</b> This village is within the green belt and the proposed sites would entail the loss of mature trees and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the village. There are also concerns about the increased levels of traffic, access to school places and the sewerage/drainage system. These issues would need to be resolved	A paper setting out the justification for releasing green belt has been prepared as part of the village sites preferred options proposals. It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to hatton Park sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.
<b>Stoneleigh:</b> development here would impact on the green belt and the separation between Leamington and Kenilworth. The village does not have good access to facilities and services and the road infrastructure could not cope with development	No development is proposed in Stoneleigh
<b>Stoneleigh:</b> should be classified as a	The assessment undertaken in the village hierarchy

secondary service village given its proximity to employment and larger centres of population. There are sites that could be developed close to village and the village envelope should be redrawn to accommodate this	report suggests that Stoneleigh does not have the services or the critical mass to accommodate substantial levels of growth
<b>Weston Under Wetherley:</b> Support for some development here from landowners	The assessment undertaken in the village hierarchy report suggests that Weston under Wetherley does not have the services or the critical mass to accommodate substantial levels of growth
<b>Hatton Station:</b> the infrastructure in the village could not support significant development here. In particular, the road network is unsafe; drainage is a problem; there are no amenities for children or elderly people; the bus service is inadequate; there is pressure on schools; there are no shopping facilities. The land is in the green belt. This area has rich ecology which will be undermined by proposed development	It is recognised that additional housing across the District and within specific villages will require investment in infrastructure. Infrastructure planning is taking place in parallel with proposals for development, including in relation to Hatton Park sites. No development is being brought forward in locations where infrastructure providers believe the requirements cannot be met.  The impact on is an issue which has been given weight in assessing sites and where other factors do not carry more weight this will be relevant in selecting the most appropriate sites.

## Part 2: Statistical Analysis

The table below provides a statistical summary of the representations received in so far as they relate to **the 10 Primary and Secondary Service Villages**. It should be noted however that the planning system does not place weight on the quantity of responses received in relation to a site or an issue, but rather gives weight to the strengths of the arguments put forward.

Village Options	No. Of Reps	Support	Object	Other Comments
<b>Villages Overall</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>30 (8%)</b>	<b>328 (92%)</b>	
<b>Primary Service Villages</b>				
• Bishops Tachbrook (100-150 dwellings)	33	1 (3%)	32 (97%)	
• Cubbington (100-150 dwellings)	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	
• Hampton Magna (100-150 dwellings)	128	2 (2%)	126 (98%)	Petition signed by 831 people objecting to RDS proposals for Hampton Magna
• Kingswood (Lapworth) (100-150 dwellings)	55	4 (7%)	51 (93%)	

• Radford Semele (100-150 dwellings)	7	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	
<b>Secondary Service Villages</b>				
• Barford (70-90 dwellings)	38	2 (5%)	36 (95%)	
• Baginton (70-90 dwellings)	18	1 (6%)	17 (94%)	
• Burton Green (70-90 dwellings)	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	
• Hatton Park (70-90 dwellings)	36	4 (11%)	32 (89%)	Petition signed by 82 people objecting to development at Oaklands Farm
• Leek Wootton (70-90 dwellings)	10	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	
<b>Other Rural Settlements</b>	27	3 (11%)	24 (89%)	