

**WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL
STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT**

**Minutes of the Meeting of the SHLAA Partnership held on Thursday 06 March 2014 at the
Council Offices, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa.**

Present

Sally Jones	(SJ)	Warwick DC (Planning)
Reuben Bellamy	(RB)	Cala Homes Ltd
Jo Welch	(JW)	Jephson Housing
Julie Morgan	(JM)	Miller Homes Ltd
Ken Bruno	(KB)	Warwick DC (Housing)

1. Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1 Members were welcomed to Riverside House and thanked for giving up their time to attend the partnership meetings.
- 1.2 Julie Morgan would now be representing Miller Homes. Apologies were received from Richard Hardy (Richard Hardy Bromwich) and Abigail Hay (WDC Housing)

2. Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 SJ requested that, during site specific discussions, members of the Partnership declare if they have any specific professional interests in the site.

3. Local Plan Timetable

- 3.1 SJ gave a quick outline of the Local Plan Timetable. The draft (Submission Version) of the Local Plan was due to be considered by Full Council on 23rd April. This would be followed by a six week consultation period during June and July on aspects of the “soundness” of the draft Local Plan. It was hoped that submission to the Secretary of State could take place by September with an Examination at the end of the year and adoption early in 2015.

4. The SHLAA Review

- 4.1 The purpose of the review was to:
 - Add new sites, such as those arising from the consultations on the Revised Development Strategy and the Villages Consultation, and any other sites which have been put forward
 - Update information on sites in the existing SHLAA, such as sites receiving planning permission or where new evidence or supporting site investigations have been submitted
 - Review site capacities as appropriate

- 4.2 Forms had been sent out to those that had promoted a site in the existing SHLAA requesting either, confirmation that they still wished the site to be included, or details of any changing circumstances or site details.

5. Sites for Consideration for Viability & Marketability

- 5.1 *Land at Goggbrook Lane.* There were concerns about how the noise issues could be overcome and the impact, on the site size, of widening the lane if this was deemed to be necessary.
- 5.2 *Land West of the Racecourse.* This was considered to be an excellent location and worth considering if the arm of the racecourse could be released from the site. However access was an issue which would need to be resolved. Currently undeliverable.
- 5.3 *Land at Longbridge.* Members thought this was a good location which was sufficiently shielded from motorway noise and the impacts of the two hotels near the M40 roundabout. However there were concerns about any odour issues from the sewage farm.
- 5.4 *MPS Premises, Lock Lane.* This was potentially a good canal side site but probably only if it was developed comprehensively along with adjoining land to the west.
- 5.5 *Land at Old Budbrook Road.* This site had been identified as a former landfill site but no information on the type of landfill was available. This information would be required in order to assess whether the site was suitable or viable. There were issues around noise from the railway as trains pull away from Warwick Parkway.
- 5.6 *Former Poultry Farm, Norton Lindsey.* Members were of the opinion that this could potentially be a good site, subject to satisfactory access. The speed limit would probably need to be reduced. (NB It was possible that this site would not be included in the SHLAA as it did not abut the built up area of the village)

6.0 Discussions about Determining the Capacity of Sites

- 6.1 The meeting discussed techniques of assessing the capacity of housing sites, once other supporting infrastructure had been determined. It was generally agreed that there was no correct/ accurate way of doing this other than on a site-by-site basis. For example, the accommodation of SUDS was a major consideration and the land take varied enormously from site to site depending on the geological characteristics of the site.
- 6.2 There was some discussion around densities and the difficulties of planning for garden suburbs if densities of 35 dph were to be achieved. There was a view that housing mix made little difference to density since, with smaller houses, the need to accommodate more cars made up for having fewer but larger dwellings (in terms of land take). There was concern that the affordable dwellings were getting smaller and being built at very high densities, especially as the HCA was calling for more 1-bed properties.