



Local Plan Submission

Consultation Statement

Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012

Regulation 22c

January 2015

CONTENTS	Page No.
Introduction	3
(i) List of bodies and persons invited to make representations under regulation 18	3
(ii) How those bodies and person were invited to make representations under regulation 18	3
(iii) Summary of the main issues raised by the representations made in pursuant to regulation 18 a) Issues, Scenarios and Objectives (Helping Shape the District) Consultation b) Preferred Option Consultation: May 2012 c) Revised Development Strategy d) Village Sites and Settlement Boundaries	4
(iv) How representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken in to account a) Issues, Scenarios and Objectives (Helping Shape the District) Consultation b) Preferred Option Consultation: May 2012 c) Revised Development Strategy d) Village Sites and Settlement Boundaries	24
(v) Regulation 20 Representations - the number of representations made and summary of main issues raised a) Publication Draft b) Focused Changes	27
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 - Organisations invited to attend topic workshops during Issues and Scenarios consultation	32
Appendix 2 - Organisations invited to make representations at various stages of the plan	33
Appendix 3 - General consultation letters issued at the start of each consultation	52

Introduction

(i) List of bodies and persons invited to make representations under regulation 18

a) Issues, Scenarios and Objectives (Helping Shape the District) Consultation: March 2011

Appendix 2 of submission document 'LP01 - Report of Public Consultation of the Local Plan Issues and Scenarios' contains a list of specific bodies and statutory organisations consulted. As described in section two of this Report of Public Consultation extensive consultation was undertaken with various bodies, through a variety of forms, including schools, town and parish councils, neighbouring authorities, community and voluntary organisations and the business community. Bodies invited to attend topic workshops is listed in Appendix 1 below. A full list of the organisations invited to make representations is in Appendix 2 below. In addition 2734 individuals and 88 commercial organisations were consulted, who were registered on the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) consultation database.

b) Preferred Option Consultation: May 2012

A full list of the organisations invited to make representations is in Appendix 2 below. In addition, 3170 individuals and 112 commercial organisations were consulted who registered on the SCI consultation database.

c) Revised Development Strategy Consultation: June 2013

A full list of the organisations invited to make representations is in Appendix 2 below. In addition, 4749 individuals and 228 commercial organisations were consulted who registered on the SCI consultation database.

d) Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation: November 2013

A full list of the organisations invited to make representations is in Appendix 2 below. In addition, 3995 individuals and 321 commercial organisations were consulted who had been registered on the SCI consultation database.

(ii) How those bodies and person were invited to make representations under regulation 18

a) Issues, Scenarios and Objectives (Helping Shape the District) Consultation: March 2011

A start of the consultation period notification was sent via email and/or letter to all consultees described above. A copy of this letter is in Appendix 3 below. Consultees had the opportunity to make representations by email, post or online using the Council's e-consultation system. As described above a series of workshops with organisations and statutory consultees were held around different issues. The Council complied with the methods of communication as set out in its SCI, this included a press advert; press notice; exhibitions and drop in sessions and public and organisation specific meetings. During this consultation the Council also commissioned an independent market research company,

BMG Research, to undertake a face to face survey to obtain a representative sample of people across the District. The results of this study are in the submission document LP02 - Issues & Scenarios - Report of Local Resident Survey.

b) Preferred Option Consultation: May 2012

A start of the consultation period notification was sent via email and/or letter to all consultees described above. A copy of this letter is at is in Appendix 3 below. Consultees had the opportunity to make representations by email, post or online using the Council's e-consultation system. The Council complied with the methods of communication as set out in its SCI, this included a press advert; press notice; exhibitions and drop in sessions and public meetings.

c) Revised Development Strategy Consultation: June 2013

A start of the consultation period notification was sent via email and/or letter to all consultees described above. A copy of this letter is at is in Appendix 3 below. Consultees had the opportunity to make representations by email, post or online using the Council's e-consultation system. The Council complied with the methods of communication as set out in its SCI, this included a press advert; press notice; exhibitions and drop in sessions and public meetings.

d) Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation: November 2013

A start of the consultation period notification was sent via email and/or letter to all consultees described above. A copy of this letter is at is in Appendix 3 below. Consultees had the opportunity to make representations by email, post or online using the Council's e-consultation system. The Council complied with the methods of communication as set out in its SCI, this included a press advert; press notice; exhibitions and drop in sessions and public meetings.

(iii) Summary of the main issues raised by the representations made in pursuant to regulation 18

a) Issues, Scenarios and Objectives (Helping Shape the District) Consultation: March 2011

The section below sets out the main issues that the Council considers to have arisen from this consultation. It should be noted however, that a range of other issues were also raised.
Summary of Main Issues Raised: Helping Shape the District Consultation
Following a decision to prepare a new Local Plan in 2010, this consultation sought views on the main issues facing the District; views on potential levels of growth and the main objectives for a new local plan.
The key issues identified by the Council for this consultation were: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Uncertain future of the local economy• High house prices and lack of affordable housing• Economic strength of the town centre• Size and condition of public facilities and services and whether they can meet current and future needs

- Unequal opportunities to improve health and well being
- Road congestion and air pollution
- Threat of flooding of homes and businesses
- Areas of poverty in Warwick and Leamington
- Threats to the Environment
- Crime and Fear of Crime
- The impact of HS2

Of these, the most important issues identified through the consultation (based on the percentage agreeing that these issues are important for the local area) were:

- Road Congestion and Air Pollution (78%)
- Economic Strength of Town Centres (77%)
- Size and condition of public facilities and services and whether they can meet current and future needs (75%)
- Threats to the environment (73%)
- Uncertain future of the local economy (69%)

The public was asked which of three broad housing growth scenarios would best address the issues highlighted in the consultation response.

- Scenario 1: Low Levels of new development and investment (equating to around 250 new homes per annum and 4 hectares of employment land per year)
- Scenario 2: Average levels of new development and investment (equating to around 500 new homes per annum and 4.5 hectares of employment land per year)
- Scenario 3: High levels of new development and investment (equating to around 800 new homes per annum and 5 hectares of employment land per year)

The headline findings were as follows:

- 58% of respondents to the questionnaire (244 respondents) considered that Scenario 1 would be the best option for the District, with 28% (116 respondents) favouring Scenario 2 and 14% (59 respondents) preferring Scenario 3.
- Just over half of respondents (53%) of the sample survey considered that scenario 1 would be best for the District, with over a third (37%) preferring scenario 2, and only 10% favouring scenario 3;
- The most common reasons given by those preferring scenario 1 was that they felt the area already had enough homes, and they were against development on green belt land and preferred less impact on the environment. In relation to scenario 2, respondents preferred this scenario as it was more balanced and a compromise between competing objectives, and also recognised that more homes are needed. The overwhelming reason for those who preferred scenario 3 was the need for more housing.

There was clear support for scenario 1, many feeling this matches the views of local residents. Many felt that limiting growth in Warwick District to previously developed sites within the towns and villages would support their regeneration, and also the regeneration of the major urban areas in the region. Others felt this level of growth would reduce adding to the burdens on the existing road network and help maintain the existing quality of life. Views were also expressed in opposition to scenario one. Many felt this scenario did not reflect the recent announcements made by the Government urging Councils to 'plan for growth', or that the scenario was supported by any evidence that it would meet the future needs of the District and may therefore put pressure for more growth elsewhere in the region. This view was held by many landowners/developers.

Scenario 2 draws support on the grounds of its ability to deal with the important issues, and it is noted that this level of growth is in line with the previous figures emerging from the Regional Spatial Strategy. Others also cite the need for investment in local schools, and the potential to

generate additional resources from this scenario to absorb future growth in student numbers. Similar views were expressed in opposition to scenario two as for scenario one, in that it was not supported by any evidence of future needs, nor does it reflect the Government's recent statements.

Scenario 3 draws support, mostly from the landowner/development sector with many citing it as the only scenario which can address the issues of housing and infrastructure needs that exist in the area. The economic benefits are also referenced, including its consistency with the Government's emphasis on economic growth, and the need for more housing to support the economic aspirations of the Council. Scenario 3 also drew opposition, with concerns expressed over the impact of building on green-field land, its impact on communities and possible coalescence of towns and villages. Other criticisms also included the absence of any population forecast to support the scenario.

Other scenarios were put forward. A small number of respondents have suggested no growth as their preferred scenario, citing concerns over the sustainability of growth, and that growth does not represent progress and that other methods of achieving economic activity should be found. Others suggested very little new development is needed given the number of vacant houses, shops and offices currently available, and the lack of certainty in forward planning over such a long time period given the current economic uncertainties. Some also felt that growth only served to fuel further growth in the future, which infrastructure or public services cannot keep pace with.

Others called for growth based on local needs that provides affordable housing and housing for the elderly, which would be lower than scenario two. Alternatively, others considered the evidence of housing need and particularly affordable housing need would require levels higher than scenario 3. Others cited greater flexibility required rather than setting a target, particularly given the uncertainty in the economy.

b) Preferred Option Consultation: May 2012

The section below sets out the main issues that the Council considers to have arisen from this consultation. It should be noted however, that a range of other issues were also raised.

Summary of Main Issues Raised – Preferred Options 2012

The Preferred Options put forward proposals to deliver 10,800 dwellings within the Plan Period. In doing so it sought to build on the 2011 "Helping Shape the District" Consultation. However it also took account of new evidence, particularly a new SHMA and an updated SHLAA. The SHMA's projections for growth in the District indicated that it would be difficult to justify a low level of growth in line with the 2011 consultation.

The Preferred Options also built on a Strategy for the Local Plan agreed by Council in December 2011 (Strategy for the Future and Sustainable Prosperity of Warwick District). This Strategy set out a framework for the Local Plan to:

- Support prosperity
- Provide the homes the District needs
- Support sustainable communities

The Preferred Options set out the direction of travel in relation to a wide range of policy areas: housing, economy, retailing and town centres, built environment, historic environment, climate change, inclusive, safe and healthy communities, transport, green infrastructure, green belt, culture and tourism, and flooding and water

Issue 1: The preferred level of growth

Preferred Option PO1 sets out a level of housing growth of 10,800 new dwellings over the Plan Period (2011-2029) or 600 per annum

Nature of the issue

- a) Did the Council have sufficient regard to local public opinion which supported lower levels of growth?
- b) The proposed level of growth will encourage in-migration and is not necessarily better for the area
- c) Will the proposed level of growth be damaging to the environment and quality of life for residents?
- d) Is the proposed level of growth too high especially given current economic climate?
- e) Are higher levels of growth needed to deliver affordable housing requirement?
- f) Is the level of growth aligned with employment growth?
- g) As jobs forecasts are unlikely to be accurate, is this data useful in informing the level of growth?
- h) Is this amount of housing is needed whilst there are so many empty properties?
- i) Is the level of growth based on sound, relevant and up to date data?
- j) Does the level of growth have sufficient regard to cross boundary need?
- k) Suggested levels of growth ranged from 0 to 800 per year

Issue 2: Broad Location of Growth

Preferred Option PO3 set out the Council's proposals for Broad Location of Growth , including concentrating growth on the edge of urban areas, avoiding coalescence and distributing growth across the District (including villages)

Nature of the Issue

- a) Support for avoiding coalescence
- b) Some support for approach to allocated to urban fringe
- c) Varying views on merits of distributing development across the District
- d) Varying views on whether the level of growth for village is too high or too low
- e) Support for brownfield allocations but belief that more should be done to locate development on brownfield sites
- f) Concern about development in the green belt, combined with a view that Lower Heathcote area should be allocated before any green belt is released
- g) Concern about quantum of development propose for Warwick and the impact this could have on the infrastructure and character of the town

Issue 3: Proposals for Kenilworth

Preferred Option PO4(A) set out proposals for the development of 770 homes and associated facilities on a green belt site at Thickthorn on the east side of Kenilworth. The proposals involved the relocation of two sports clubs.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Some support for Thickthorn site and recognition that Kenilworth needs additional housing.
- b) Concerns about traffic flow on roads in the Thickthorn area
- c) A view that Wardens Cricket/Football Club should not be moved and questions about where would they move to?
- d) Concern about green belt erosion – especially combined with impact of HS2 and development at Stoneleigh Park

- e) Concerns about Impact on recreation, biodiversity, coalescence and the setting of Thickthorn Manor
- f) Concerns about the impact on the character of the town
- g) Concerns about the ability of infrastructure and facilities in the Town to cope

Issue 4: Proposals for North Leamington

Preferred Option PO4(A) set out proposals for the development of 1980 homes and associated facilities on a green belt sites to the north of Leamington.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern at green belt erosion, particularly the view that this area it fulfills the 5 purposes of the green belt and its development will lead to coalescence
- b) A view that exceptional circumstances have not been justified, especially as there alternatives available
- c) Concern at loss of recreation, wildlife, and impact on the historic environment
- d) Concern at loss of agricultural land
- e) Concern about impact on the character of the northern approach into Leamington
- f) Concern about impact on surrounding roads network leading to congestion
- g) View that the need for a northern Relief Road exacerbates problems regarding traffic, green belt and landscape
- h) Concern that development here would change the character of the whole area and especially Old Milverton
- i) Concern about precedent with these proposals potentially to leading to more development
- j) A view that this areas is not well located for employment or retail located to the south of Warwick and Leamington

Issue 5: Proposals for South of Warwick and Whitnash

Preferred Option PO4(A) set out proposals for the development of 3900 homes and associated facilities on greenfield sites to the south of Leamington, Whitnash and Warwick.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern about impact on road network leading to congestion
- b) Concern about impacts air pollution with some areas already experiencing poor air quality
- c) Warwick has been heavily developed in recent years and will not be able to cope with more
- d) Concern about loss of countryside, quality landscape and impact on wildlife/habitats
- e) Impact on historic environment, particularly a negative impact on Castle Park (inc. objection from English Heritage).
- f) Concern that separation between Warwick and Leamington would be lost and impact on gap between the towns and Bishops Tachbrook
- g) A view that this represents too much development focused in one area and a concern that the market would be unable to deliver this.
- h) A view that this area is remote from the Gateway and Coventry employment
- i) Concern about loss of agricultural land
- j) Concern about loss of last remaining green areas around Whitnash
- k) Some flooding concerns on some sites

Issue 6: Proposals for Loes Farm

Preferred Option PO4(A) set out proposals for the development of 180 homes on a green belt site to

the north of Warwick.

Nature of the Issue

- a) A view that development should not take place on green belt and that exceptional circumstances have not been justified
- b) Concern that development here could ultimately lead to coalescence issues with Leek Wootton and Kenilworth
- c) Concern that the high quality landscape adjacent to historic garden will be ruined
- d) Concern about impact on ecology, trees and ancient hedgerows
- e) Loss of a popular area for recreation
- f) Concern about traffic impacts leading to increased congestion, noise, pollution and safety concerns
- g) Impact on landscape – this is a very visible site and development would damage the character of the areas
- h) A concern about added pressure on local schools

Issue 7: Proposals for villages

Preferred Option PO4(B) set out proposals for around 830 homes within 12 growth villages including 9 within the green belt. No sites were allocated and for some villages a range of housing numbers was proposed.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Has the Council successfully balance a top down / bottom up approach in the proposals
- b) Concern about infrastructure capacity/delivery in villages
- c) Concern that village classification is not consistent or clear
- d) Concern that villages are not necessarily sustainable locations for development
- e) Concern that character of some villages will be harmed
- f) Some support for more homes (choice, affordability, support local facilities etc).

Issue 8: Housing

As well as proposing preferred housing allocations, PO4 set out proposals for categorising rural settlements and encouraging brownfield development. PO5 set out proposals for affordable housing. PO6 set out proposals for mixed communities and choice of housing.

Nature of the Issue

- a) A view that the District's need is for new housing for first-time buyers/young people and older people rather than families
- b) A view that more should be done to provide for students to reduce the impact they have on the community
- c) A view that there is a need to limit concentrations of student accommodation
- d) Some mixed views on the proposals for 40% affordable housing requirements, with some arguing this is too high and other arguing that we need more affordable housing in preference to market housing
- e) Support for rural exceptions for affordable housing
- f) A need to clarify what we mean by affordable housing
- g) Need for smaller homes in rural areas
- h) The lifetimes homes policy cannot be justified
- i) Extra care accommodation is important, but some concern that capacity may have been reached in the district

- j) Mixed views on the need to provide accommodation for gypsy and travellers

Issue 9: Economy

Preferred Option PO8 set out the policy direction for the economy seeking to support the economic strategy, including supporting growth of knowledge industries and low carbon economy. PO8 also proposed new employment allocations at Kenilworth, north of Leamington and south of Warwick. It also indicated possible support for a sub-regional employment site subject to the case being made for this.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern about the impact on green belt, with two of the proposed allocation being within the existing green belt area
- b) Support for the role of town centres as centres for employment
- c) Need to build in flexibility for a range of uses by providing a range sites
- d) Mixture of views about whether the proposed employment allocations were appropriate
- e) Concern about lack of information regarding the Gateway proposals and in particular concerns that the proposals have not been justified in terms of impact on the green belt and infrastructure
- f) Concern that the proposed approach is not flexible enough in terms of enabling existing employment land to come forward for other uses.
- g) Mixture of views as to whether an appropriate amount of employment land is being provided
- h) Concern that the location of housing and employment uses has not been carefully planned and will result in unnecessary journeys

Issue 10: Retailing and Town Centres

Preferred Option PO9 set out the approach to support the vitality of town centres and retail policy. The approach sought to put town centres first for all town centre uses, support a major, retail-led development in Leamington Town Centre, resist out of town retail and protect local and rural retail.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Some support for town centres first approach and resistance to out of town retail
- b) Concern that there is already enough retail provision in Leamington and that a further retail allocation is not required
- c) Town centres first should not just be about retail, it also needs to cover other town centre uses such as accommodation.
- d) Retail frontage policy needs to be evidenced based, rather than arbitrary
- e) Some views that proposals for Clarendon Arcade are unjustified and will be damaging to the character of Leamington.

Issue 11: Built and Historic Environment

Preferred Option PO10 set out proposals to promote high quality design with particular reference to Garden, Towns, Villages and Suburbs. It also recognised the important links that the layout and design of new development can have with other aspects of the Plan such as the historic environment, natural environment, health and climate change. Preferred Option PO11 set out proposals to recognise that rich heritage assets in the District and to protect and enhance these.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Development should encourage active and healthy lifestyles
- b) A view that we need more clarity through design codes

- c) Concern that proposals for garden towns and suburbs will result in lower densities whereas, higher densities would help reduce land-take
- d) High quality design is important and the proposals for garden towns and suburbs supported by some – although more detailed is required
- e) Recognition that heritage is very important to the towns but concern that proposals don't go far enough in protecting heritage assets
- f) Concern that some development proposals would compromise heritage assets
- g) Policies need to be strengthened and clarified.

Issue 12: Climate Change

Preferred Option PO12 set out the policy direction for achieving sustainable buildings, planning for renewable energy and adaptation for climate change.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Some support for aiming to achieve low carbon development, but a view that more should be done
- b) Concern that the policy could be too stringent and could impact on viability. Linked to this a concern that the approach would not be compliant with the NPPF.
- c) A view that more work should be done on viability
- d) The approach needs to be clarified

Issue 13: Inclusive, Safe and Healthy Communities

Preferred Option PO13 set out a broad policy framework to encourage community safety and reduce the fear of crime, to ensure open space and sports facilities are provided with new development, to protect existing open space and encourage healthy and inclusive lifestyles

Nature of the Issue

- a) Recognition of the importance of open space
- b) Concern that emphasis on growth will undermine quality of life and access to open space
- c) Need to encourage active modes of transport such as cycling and walking
- d) Need to do more to improve existing areas of deprivation
- e) Large new development may undermine community safety
- f) Need good quality health facilities to support growth

Issue 14: Transport

Preferred Option PO14 set out the approach for ensuring good access, supporting sustainable modes of transport, providing new transport infrastructure and providing appropriate levels of parking.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern about congestion and lack of information as to how this will be addressed
- b) Support for more investment in cycling, walking and public transport
- c) Support for minimising need to travel
- d) Doubts about whether the proposed road mitigation measures will be effective and concerns about the methodology used in identifying these proposals
- e) Recognition that the nature of the towns – particularly Warwick – will mean transport mitigation is hard to implement
- f) Significant objection to Leamington Northern Relief Road
- g) Concerns about impacts on air quality, particularly in AQMAs
- h) Concerns that town centre parking will not be able to cope

- i) View that more parking should be provided in new residential areas
- j) Concerns about impact of HS2

Issue 15: Green Infrastructure
 Preferred Option PO15 set out the approach to providing district-wide green infrastructure and local green infrastructure. It also sought to support sub-regional provision and biodiversity offsetting

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern that not ecological constraints are understood and identified
- b) The proposals to develop so much green field land are in contradiction with the aims of this Preferred Option
- c) The green wedges concept is meaningless and will not provide effective protection
- d) More needs to be done to recognise the important role of the canal
- e) Support to approach for ensuring the new development include adequate open space
- f) Concern that the approach does not protect habitats effectively
- g) Need more access to the countryside to the south of the towns
- h) Need to ensure allotments are provided for

Issue 15: Green Belt
 Preferred Option PO16 set out the circumstances for amending green belt boundaries and identified a number of locations where green belt would be released for development. Circumstances where development would be appropriate within the green belt were also identified.

Nature of the issue

- a) Extensive concerns about the impact of some of the preferred development sites on the green belt
- b) Concern about coalescence and loss of valued open space
- c) Concern that the proposals represent a “nibbling away of the green belt” rather than a coherent strategy
- d) Green belt boundaries should not be changed and exceptional circumstances have not been justified

Issue 16: Infrastructure
 A draft infrastructure plan was prepared alongside the preferred options. This outlined progress in identifying infrastructure requirements to support new development with regard to transport, education, health, green infrastructure, sports facilities etc.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern that infrastructure won’t be able cope with the scale of new development and scepticism that the infrastructure proposals would be able to address this
- b) Concern that not enough has been done to identify infrastructure and in particular to ensure infrastructure can be funded and will be brought forward at the right time
- c) Support for ensuring infrastructure is delivered ahead of or in pace with development

c) Revised Development Strategy Consultation: June 2013

The section below sets out the main issues that the Council considers to have arisen from this consultation. It should be noted however, that a range of other issues were also raised.

Summary of Main Issues Raised – Revised Development Strategy 2013

The Revised Development Strategy put forward new proposals to deliver 12,300 dwellings within the Plan period, along with some significant revisions to the spatial strategy for providing these, most notably:

- Removal of the potential allocations to the north of Leamington and the retention of green belt in this area
- Removal of the potential allocation at the Asps to the south of Warwick.
- The inclusion of the area at Lower Heathcote to the south of Harbury Lane.
- The changes in the development came about partly as a response to the 2012 consultation and partly to address new evidence regarding the lack of exceptional circumstances for green belt releases to the north of Leamington and the impact of the development at the Asps on heritage and landscape.

The higher level of growth proposed reflected updated evidence regarding objectively assessed need. In doing so, it acknowledged the “Helping Shape the District” Consultation, however it also took account of new evidence, particularly a new SHMA and an updated SHLAA. The SHMA’s projections for growth in the District indicated that it would be difficult to justify a low level of growth in line with the 2011 consultation.

The Revised Development strategy also included revised and more detailed proposals for employment land allocations. It also sought to clarify infrastructure requirements and set out proposals for a country park to the south of Warwick.

Issue 1: Level of growth

RDS1 set out proposals for an Interim Level of Growth of 12,300 homes during the plan period. The level of growth was identified as “interim” as the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint SHMA was being prepared whilst the consultation was taking place.

Nature of the issue

- a) The proposed level of growth is inconsistent with the vision of making Warwick District a great place to live, work and visit
- b) Interim level of growth is not supported by evidence – though diverse views as to whether it should be higher or lower
- c) The area has been subject to significant growth in recent years and cannot accommodate the level of growth proposed: impact on infrastructure; impact on heritage and landscape; impact on green belt; impact congestion and air quality
- d) Concern that the level of growth places too much emphasis on (unrealistic?) economic factors leading to higher housing requirements than would otherwise be the case. This concern was balanced by a view that the number of dwellings proposed would not support the level of employment growth forecast
- e) Concerns about Duty to Cooperate including whether enough has been done to take account of proposals in Stratford District; the effectiveness of cooperation with Coventry; the impact of the Gateway proposals and the need to provide more evidence to demonstrate that Duty to Cooperate has been fulfilled.
- f) View that the consultation is premature given that the Joint SHMA had not been prepared
- g) The level of growth does not provide enough housing to meet affordable housing needs
- h) Lack of regard to previous consultations which indicated a preference amongst residents of

a lower level of growth

Issue 2: Meeting the growth

RDS2 set out the categories of housing to be combined to meet the housing requirement including allocations, small SHLAA sites, commitments and windfalls

Nature of the Issue

- a) Too many windfalls (23% of total) are assumed in the supply
- b) Insufficient sites allocated to meet the need
- c) More should be done to bring empty homes back in to use

Issue 3: Broad Location of Growth and Distribution of Development

RDS3 retained a similar approach to the broad location of growth as had been set out in the Preferred Options. However it placed a greater emphasis on protecting green belt where no exceptional circumstances exist in line with the NPPF. As a result, RDS 4 proposed a different balance in the location of allocated sites whilst retaining an emphasis on site of the edge of urban areas couple with some growth in sustainable villages.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Tension between those who oppose green belt releases to the north of Leamington and those who oppose the quantum of development to the south of Warwick
- b) Concerns about the impact of the quantum of development in the south of Warwick on infrastructure, the character of the town, air quality, congestion, landscape and historic environment.
- c) The proposals are unbalanced with too much development in the south of the District
- d) Some concern about the importance given to green belt whilst many greenfield sites also service an important purpose. However this was balanced by support for the protection of green belt except where exceptional circumstances can be justified
- e) Questions about whether more could be done to bring forward development on brownfield sites
- f) The proposals for villages are not based on evidence as the settlement hierarchy is not robust and the numbers of houses allocated to villages are not consistent
- g) Varying views as to whether villages could accommodate further growth or whether the amount allocated is too high

Issue 4: Sites to be Allocated

RDS5 allocated housing sites on the edge of the urban area for including 3700 to the south of Warwick, 600 at Whitnash and South of Sydenham, 220-250 at Red House Farm, Leamington and 700 at Thickthorn, Kenilworth

Nature of the Issue

- a) **Generic concerns:** Concerns were raised about all the sites proposed for allocation. These generic concerns referred to:
 - i. Impact on landscape and the character of the area
 - ii. Impact on ecology
 - iii. Impact on infrastructure, especially roads/transport
 - iv. Loss of agricultural land
 - v. Impact on air quality

- b) **Concerns relating to specific sites: Sites South of Warwick and Whitnash (including Woodside Farm):**
- i. Impacts on air quality and health
 - ii. Specific local congestion issues
 - iii. Impacts of traffic mitigation on heritage assets and particularly the setting of the Castle
 - iv. Concern about the impact on Banbury Road, Avon Bridge
 - v. Impacts on local schools, hospital and GP services
 - vi. Unfair distribution of development leading to concentrated impacts
 - vii. Impacts on heritage assets – particularly relating to the area south of Gallows Hill
 - viii. Poor location with respect to employment areas
 - ix. Concern about coalescence with Bishops Tachbrook
 - x. Concern about flood risk in the Myton area
 - xi. Negative impact of tourism and the economy
 - xii. The cumulative impact of development here combined with development at Gaydon in Stratford District needs to be considered.
- c) **Concerns relating to specific sites: Whitnash East (South of Sydenham)**
- i. Loss of green area between Whitnash and Sydenham
 - ii. Impacts on local schools, hospital and GP services
 - iii. Need to protect the Whitnash Brook nature area
 - iv. The area is difficult to access and is divorced from the rest of the built up area
 - v. The area would be difficult to serve by bus
- d) **Concerns relating to specific sites: Fieldgate Lane/Golf Lane**
- i. Concern about compatibility with neighbouring golf club
 - ii. Concerns about flooding resulting from the steep slope of the site
- e) **Concerns relating to specific sites: Red House Farm**
- i. This area should include a higher percentage of affordable housing
 - ii. The site area could be extended to increase the number of dwellings
- f) **Concerns relating to specific sites: Thickthorn**
- i. Loss of green belt – no exceptional circumstances
 - ii. Impact on emergency services in the town
 - iii. Concerns about surface water flooding
 - iv. Proposed density is too high
 - v. Kenilworth is already threatened by HS2, this will result in a further loss of greenbelt
 - vi. Concern about loss of local sports clubs
 - vii. Perception of coalescence with north Leamington
 - viii. Concerns about availability and deliverability given land ownership complexities
 - ix. Insufficient to meet the needs of Kenilworth

Issue 5: Provision and Location of Employment Land

RDS6 indicates a need for 22.5 hectares of new employment land and RDS7 allocates this land across two sites in Kenilworth and Warwick, with an additional allowance for the sub-regional employment site to provide for some small scale local employment needs.

Nature of the Issue

- a) There is no need for additional employment land to the south of Warwick as there is already

- a) a good supply in that area and too much allowance has been made for flexibility
- b) Take up of employment land has been slow and does not indicate the need for more.
- c) Retention and protection of existing employment land minimise the need for green field allocations
- d) If more employment land is to be provided a sequential approach should be applied meaning it should be provided within or close to town centres.
- e) Concern that not enough employment land is being provided to meet jobs forecasts and that the economic forecasts are out of date
- f) Employment allocations should make provision for other employment generating uses (e.g those outside B Use Classes)
- g) Concern that the proposals for consolidated employment land to release housing would undermine employment provision for low paid workers in the District

Issue 6: Sub-Regional Employment Site

RDS8 proposed the allocation of a major sub-regional employment site in the vicinity of Coventry Airport for B class uses. The proposals indicated that the land should be retained in the green belt but that significant employment generation would provide very special circumstances

Nature of the Issue

- a) A view that the sub-regional employment site proposal is unsustainable and has not been justified, particularly given its green belt location (inconsistent with the NPPF)
- b) Other sites are better located and/or are already available to provide for sub-regional needs
- c) Concern that the site is not well located in relation to areas of deprivation and unemployment in the north of the sub-region
- d) Concern that the proposal will not support regeneration as it will compete with nearby sites with available land
- e) The forecast job generation from the site cannot be justified
- f) Concern that the proposals will result in increased use of the car given its remoteness from the District's towns
- g) Concern about the negative impact on the village of Baginton (traffic, coalescence, etc)

Issue 7: Infrastructure

Alongside the main site allocation, section 5 of the Revised development Strategy sets out proposals for the infrastructure requirements to support the development

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern that the infrastructure proposals set out to support each of the development sites would not be deliverable or affordable
- b) More should be done to encourage sustainable modes of transport. The mitigation places too much emphasis on the car
- c) Infrastructure needs to be in place either ahead of new development or at least alongside it.
- d) The proposed mitigation won't work – particularly the transport proposals
- e) The Infrastructure need to be more clearly evidenced and costed.
- f) The infrastructure proposals need to be more clearly funded

d) Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation: November 2013

The section below sets out the main issues that the Council considers to have arisen from this

consultation. It should be noted however, that a range of other issues were also raised.
Summary of Main Issues Raised – Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation
During the early stages of the Local Plan preparation it had been intended to prepare a separate Development Plan Document regarding rural settlement boundaries and the allocation of sites in rural settlements. However, it became apparent that it would possible and preferable to include these matters within the Publication Draft Local Plan. This consultation therefore built on the policy framework set out in the Preferred Options and Revised Development Strategy to propose village boundaries and site allocations for 10 growth settlements, 3 sites adjacent to smaller villages and 2 other rural sites.
<p>Issue 1: Supporting rural services and vitality of rural settlements</p> <p>One of the arguments for proposing growth in and around rural settlements is to support local services and to provide housing to enhance housing choice in rural settlements. However, to ensure sustainable settlement patterns are maintained, the proposals focused on those settlements that the Council considered to be the most sustainable The proposals therefore</p> <p>Nature of the Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Support the recognition that there is a need for growth not just within or on the edge of the main urban areas but also in sustainable rural areas, to support local services / facilities b) Support the proposal that the mix of houses should include sufficient affordable housing c) Support for the expansion of rural settlements to accommodate new housing d) Need to ensure that development consider the needs of small businesses
<p>Issue 2: Overall number of dwellings proposed in rural settlements</p> <p>In total the consultation document proposed around 800 dwellings in rural areas</p> <p>Nature of the Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The number of new homes in rural settlements could be greater b) The burden of extra houses should be fairly shared out -it is biased and unfair that villages are having houses c) The level of growth exceeds the needs of rural areas
<p>Issue 3: Green Belt</p> <p>For growth villages that are currently “washed over” by green belt it is proposed to remove the area within the settlement boundary from the green belt.</p> <p>Nature of the Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inconsistent to propose green belt releases in villages when areas north of Leamington are being retained in the Green Belt b) There must be 'exceptional circumstances' before building on Green Belt land is allowed. There are no exceptions circumstances for the release of this Green Belt, particularly as there alternative non-green belt sites c) Concern that more houses are proposed on Green Belt compared to non-Green Belt villages
<p>Issue 4: Site selection methodology</p> <p>The village site appraisal matrix looks at a wide range factors to assess sites within and adjacent to rural settlements</p>

Nature of the Issue

- a) The site selection process should have included a scoring system.
- b) Landscape sensitivity assessment fails to provide an appropriate historic environment assessment.
- c) Consider that the site selection process and methodology, which has been developed by WDC for appraising village site options, is appropriate, suitably thorough and robust.
- d) the approach to the identification of villages for rural growth is not robust and is premature ahead of a clear identification of an objectively assessed housing need.
- e) There were a range of comments regarding other settlements and/or sites that should have been included as growth villages

Issue 5: Village Boundaries

The consultation document identified a boundary for each of the settlements where growth was proposed. This applied to both green belt and non-green belt villages. Where the settlement was within the green belt it was proposed that the inset area should be removed from green belt

Nature of the Issue

- a) Insetting of villages in the Green Belt is supported as it will generate opportunities to construct affordable housing.
- b) It is not necessary to remove Green Belt status from a village in order to permit some new development within existing villages
- c) Top down imposition of sites and boundaries is not acceptable – this should involve more input from local people
- d) In the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land, village boundary policies should be considered out of date.

Issue 6: Proposals for Baginton

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed a development site with capacity for 35 dwellings. A further four sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation. It should be noted that the SHLAA includes a number of further sites in the Baginton with very substantial capacity (hundreds, even thousands of dwellings – these were not considered in detail as part of the village sites consultation).

Nature of the Issue

- a) The village makes a contribution to openness as it is. Its closeness to Coventry makes Baginton very sensitive to new development. It should be retained as it is now with washed-over status.
- b) In selecting the preferred site neither the Baginton Conservation Area Appraisal nor the industry standard guidance on assessing the impact of development on the setting if heritage assets have been applied.
- c) Mixed responses regarding the preferred site
- d) Baginton could accommodate substantially more housing
- e) The preferred site is well located for services, and could enhance visual appearance and forms a logical boundary to the village

Issue 7: Proposals for Barford

Barford lies outside the green belt. The consultation document proposed a village boundary. It also proposed 3 development sites with a capacity for 80 dwellings. A further four sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern about the scale of housing in Barford.
- b) Barford village is a more sustainable location than its secondary service village classification would suggest.
- c) Acceptance that the WDC Local Plan must accept a share of the district-wide growth even though it is in excess of the village's identified and measured immediate local needs.
- d) The Neighbourhood Development Plan Group supports the three preferred sites named in the consultation documents provided that: (i) The mix of types of housing meets the needs identified in the Housing Needs Survey, (ii) The building is phased over the Local Plan period
- e) A range of view regarding the proposed sites and the omitted sites, with arguments put forward that alternative sites should be considered.
- f) The settlement boundary makes no practical sense. Indeed, it seems to have been designed specifically to exclude Barford House and our clients' land.
- g) The boundary should be set nearer the houses and on the same line as all of the other back gardens.
- h) The bulge in the boundary to the east of Dugard Place in order to accommodate the extended garden of one house is anomalous.

Issue 8: Proposals for Bishops Tachbrook

Bishops Tachbrook lies outside the green belt. The consultation document proposed a village boundary. It also proposed a development sites with a capacity for 150 dwellings. A further two sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Some support for the preferred site given its location in the village and the potential for it to be integrated and to improve existing services.
- b) Concern about the scale of the development in a relatively small village, particularly as a local survey indicated a need for 20 dwellings.
- c) The scale of development is not required when 4500 new houses are being proposed on sites within 2 miles of the village.
- d) Other small sites around the parish could accommodate small numbers of housing
- e) Concerns about site access
- f) Concerns about speed and road safety along Oakley Wood Road
- g) Concern about loss of a playing field
- h) Concern about impact on infrastructure
- i) Concern about impact on the character of the village
- j) A range of points raised regarding the discounted sites

Issue 9: Proposals for Burton Green

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed a development site with capacity for 60 dwellings. A further six sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation. It should be noted that HS2 will pass through

(under) Burton Green and is likely to have a significant impact on the village.

Nature of the Issue

- a) The requirement for Burton Green to accommodate further 70 - 90 homes is excessive and would create a large change in the population.
- b) The proposed numbers were to take into account properties destroyed by HS2, however the number of properties impacted by HS2 has decreased and therefore so should the allocation
- c) Concern about the capacity of the local school
- d) The village has a linear form - uncertainty over whether this should be re-enforced or bulked out at certain locations in the village.
- e) All of the housing development should not be placed on the preferred site. Some should be located on one of the discounted sites.
- f) Concern that the preferred site is too remote and would bring little benefit to the existing community
- g) The location should be noted is one of the highest points in Burton Green and therefore any development would have the highest visual impact on the landscape.
- h) Development of the site would create a new heart for the village by bring the local facilities together whilst avoiding urbanisation
- i) Would provide housing for young people
- j) A mixture of views about discounted sites, with some being strong promoted and supported
- k) The green belt should extend to cover gardens associated with dwelling houses to deter a development of those gardens on a piecemeal basis. Village boundary should be kept as tight as possible.
- l) The settlement boundary on the plan does not include the whole of the village in Red Lane.
- m) Keep the Green Belt as now, to avoid back land infilling

Issue 10: Proposals for Cubbington

Cubbington is surrounded by Green belt, but the built up area of the village is excluded from the green belt. The consultation document proposed an amendment to the green belt boundary to release two development sites with a combined capacity of approximately 75 dwellings. A further three sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern about capacity of infrastructure, particularly local schools
- b) Need to ensure affordable housing is included within new developments
- c) The allotments should be replaced if development goes ahead
- d) Concern about loss of allotments and the wide range of benefits these bring
- e) Concern about access and highways advice
- f) Concern about flooding at nearby properties
- g) Discounted sites promoted with arguments put forward as to why these could be preferred to the proposed sites.

Issue 11: Proposals for Hampton Magna

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed a development site with capacity for 100 dwellings. A further five sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of Issue

- a) Perception that discounted sites have not been considered fairly

- b) Concern that the village does not have the capacity for more growth, particularly in terms of infrastructure
- c) Concern about air, light & noise pollution
- d) Considered to be inappropriate development in the green belt without any exceptional circumstances to justify its release from the green belt.
- e) Infrastructure needs to be put in place before the development takes place
- f) Concern about capacity of local highway network – particularly the traffic signals under the railway
- g) Concern about road safety as a result of additional traffic
- h) Concern about site access
- i) Concern about flooding, impact on ecology and archaeology, impact on landscape
- j) Discounted sites promoted with arguments put forward as to why these could be preferred to the proposed sites.
- k) With regard to the village boundary, residents support to maintain as current with site promoters wishing to amend according to site being promoted.

Issue 12: Proposals for Hatton Park

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed a development site with capacity for 90 dwellings. A further four sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Hatton Park does not have the facilities or infrastructure to support 90 more dwellings. Village needs an upgraded shop, new doctors and probably a school. Public transport and recreation facilities are limited
- b) Focussing development at Hatton Park is contrary to the need to provide affordable and market homes in rural locations with good community facilities.
- c) There is no identified local housing need in Hatton Park at present. 90 homes would increase the population by 10%+.
- d) The site has greater capacity than indicated – up to 150 dwellings
- e) Concerns about light pollution
- f) Concerns about safe site access, given how busy Birmingham Road is
- g) Concerns about drainage and flooding
- h) Concerns about landscape and ecology impacts
- i) Alternative sites were promoted as preferable to the proposed sites
- j) There are no exceptional circumstances for the release of this Green Belt land
- k) If development takes place, there will be a future risk of coalescence with communities on the outskirts of Warwick.

Issue 13: Proposals for Hatton Station

The consultation document proposed a new settlement boundary for Hatton Station and included two development sites Site 1 (Storage Depot) for 20 dwellings and Site 2 (off Station Rd) for 5 dwellings)

Nature of the Issue

- a) No justification for releasing this area from the green belt - The present level of development does retain openness, but intensification would harm openness
- b) Consider that site 1 has many positives. The site is previously developed land with an existing access, which is suitable for new development. The site is located close to the train

station, providing a choice of transport for any new residents. Indeed new development would help keep the station viable.

- c) Site 1 has impact on ecology, recreational land and green belt
- d) Community facilities and services such as schools, shops, roads and transport may not be able to safely absorb additional residents.
- e) Sewage and drainage systems are currently at capacity and there are concerns about the level of provision for other utilities such as electricity and broadband
- f) Proposed development at Hatton station would increase footfall at the station
- g) Site 2 is close to the motorway giving rise to noise concerns
- h) The settlement boundary should NOT include the dwellings to the North of the canal, i.e. maintaining the status quo, with the whole area to the North being washed over by the Green Belt as there are no suitable sites for development.

Issue 14: Proposals for Hill Wootton

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed a single development with capacity for 5 dwellings

Nature of the Issue

- a) A small village, which helps create openness of the Green Belt. It is essentially rural farmland and it is inappropriate that it should be removed from the protection of the Green Belt by inseting.
- b) The proposed allocation is directly opposite a Grade II listed building, with concerns about impact on setting.
- c) Concerns about traffic and flooding
- d) Concerns about loss of agricultural land

Issue 15: Proposals for Kingswood

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed seven development sites totalling 62 dwellings. A further six sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Balanced approach to housing in the area with reasonable allocations.
- b) Some support for the proposals including the allocated sites and the village boundary
- c) The village could accommodate growth - there are important environmental considerations that need to be considered but these do not justify any reduction in housing provision particularly as it provides a sustainable location for rail links.
- d) A number of sites have significant flooding constraints
- e) Concern about the change in status from washed over by greenbelt to inset in greenbelt. It seems to be a thinly veiled attempt to undermine the rural nature of the village and facilitate future developments.
- f) The land east of Station Lane should be safeguarded for future development needs to be met without having to review the Green Belt again
- g) Concern about traffic and speeding
- h) A wide range of comments concerning the specific sites – both those proposed for allocation and those that are not

Issue 16: Proposals for Leek Wootton

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed five development sites totalling 80 dwellings. A further eight sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Concern about delivery with Police having ideas at odds with the proposals
- b) The village needs more family (2 bed) houses
- c) Concerns about capacity of infrastructure (school, sewage system, sports facilities) and about the ability of the infrastructure development to take place
- d) The Parish Council opposes a single large development, preferring a number of smaller sites.
- e) Concerns about impact on heritage (particularly Woodcote House)
- f) The quantum of development is very significant for a village the size of Leek Wootton and will have a detrimental impact on its character and facilities
- g) The junction at the Anchor pub is already dangerous and will not be able to absorb the extra traffic arising from the proposed development sites
- h) The village should be retained in the green belt as it makes a contribution to its openness.
- i) A wide range of comments concerning the specific sites – both those proposed for allocation and those that are not

Issue 17: Proposals for Radford Semele

The consultation document proposed a village boundary around the built up area of this non-green belt village. It also proposed the allocation of site to the north of the village with a capacity for around 100 dwellings. Three further sites were considered but were not proposed for allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Some support for growth in village and recognition that the village should be a primary service village
- b) Some support also for the proposed site which has a central location in the village with access to buses, and the highway network.
- c) Concerns about proposed site relate to access, safety and congestion and landscape, ecology and impact on heritage assets
- d) The other sites considered were promoted with views put forward that any of these could be considered preferable to the proposed site

Issue 18: Proposals for Shrewley Common

The consultation document proposed a village boundary with the built up area being removed from the green belt. It also proposed two development sites totalling 20 dwellings.

Nature of the Issue

- a) The village should remain “washed over” by green belt and the scale of this development is small and does not justify taking the whole village out of the Green Belt.
- b) The proposed sites could be accommodated in to the village without compromising its character
- c) Concern about site access
- d) Concern about sewerage problems and the drainage system
- e) Concern about the capacity of infrastructure and services to support the proposed development

Issue 19: proposals for other sites (Aylesbury House and Oaklea Farm)

These two sites, at opposite ends of the District, sit apart from the District’s built up areas, one (Aylesbury House) being close to Hockley Heath in Solihull, the other (Oaklea Farm) being adjacent to Coventry. Each site is within the green belt and in the case of Aylesbury House it is proposed to retain that designation whilst justifying its allocation under paragraph 89 of the NPPF. Each site has capacity for approximately 20 dwellings.

Nature of the Issue

Aylesbury House

- a) Support for the sensitive restoration of Aylesbury House subject to effective heritage mitigation
- b) Conversion to residential (flats) of the old building (the Hotel) can be undertaken without changing the Green Belt status.
- c) Concern about restrictions on access

Oaklea Farm

- d) Recognition that this site is bounded by roads and could be developed without harm to the green belt

(iv) How representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken in to account

With the exception of the “Helping Shape the District” consultation undertaken in March 2011, the Council has summarised the representations received and has provided a response to the points raised in the representations at each stage of consultation during the preparation of the Plan. These summaries and responses have been published in the reports of public consultation. This process has enabled the Council to carefully assess and take in account every point raised. This in turn ensures that each consultation has informed the next iteration of the Plan.

These reports of Public Consultation are provided in the appendices to this Statement and address the requirement of this clause of Regulation 22c.

With regard to the “Helping to Shape the District” consultation, the nature of this consultation meant that formal responses to representations were not possible or appropriate since the consultation analysis was more statistical in nature.

a) Issues, Scenarios and Objectives (Helping Shape the District) Consultation: March 2011

The representations made through this consultation were taken in to account preparing the Strategy for the Future and Sustainable Prosperity of Warwick District and the Preferred Options. The table below sets out how the key issues arising from this consultation were addressed in the Preferred Options.

Issue	Response – Helping Shape the District
The key issues identified by the Council for this consultation were: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Uncertain future of the local economy	These issues were all reflected in the Preferred Options (see para 4.80)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High house prices and lack of affordable housing • Economic strength of the town centre • Size and condition of public facilities and services and whether they can meet current and future needs • Unequal opportunities to improve health and well being • Road congestion and air pollution • Threat of flooding of homes and businesses • Areas of poverty in Warwick and Leamington • Threats to the Environment • Crime and Fear of Crime • The impact of HS2 	
<p>Of these, the most important issues identified through the consultation (based on the percentage agreeing that these issues are important for the local area) were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Congestion and Air Pollution (78%) • Economic Strength of Town Centres (77%) • Size and condition of public facilities and services and whether they can meet current and future needs (75%) • Threats to the environment (73%) • Uncertain future of the local economy (69%) 	<p>The Preferred Options and associated documents included a framework which sought to address each of these issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Congestion and Air Pollution: PO14 • Economic Strength of Town Centres: PO9 • Size and condition of public facilities and services and whether they can meet current and future needs: Infrastructure Plan • Threats to the environment: PO10, PO11, PO12, PO18 • Uncertain future of the local economy: PO8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario 1: low Levels of new development and investment (equating to around 250 new homes per annum and 4 hectares of employment land per year) • Scenario 2: Average levels of new development and investment (equating to around 500 new homes per annum and 4.5 hectares of employment land per year) • Scenario 3: High levels of new development and investment (equating to around 800 new homes per annum and 5 hectares of employment land per year) <p>The headline findings were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58% of respondents to the questionnaire (244 respondents) considered that Scenario 1 would be the best option for the District, with 28% (116 respondents) favouring Scenario 2 and 14% (59 respondents) preferring Scenario 3. • Just over half of respondents (53%) of the sample survey considered that scenario 1 would be best for the District, with over a third (37%) preferring scenario 2, and only 10% favouring scenario 3; 	<p>Whilst Scenario 1 received the most support through the Consultation, the evidence provided by the 2012 SHMA indicated that this level of growth would not be sufficient to meet the District's needs and could not be justified (the SHMA indicated it would lead to a reduction in the number of jobs in the District).</p> <p>The level of growth planned for in the Preferred Options (600 dwellings per annum) sought to take full account of the evidence provided by the SHMA at the same as recognising that the consultation indicated a local preference for lower levels of growth. This influenced the decision at that time not to plan for levels of growth at the upper end of the range of scenario provided in the SHMA</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most common reasons given by those preferring scenario 1 was that they felt the area already had enough homes, and they were against development on green belt land and preferred less impact on the environment. In relation to scenario 2, respondents preferred this scenario as it was more balanced and a compromise between competing objectives, and also recognised that more homes are needed. The overwhelming reason for those who preferred scenario 3 was the need for more housing. 	
<p>A small number of respondents have suggested no growth as their preferred scenario, citing concerns over the sustainability of growth, and that growth does not represent progress and that other methods of achieving economic activity should be found.</p>	<p>It was considered that no growth would not be compliant with national policy and would not support the District's growth ambitions as set out in the Strategy for the Future and Sustainable Prosperity of Warwick District</p>
<p>Others suggested very little new development is needed given the number of vacant houses, shops and offices currently available, and the lack of certainty in forward planning over such a long time period given the current economic uncertainties. Some also felt that growth only served to fuel further growth in the future, which infrastructure or public services cannot keep pace with.</p>	<p>It was considered that this scenario would not be compliant with national policy and would not support the District's growth ambitions as set out in the Strategy for the Future and Sustainable Prosperity of Warwick District. Given the low number of vacant properties in the District this was considered to be unlikely to have a significant impact. Whilst economic uncertainty was certainly a factor, the evidence pointed towards the need for housing growth as a means of support the future prosperity of the District.</p>
<p>Others called for growth based on local needs that provides affordable housing and housing for the elderly, which would be lower than scenario two. Alternatively, others considered the evidence of housing need and particularly affordable housing need would require levels higher than scenario 3.</p>	<p>The need for affordable housing and housing to meet the needs of specific groups was considered within the SHMA. This indicated that a high level of growth would be required to meet in full the District's affordable housing need. It was considered that this was unrealistic and that a pragmatic approach would be to plan for a significant proportion of new development to be affordable homes.</p>
<p>Others cited greater flexibility required rather than setting a target, particularly given the uncertainty in the economy.</p>	<p>It was considered that this would have provided uncertainty making it hard to plan for infrastructure and to allocate appropriate sites.</p>

b) Preferred Option Consultation: May 2012

For details of how representations were taken in to account see:

Document **Ref LP06**: [Report on the Outcomes of Public Consultation \(part 1\)](#),

Document **Ref LP07**: [Report of Public Consultation – Preferred Options \(Part 2\), Revised Development Strategy, Village Sites and Settlement Boundaries](#)

c) Revised Development Strategy Consultation: June 2013

For details of how representations were taken in to account see:

Document Ref LP07: [Report of Public Consultation – Preferred Options \(Part 2\), Revised Development Strategy, Village Sites and Settlement Boundaries](#)

d) Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation: November 2013

For details of how representations were taken in to account see:

Document Ref LP07: [Report of Public Consultation – Preferred Options \(Part 2\), Revised Development Strategy, Village Sites and Settlement Boundaries](#)

(v) Regulation 20 Representations - the number of representations made and summary of main issues raised

a) Publication Draft May 2014

Number of Representations Made	
Number of respondents	364
Number of representations received	1640
Number of representations objecting	1309
Number of representation in support	331

The section below sets out the main issues that the Council considers to have arisen from this consultation. It should be noted however, that a range of other issues were also raised. See Document Ref LP15: [Publication Draft - Public Participation Report](#) for the all representation and the Council's response to these.

Summary of Main Issues Raised

Issue 1: The Housing Requirement

Policy DS6 sets out a housing requirement of 12860 new dwellings over the Plan Period (2011-2029) or 714 per annum

Nature of the issue

- a) Has the Council had sufficient regard to the 2012 ONS population projections? Do these projections justify a lower objectively assessed need (OAN) for the District?
- b) Is the methodology used in the Joint SHMA reasonable and robust?
- c) Has the Council had sufficient regard to environmental and viability constraints in setting the housing requirement? Does the extent of the green belt and other constraints such as heritage, landscape and the cost of infrastructure suggest that it is reasonable for the Council to plan for a lower requirement for the District?
- d) Should unmet housing need arising elsewhere (in particular Coventry and Birmingham) be further addressed within the District? As a result, should the proposed housing requirement be higher than set out in Policy DS6?
- e) Has the Council had sufficient regard to employment projections? Does the proposed housing requirement provide for the projected growth in jobs particularly in light of the CWLEP's growth ambitions and the proposed sub-regional employment site?

<p>f) Has the Council taken account of market signals in setting its housing requirement, or is there a case for a higher requirement to take these in to account?</p>
<p>Issue 2: Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>The Council has prepared a Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper which sets out its activities and the agreements that have been reached to demonstrate fulfilment of the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Nature of Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Has the Council met the legal requirements of the Duty to Cooperate? b) Has the Council identified the correct strategic issues on which cooperation needs to focus? c) Have the Council's Duty to Cooperate activities been effective in planning for issues with cross boundary impacts?
<p>Issue 3: Meeting the Housing Requirement</p> <p>Policy DS7 sets out how the Council has proposed to meet its housing requirement including windfalls, small urban SHLAA sites, consolidated employment land and allocated sites</p> <p>Nature of the Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is the Council's overall approach to meeting the housing requirement justified? b) In particular, has the Council allowed for an appropriate number of windfall developments? c) Is the Council's approach to allowing for the development of small urban SHLAA sites and consolidated employment areas reasonable? d) As a result are the proposed site allocations appropriate to meet the District's housing requirement?
<p>Issue 4: Distribution of Development</p> <p>Policy DS4 sets out the Council's Spatial Strategy for the Local Plan. This is delivered through Policy DS10 which indicates the broad location of allocated housing sites and Policy DS11 which sets out the housing site allocations.</p> <p>Nature of the Issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is the Council's spatial strategy reasoned and consistent with the NPPF? b) Has the Council done enough to take account of opportunities to bring forward previously developed land for development? c) Is too much development concentrated in the areas to the south of Warwick? d) Should more development be located in the green belt on the fringes of Coventry? e) Have the proposed exceptional circumstances to release land from the green belt for development been sufficiently justified? f) Has the Council identified the right amount of the development for growth villages and have the right villages been identified for growth? g) Has the Council allocated the right sites? (numerous issues have been raised with regard to whether specific sites are appropriate)
<p>Issue 5: Employment Land Provision</p>

Policy DS8 sets out a requirement for 66 hectares employment over the Plan Period and Policy DS9 indicates that in addition to the employment land already available, 21 hectares should be allocated, split between Thickthorn, Kenilworth and Stratford Road, Warwick.
(NB: Sub Regional Employment Site is dealt with separately in issue 6)

Nature of the Issue

- a) Does the Plan make the right level of provision for employment land over the Plan period?
- b) Are the proposed employment allocations appropriate to meet the needs of business?

Issue 6: Sub Regional Employment Site

Policy DS16 make provision for a sub-regional employment site in the vicinity of Coventry Airport.

Nature of the Issues

- a) Is there a need for sub-regional employment site or is existing provision adequate?
- a) Is the proposed location the best location to meet sub-regional employment needs (e.g no direct rail link)
- b) Does the evidence of potential employment creation provide exceptional circumstances for the loss of green belt?

Issue 7: The Provision of Infrastructure

The Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure needed to support the growth proposed in the Plan. The Plan includes costs and sources of funding

Nature of the Issue

- a) Is the proposed infrastructure set out in the IDP adequate and appropriate?
- b) Can the proposed infrastructure be delivered and is the Council's approach viable?

Issue 8: Traffic and Transport

This issue is closely linked to issues 1,3,4,7 and 9. It has been an area of significant concern in representations. The IDP sets out proposals for transport mitigation to support the proposed level and location of growth, whilst Policies TR1 and TR2 provide the policy framework for new development.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Is the proposed transport mitigation strategy (as set out in the IDP) effective in mitigating the impacts of growth?
- b) Does the proposed approach place too much emphasis on car- borne transport and insufficient emphasis on other forms of transport?
- c) Are the proposals set out in the IDP deliverable and viable?
- d) Have the potential impacts on air quality, community cohesion and air quality been effectively addressed?

Issue 9: Historic Environment

The District has a rich variety of heritage assets. In this context the development proposals and site allocations set out in the Plan will have an impact. Policies HE1 to HE6 set out policy framework for protecting and enhancing heritage assets in the District.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Have impacts on heritage assets been adequately considered in assessing sites and making allocations?
- b) Have indirect impacts such as those resulting from transport mitigation, been adequately considered and addressed?
- c) Is the policy framework sufficiently robust to ensure the District’s heritage assets will be adequately protected and enhanced?

Issue 10: Health

The Plan seeks to place health at its heart and includes a range of policies (for example SC0, HS1- HS6, BE1, TR2) which seek to ensure health is an important factor in taking planning decisions.

Nature of the Issue

- a) Does the Plan effectively address air quality concerns?
- b) Is the Plan effective in encouraging healthy and active lifestyles?
- c) Should more done to understand the health impacts of developments when planning applications are being assessed
- d) Could more be done to address concerns around healthy diets and obesity in the District?

Key Issue 11: Affordable Housing and Housing Mix

Policies H2 and H3 seek to ensure an adequate supply of affordable housing is brought forward, whilst policies H4, H5 and H6 seek to ensure that right mix of housing is achieved to meet the needs of the community

Nature of the Issue

- a) Will the plan’s policies and proposals deliver the affordable housing that the District needs?
- b) Is the proposed housing mix reasonable, or should this be determined by market forces?
- c) Has the right balance been struck between providing for student accommodation and minimising the impact this can have on established communities?
- d) Will these proposals undermine the viability of housing sites and/or undermine the contribution that site can make towards infrastructure?

b) Focused Changes – November 2014

Number of Representations Made	
Number of respondents	62
Number of representations received	128
Number of representations objecting	95
Number of representation in support	33

The section below sets out the main issues that the Council considers to have arisen from this

consultation. It should be noted however, that a range of other issues were also raised. See Document Ref LP14: [Focused Changes - Public Participation Report](#) for the all representation and the Council's response to these.

Summary of Main Issues Raised

Issue 1: Location of employment land

The Focused Changes proposed removing the allocation for employment land North of Gallows Hill and replacing this with Land at Stratford Road

Nature of the issue

- a) There was some support for this proposal on the basis that the site would make a suitable location for employment being close to the motorway and would enable the area to the north of Gallows Hill to come forward for residential
- b) Some concerns raised about flooding at Stratford Road
- c) Some concerns raised about the impact of the proposal on heritage assets, particularly Castle Park and Longbridge Manor
- d) Some concerns raised about traffic
- e) A view was made that employment land at Tournament Fields had not been developed suggesting that there is not a need for more employment land in this location

Issue 2: Community Stadium proposals

The Focused Changes proposed the relocation of a Community Stadium (linked to Leamington Football Club) to an area to the north of Gallows. The publication draft had previously proposed a Community Hub (including a community sports complex) in an area slightly to the north of the new proposed allocation.

Nature of the Issue

- a) A view that a new stadium is not needed as the Football Club already have a ground
- b) Concern about traffic and congestion
- c) Concern about the compatibility of a stadium with residential uses, including noise
- d) Concern about the impact of a stadium on heritage, particularly Castle Park and associated issues of light pollution

Issue 3: Sub-regional Employment Site and the Strategic Employment Land Study

Whilst the Focused Changes did not propose any change to the sub-regional employment site allocation, it did seek views on the Strategic Employment Land Study (SELS) which included evidence regarding sub-regional employment land needs and an assessment of employment land supply.

Nature of the Issue

See issue 6 above under "Publication Draft"

- a) Concern that the SELS does not provide a robust evidence base and used flawed methodology
- b) Concern that the SELS didn't assess the quality of the green belt or compare the impact of the proposal on the green belt here with potential impacts elsewhere
- c) Concern that the SELS didn't assess all alternative sites and the study wasn't an objective study in that it sought to support the objectives of the Local Enterprise Partnership
- d) Concern that the scenario preferred in the SELS was based on a pro-growth scenario set out in the Strategic Economic Plan. However, this scenario was not sufficiently justified in the SEP.

Appendix 1

Organisations invited to attend topic workshops during Issues and Scenarios consultation

Organisation

Fire & Rescue
Adult Health and Community Services
Age Concern
Air Ambulance
Ancient Monuments Society
British Waterways
CBI
Chiltern Railways
Churches Together
CLARA
Commission for Racial Equality
Council for Disabled People
Cov & Warks Chamber of Commerce
CPRE
CVS
DfT Rail
Director of Facilities, Warwick Hospital
EA
English Heritage
National Grid
Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group
Fields in Trust
FOE
Forestry Commission
Freight Transport Association
Friends, Families and Travellers
HBF
Head of Property
Highways Agency
Hospital Trust
Homes and Communities
Inland Waterways
Kenilworth Chamber of Trade
Kenilworth Society
Leamington Society
Mencap

Organisation

Mid Warks Chamber of Commerce
Mid Warks NFU
MIND
National Institute for Deaf People
National Trust
Natural England
Leamington Old Town Traders
Warwickshire County Council
Police Community Safety Office
RLS Chamber of Trade
RNIB
Road Haulage Association
Rural Housing Enabler
Rural Hub
S Warwickshire Drug Team
Senior Peoples Forum
South Warks PCT
Sport England
Stagecoach
STW
Sustrans
Georgian Group
Victorian Society
Twentieth Century Society
Warks Rural Community Council
Warwick Chamber of Trade
Warwick Society
Warwick Traffic Forum
Warwickshire Association of Youth Clubs
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust
West Midlands Housing Board
West Midlands NHS
Whitnash Society
Woodlands Trust
Youth and Community service WCC
Warwickshire Asssoc for the blind

Appendix 2

Organisations invited to make representations at various stages of the plan

Organisations invited to make representations at Issues and Scenarios stage

Organisation	Category
Birmingham City Council	Adjoining Council
Coventry City Council	Adjoining Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Rugby Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Stratford upon Avon District Council	Adjoining Council
Balsall Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Beaudesert Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Berkswell Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brandon & Bretford Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brinklow Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Charlecote Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Chesterton & Kingston Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Frankton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Fulbrook Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Hampton Lucy Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Harbury Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Long Itchington Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Marton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Newbold Pacey & Ashorne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Preston Bagot Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Princethorpe Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ryton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Snitterfield Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Stretton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Tamworth in Arden Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ufton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wellesbourne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wolverton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Advantage West Midlands	Organisation
Alvis Sports Club	Organisation
B.L.A.S.T.	Organisation
Binswood Allotment Society	Organisation
Birmingham International Airport Ltd	Organisation

BLAST (Bringing Leamington Allotment Societies Together)	Organisation
Brindley Twist Tafft & James	Organisation
British Transport Police	Organisation
Callingham Associates	Organisation
Campaign Against Expansion of Coventry Airport	Organisation
Connect Training	Organisation
Coventry & Warwickshire Society of Chartered Architects	Organisation
Coventry Golf Club Limited	Organisation
CPRE Warwickshire	Organisation
Crackley Residents' Association	Organisation
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	Organisation
Forestry Commission	Organisation
Friends of the Earth	Organisation
Friends, Families & Travellers and Traveller Law Reform Project	Organisation
Health and Safety Executive	Organisation
Hill Close Gardens	Organisation
Holmes Antill	Organisation
Jehovah's Witnesses	Organisation
Kenilworth Allotment Tenants Association	Organisation
Kenilworth Chamber of Trade	Organisation
Kenilworth Disability Action Group	Organisation
Kenilworth Golf Club	Organisation
Kenilworth Society	Organisation
Leamington and County Golf Club	Organisation
Leamington Gospel Hall Trust	Organisation
Midland Heart Ltd	Organisation
Mono Consultants Ltd	Organisation
Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre Partnership	Organisation
Sherbourne Estate	Organisation
SPAce	Organisation
St Johns Westwood	Organisation
St. John's Church	Organisation
Stratford and Warwick Waterways Trust	Organisation
Sundial Group	Organisation
Tesco Stores Ltd	Organisation
The Leamington Society	Organisation
The National Trust	Organisation
The Warwick Society	Organisation
University of Warwick	Organisation
Warwick and Leamington Green Party	Organisation
Warwick and Leamington Green Party	Organisation
warwick books ltd	Organisation

Warwick Independent Schools Foundation	Organisation
Warwickshire Association for the Blind	Organisation
Warwickshire Rural Community Council	Organisation
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Organisation
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Organisation
Woodland Trust	Organisation
WYG Planning & Design	Organisation
Young Housing Project	Organisation
Governors of Champion School	Organisation, School
Ashow, Burton Green & Stoneleigh Joint Parish Council	Parish Council
Baddesley Clinton Parish Council	Parish Council
Baginton Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council	Parish Council
Beausale, Hasely, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council	Parish Council
Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council	Parish Council
Bubbenhall Parish Council	Parish Council
Budbrooke Parish Council	Parish Council
Cubbington Parish Council	Parish Council
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury JPC	Parish Council
Hatton Parish Council	Parish Council
Lapworth Parish Council	Parish Council
Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe Parish Council	Parish Council
Norton Lindsey Parish Council	Parish Council
Old Milverton & Blackdown JPC	Parish Council
Radford Semele Parish Council	Parish Council
Rowington Parish Council	Parish Council
Shrewley Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford Residents Association	Residents' Association
Burton Green Residents' Association	Residents' Association
Burton Green Residents' Association	Residents' Association
Cannon Park Community Association	Residents' Association
Cannon Park Community Association	Residents' Association
CLARA	Residents' Association
Crackley Residents Association	Residents' Association
Finham Residents Association	Residents' Association
Southern Windy Arbour Area Residents' Association	Residents' Association
Advantage West Midlands	Statutory Consultee
Ancient Monuments Society	Statutory Consultee
British Gas Properties	Statutory Consultee
British Gas Trading	Statutory Consultee
British Telecommunications plc	Statutory Consultee
British Waterways	Statutory Consultee

British Waterways	Statutory Consultee
Central Networks	Statutory Consultee
Centro	Statutory Consultee
Centro	Statutory Consultee
Defence Estates	Statutory Consultee
DEFRA	Statutory Consultee
Department for Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform	Statutory Consultee
Department for Children, Schools and Families	Statutory Consultee
Department for Culture, Media & Sport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Transport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Works & Pensions	Statutory Consultee
Department of Health	Statutory Consultee
E.ON UK plc	Statutory Consultee
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency (Biodiversity)	Statutory Consultee
E-on	Statutory Consultee
Government Office for the West Midlands	Statutory Consultee
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee
Home Office	Statutory Consultee
HSE Chemical & Hazardous Installations Division	Statutory Consultee
Ministry of Defence	Statutory Consultee
Natural England	Statutory Consultee
Natural England	Statutory Consultee
Network Rail	Statutory Consultee
NHS Warwickshire	Statutory Consultee
NHS West Midlands Division	Statutory Consultee
nPower	Statutory Consultee
Oil & Pipelines Agency	Statutory Consultee
Positive about Young People	Statutory Consultee
Powergen UK plc	Statutory Consultee
Scottish Power	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water (Disposal)	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water (Supply Team)	Statutory Consultee
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire Foundation trust	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire PCT	Statutory Consultee
Sport England	Statutory Consultee
The Coal Authority	Statutory Consultee
The Theatres Trust	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire & Northamptonshire Air Ambulance	Statutory Consultee

Warwickshire County Council - Environment & Economy Directorate	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council - Heritage & Culture (Museums)	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council - Landscape Architect Team	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council (Minerals Policy Team)	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council [Gypsy and Traveller Team]	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council [Museum Field services]	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Police	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Fire Service	Statutory Consultee
Kenilworth Town Council	Town Council
Royal Leamington Spa Town Council	Town Council
Warwick Town Council	Town Council
Whitnash Town Council	Town Council

Organisations invited to make representations at Preferred Options stage

Organisation	Category
Birmingham City Council	Adjoining Council
Coventry City Council	Adjoining Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Rugby Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Stratford upon Avon District Council	Adjoining Council
Warwickshire County Council	Adjoining Council
Balsall Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Beaudesert Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Berkswell Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brandon & Bretford Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brinklow Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Charlecote Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Chesterton & Kingston Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Frankton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Fulbrook Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Hampton Lucy Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Harbury Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Long Itchington Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Marton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Newbold Pacey & Ashorne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Preston Bagot Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Princethorpe Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ryton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Snitterfield Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Stretton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Tamworth in Arden Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ufton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wellesbourne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wolverton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Organisation	Categories
Alvis Sports Club	Organisation
B.L.A.S.T.	Organisation
Bath Place Community Venture	Organisation
Binswood Allotment Society	Organisation
Birmingham International Airport Ltd	Organisation
BLAST (Bringing Leamington Allotment Societies Together)	Organisation
Brindley Twist Tafft & James	Organisation
British Transport Police	Organisation
Callingham Associates	Organisation
Campaign Against Expansion of Coventry Airport	Organisation
Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Organisation
Coventry & Warwickshire Society of Chartered Architects	Organisation
Coventry Golf Club Limited	Organisation
CPRE Warwickshire	Organisation
Crackley Residents' Association	Organisation
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	Organisation
Forestry Commission	Organisation
Friends of the Earth	Organisation
Friends, Families & Travellers and Traveller Law Reform Project	Organisation

Hatton Parish Plan Steering Group	Organisation
Health and Safety Executive	Organisation
Hill Close Gardens	Organisation
Jehovah's Witnesses	Organisation
Kenilworth Allotment Tenants Association	Organisation
Kenilworth Chamber of Trade	Organisation
Kenilworth Disability Action Group	Organisation
Kenilworth Golf Club	Organisation
Kenilworth Society	Organisation
Kirkwells	Organisation
Leamington and County Golf Club	Organisation
Leamington Gospel Hall Trust	Organisation
Metropolitan and Scott Ltd	Organisation
Mono Consultants Ltd	Organisation
National Farmers' Union	Organisation
NFU	Organisation
Offchurch Plan Implementation Group	Organisation
RNID	Organisation
Sherbourne Estate	Organisation
SPAce	Organisation
Sport England	Organisation
St Johns Westwood	Organisation
St. John's Church	Organisation
Stratford and Warwick Waterways Trust	Organisation
Sundial Group	Organisation
Tesco Stores Ltd	Organisation
The Leamington Society	Organisation
The National Trust	Organisation
The Ramblers' Association	Organisation
The Warwick Society	Organisation
University of Warwick	Organisation
Warwick and Leamington Green Party	Organisation
warwick books Ltd	Organisation
Warwick Chamber of Trade and Commerce	Organisation
Warwick Independent Schools Foundation	Organisation
Warwickshire Association for the Blind	Organisation
Warwickshire Rural Community Council	Organisation
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Organisation
Woodland Trust	Organisation
WYG Planning & Design	Organisation
Governors of Champion School	Organisation, School
Ashow & Stoneleigh Parish Council	Parish Council
Baddesley Clinton Parish Council	Parish Council
Baginton Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council	Parish Council
Beausale, Hasely, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council	Parish Council
Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council	Parish Council
Bubbenhall Parish Council	Parish Council
Budbrooke Parish Council	Parish Council
Burton Green Parish Council	Parish Council
Cubbington Parish Council	Parish Council
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury JPC	Parish Council
Hatton Parish Council	Parish Council
Lapworth Parish Council	Parish Council

Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe Parish Council	Parish Council
Norton Lindsey Parish Council	Parish Council
Old Milverton & Blackdown JPC	Parish Council
Radford Semele Parish Council	Parish Council
Rowington Parish Council	Parish Council
Shrewley Parish Council	Parish Council
Weston-Under-Wetherley Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford Residents Association	Residents' Association
Burton Green Residents' Association	Residents' Association
CLARA	Residents' Association
Crackley Residents Association	Residents' Association
Finham Residents Association	Residents' Association
Southern Windy Arbour Area Residents' Association	Residents' Association
St Mary's Residents Association	Residents' Association
Campion School	School
Myton School	School
AMEC	Statutory Consultee
British Gas Trading	Statutory Consultee
British Telecommunications plc	Statutory Consultee
British Waterways	Statutory Consultee
Central Networks	Statutory Consultee
Centro	Statutory Consultee
Defence Estates	Statutory Consultee
DEFRA	Statutory Consultee
Department for Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform	Statutory Consultee
Department for Children, Schools and Families	Statutory Consultee
Department for Culture, Media & Sport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Transport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Works & Pensions	Statutory Consultee
Department of Health	Statutory Consultee
E.ON UK plc	Statutory Consultee
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency (Biodiversity)	Statutory Consultee
E-on	Statutory Consultee
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee
Home Office	Statutory Consultee
HSE Chemical & Hazardous Installations Division	Statutory Consultee
Ministry of Defence	Statutory Consultee
Mobile Operators Association	Statutory Consultee
National Grid	Statutory Consultee
Natural England	Statutory Consultee
Network Rail	Statutory Consultee
NHS Warwickshire	Statutory Consultee
NHS West Midlands Division	Statutory Consultee
nPower	Statutory Consultee
Oil & Pipelines Agency	Statutory Consultee
Positive about Young People	Statutory Consultee
Powergen UK plc	Statutory Consultee
Scottish Power	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water	Statutory Consultee
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire Foundation trust	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire PCT	Statutory Consultee

The Coal Authority	Statutory Consultee
The Theatres Trust	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire & Northamptonshire Air Ambulance	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council - Environment & Economy Directorate	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council (Minerals Policy Team)	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire County Council [Gypsy and Traveller Team]	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Police	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Chief engineers and Planning Officers Group	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Fire Service	Statutory Consultee
Kenilworth Town Council	Town Council
Royal Leamington Spa Town Council	Town Council
Warwick Town Council	Town Council
Whitnash Town Council	Town Council

Organisations invited to make representations at Revised Development Strategy stage

Organisation	Categories
Birmingham City Council	Adjoining Council
Coventry City Council	Adjoining Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Rugby Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Stratford upon Avon District Council	Adjoining Council
Warwickshire County Council	Adjoining Council
Balsall Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Beaudesert Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Berkswell Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brandon & Bretford Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brinklow Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Charlecote Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Chesterton & Kingston Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Frankton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Fulbrook Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Hampton Lucy Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Harbury Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Long Itchington Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Marton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Newbold Pacey & Ashorne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Preston Bagot Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Princethorpe Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ryton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Snitterfield Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Stretton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Tamworth in Arden Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ufton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wellesbourne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wolverton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Alvis Sports Club	Organisation
B.L.A.S.T.	Organisation
Baginton Green Ltd (Focus School)	Organisation
Bath Place Community Venture	Organisation
Binswood Allotment Society	Organisation
Binswood Ex Servicemen Allotments Association	Organisation
Birmingham International Airport Ltd	Organisation
BLAST (Bringing Leamington Allotment Societies Together)	Organisation
Bloor Homes	Organisation
Brindley Twist Tafft & James	Organisation
British Transport Police	Organisation
Callingham Associates	Organisation
Campaign Against Expansion of Coventry Airport	Organisation
Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Organisation
Coventry & Warwickshire Society of Chartered Architects	Organisation

Coventry Gospel halls Trust	Organisation
CPRE WARWICKSHIRE	Organisation
Crackley Residents' Association	Organisation
Cycleways	Organisation
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	Organisation
Federation of Small Businesses	Organisation
Forestry Commission	Organisation
Friends of the Earth	Organisation
Friends, Families & Travellers and Traveller Law Reform Project	Organisation
Goldstraws	Organisation
Green Party	Organisation
Hancock Town Planning	Organisation
Hatton Parish Plan Steering Group	Organisation
Health and Safety Executive	Organisation
Hill Close Gardens	Organisation
Holmes Antill	Organisation
Jehovah's Witnesses	Organisation
Kenilworth Allotment Tenants Association	Organisation
Kenilworth Chamber of Trade	Organisation
Kenilworth Community Forum	Organisation
Kenilworth Disability Action Group	Organisation
Kenilworth Golf Club	Organisation
Kenilworth Society	Organisation
Kirkwells	Organisation
Leamington and County Golf Club	Organisation
Leamington Gospel Hall Trust	Organisation
Leamington Society	Organisation
Leek Wootton Parish Plan Working Group	Organisation
LIBRARY SUPPLY INT LTD	Organisation
Metropolitan and Scott Ltd	Organisation
Mono Consultants Ltd	Organisation
National Farmers' Union	Organisation
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Organisation
National Landlords Association	Organisation
NFU	Organisation
Offchurch Plan Implementation Group	Organisation
Parichial Church Council Of St James Church	Organisation
Photography by David Morphew	Organisation
RNID	Organisation
Sherbourne Estate	Organisation
SPAce	Organisation
Sport England	Organisation
St Johns Westwood	Organisation
St. John's Church	Organisation
Stratford and Warwick Waterways Trust	Organisation
Sundial Group	Organisation
Tesco Stores Ltd	Organisation
The Kingsley School Playing Field Trust	Organisation

The Leamington Society	Organisation
The National Trust	Organisation
The Ramblers' Association	Organisation
The Warwick Society	Organisation
Transition Towns	Organisation
Tyler-Parkes Partnership	Organisation
University of Warwick	Organisation
Warwick and Leamington Green Party	Organisation
warwick books ltd	Organisation
Warwick Castle Park Trust Ltd.	Organisation
Warwick Chamber of Trade and Commerce	Organisation
Warwick SU	Organisation
Warwickshire Association for the Blind	Organisation
Warwickshire Gardens Trust	Organisation
Warwickshire Public Health and South Warwickshire Clinical Commisioning Group	Organisation
Warwickshire Race Equality Partnership (WREP)	Organisation
Warwickshire Rural Community Council	Organisation
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Organisation
Waterloo Housing Group	Organisation
Whitnash Community Forum	Organisation
Woodland Trust	Organisation
WRCC	Organisation
WYG Planning & Design	Organisation
Governors of Campion School	Organisation, School
Kenilworth Children's Centre & Nursery School	Organisation, School
Ashow & Stoneleigh Parish Council	Parish Council
Baddesley Clinton Parish Council	Parish Council
Baginton Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council	Parish Council
Beausale, Hasely, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council	Parish Council
Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council	Parish Council
Bubbenhall Parish Council	Parish Council
Budbrooke Parish Council	Parish Council
Burton Green Parish Council	Parish Council
Cubbington Parish Council	Parish Council
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury JPC	Parish Council
Hatton Parish Council	Parish Council
Lapworth Parish Council	Parish Council
Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe Parish Council	Parish Council
Norton Lindsey Parish Council	Parish Council
Old Milverton & Blackdown JPC	Parish Council
Radford Semele Parish Council	Parish Council
Rowington Parish Council	Parish Council
Shrewley Parish Council	Parish Council
Weston Under Wetherley Parish Council	Parish Council
Weston-Under-Wetherley Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford Residents Association	Residents' Association
Burton Green Residents' Association	Residents' Association

Cannon Park Community Association	Residents' Association
Central Leamington Area Residents Association	Residents' Association
Chase Meadow Residents Association	Residents' Association
Crackley Residents Association	Residents' Association
Finham Residents Association	Residents' Association
Hampton-on-the-Hill Residents Association	Residents' Association
Kingswood Residents Group	Residents' Association
Southern Windy Arbour Area Residents' Association	Residents' Association
St Mary's Residents Association	Residents' Association
Barford St. Peter's Primary School	School
Campion School	School
Kenilworth School & Sports College	School
Myton School	School
AMEC	Statutory Consultee
Ancient Monuments Society	Statutory Consultee
British Gas Trading	Statutory Consultee
British Telecommunications plc	Statutory Consultee
British Waterways	Statutory Consultee
Central Networks	Statutory Consultee
Centro	Statutory Consultee
Defence Estates	Statutory Consultee
DEFRA	Statutory Consultee
Department for Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform	Statutory Consultee
Department for Children, Schools and Families	Statutory Consultee
Department for Culture, Media & Sport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Transport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Works & Pensions	Statutory Consultee
Department of Health	Statutory Consultee
E.ON UK plc	Statutory Consultee
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency (Biodiversity)	Statutory Consultee
E-on	Statutory Consultee
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee
Home Office	Statutory Consultee
HSE Chemical & Hazardous Installations Division	Statutory Consultee
Ministry of Defence	Statutory Consultee
Mobile Operators Association	Statutory Consultee
Natural England	Statutory Consultee
Network Rail	Statutory Consultee
NHS Warwickshire	Statutory Consultee
NHS West Midlands Division	Statutory Consultee
nPower	Statutory Consultee
Oil & Pipelines Agency	Statutory Consultee
Positive about Young People	Statutory Consultee
Powergen UK plc	Statutory Consultee
Scottish Power	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water	Statutory Consultee

Severn Trent Water (Disposal)	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water (Supply Team)	Statutory Consultee
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire Foundation trust	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire PCT	Statutory Consultee
The Coal Authority	Statutory Consultee
The Theatres Trust	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire & Northamptonshire Air Ambulance	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Police	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Chief engineers and Planning Officers Group	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Fire Service	Statutory Consultee
Kenilworth Town Council	Town Council
Royal Leamington Spa Town Council	Town Council
Warwick Town Council	Town Council
Whitnash Town Council	Town Council

Organisations invited to make representations at Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries stage

Organisation	Categories
Birmingham City Council	Adjoining Council
Brandon & Bretford Parish Council	Adjoining Council
Coventry City Council	Adjoining Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Rugby Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	Adjoining Council
Stratford upon Avon District Council	Adjoining Council
Warwickshire County Council	Adjoining Council
Balsall Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Beaudesert Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Berkswell Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Bishops Itchington Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Brinklow Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Charlecote Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Chesterton & Kingston Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Frankton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Fulbrook Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Hampton Lucy Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Harbury Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Hockley Heath Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Long Itchington Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Marton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Newbold Pacey & Ashorne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Preston Bagot Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Princethorpe Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ryton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Snitterfield Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Stretton on Dunsmore Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Tanworth in Arden Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Ufton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wellesbourne Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
Wolverton Parish Council	Adjoining Parish
81G	Organisation
Adlington	Organisation
Age Concern	Organisation
Alvis Sports Club	Organisation
Amey	Organisation
B.L.A.S.T.	Organisation
Baginton Green Ltd (Focus School)	Organisation
Bath Place Community Venture	Organisation
Binswood Allotment Society	Organisation
Binswood Ex Servicemen Allotments Association	Organisation
Birmingham International Airport Ltd	Organisation
BLAST (Bringing Leamington Allotment Societies Together)	Organisation
Bloor Homes	Organisation
Brindley Twist Tafft & James	Organisation
British Transport Police	Organisation
Callingham Associates	Organisation
Campaign Against Expansion of Coventry Airport	Organisation

Circles Network and Sydni Centre	Organisation
Cliffe Allotments Association	Organisation
Conservation Advisory Forum	Organisation
Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Organisation
Coventry Gospel halls Trust	Organisation
CPRE Warwickshire	Organisation
Crackley Residents' Association	Organisation
Cubbington & District OAP Association	Organisation
Cubbington Freeholders	Organisation
Cubbington Methodist Church	Organisation
Cycleways	Organisation
d2planning	Organisation
DCA Design	Organisation
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	Organisation
E C Drummond (Agriculture) Ltd	Organisation
English Heritage	Organisation
Environment Agency	Organisation
Expo Management Ltd	Organisation
Faro Technologies UK Ltd	Organisation
Federation of Small Businesses	Organisation
Finham Brook Flood Action Group	Organisation
Forestry Commission	Organisation
Formation Media Ltd	Organisation
Friends of Oakley Wood	Organisation
Friends of the Earth	Organisation
Goldstraws	Organisation
Green Party	Organisation
Hampton Magna Action Group	Organisation
Hancock Town Planning	Organisation
Hatton Parish Plan Steering Group	Organisation
Health and Safety Executive	Organisation
Hill Close Gardens	Organisation
Holmes Antill	Organisation
Hosted IP communications (Europe) Ltd	Organisation
J & A Growers Ltd	Organisation
Jehovah's Witnesses	Organisation
Kenilworth Allotment Tenants Association	Organisation
Kenilworth Chamber of Trade	Organisation
Kenilworth Community Forum	Organisation
Kenilworth Disability Action Group	Organisation
Kenilworth Golf Club	Organisation
Kenilworth Runners	Organisation
Kenilworth School & Sixth Form	Organisation
Kenilworth Society	Organisation
Kingswood Residents Group	Organisation
Kirkwells	Organisation
Lapworth Charities	Organisation
Lapworth Parish Plan Steering Group	Organisation
Leamington and County Golf Club	Organisation
Leamington Gospel Hall Trust	Organisation
Leamington Society	Organisation
Leask Accountancy Solutions	Organisation
Leek Wootton Parish Plan Working Group	Organisation
Lend Lease	Organisation

LIBRARY SUPPLY INT LTD	Organisation
Metropolitan and Scott Ltd	Organisation
Midland Red (South) Ltd. dba Stagecoach Midlands	Organisation
Mid-Warwickshire Mind	Organisation
Mid-Warwickshire Neighbourhood Watch	Organisation
Mono Consultants Ltd	Organisation
National Farmers' Union	Organisation
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Organisation
National Landlords Association	Organisation
NHS Property Services	Organisation
Offchurch Plan Implementation Group	Organisation
Parichial Church Council Of St James Church	Organisation
Parochial Church Council of St Chad's	Organisation
Photography by David Morphew	Organisation
Picturesque	Organisation
Plato Trust	Organisation
RNID	Organisation
Royal Leamington Spa Chamber of Trade	Organisation
Sheldon Bosley	Organisation
Sherbourne Estate	Organisation
Smith Street Traders Association	Organisation
SPAce	Organisation
St Johns Westwood	Organisation
St. John's Church	Organisation
Stagecoach	Organisation
Stratford and Warwick Waterways Trust	Organisation
Stratford Town Management Partnership	Organisation
Sundial Group	Organisation
Tesco Stores Ltd	Organisation
The Coventry Heritage Detector Society	Organisation
The Kingsley School Playing Field Trust	Organisation
The Leamington Society	Organisation
The National Trust	Organisation
The Ramblers' Association	Organisation
The Warwick Society	Organisation
Transition Towns	Organisation
Tyler-Parkes Partnership	Organisation
University of Warwick	Organisation
Victorian Society	Organisation
Warckshire County Council	Organisation
Warwick & Leamington Green Party	Organisation
Warwick and Leamington Green Party	Organisation
warwick books ltd	Organisation
Warwick Castle Park Trust Ltd.	Organisation
Warwick Chamber of Trade and Commerce	Organisation
Warwick SU	Organisation
Warwickshire Association for the Blind	Organisation
Warwickshire Association of Youth Clubs	Organisation
Warwickshire Gardens Trust	Organisation
Warwickshire Public Health and South Warwickshire Clinical Commisioning Group	Organisation
Warwickshire Race Equality Partnership (WREP)	Organisation
Warwickshire Rural Community Council	Organisation
Warwickshire Rural Housing Association	Organisation

Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Organisation
Waterloo Housing Group	Organisation
WAYC	Organisation
West Midlands Ambulance Service	Organisation
Whitnash Community Forum	Organisation
Woodland Trust	Organisation
WRCC	Organisation
WYG Planning & Design	Organisation
Governors of Campion School	Organisation, School
Ashow & Stoneleigh Parish Council	Parish Council
Baddesley Clinton Parish Council	Parish Council
Baginton Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council	Parish Council
Beausale, Hasely, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council	Parish Council
Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council	Parish Council
Bubbenhall Parish Council	Parish Council
Budbrooke Parish Council	Parish Council
Burton Green Parish Council	Parish Council
Cubbington Parish Council	Parish Council
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury JPC	Parish Council
Hatton Parish Council	Parish Council
Lapworth Parish Council	Parish Council
Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe Parish Council	Parish Council
Norton Lindsey Parish Council	Parish Council
Old Milverton & Blackdown JPC	Parish Council
Rowington Parish Council	Parish Council
Shrewley Parish Council	Parish Council
Weston-Under-Wetherley Parish Council	Parish Council
Barford Residents Association	Residents' Association
Burton Green Residents' Association	Residents' Association
Cannon Park Community Association	Residents' Association
Central Leamington Area Residents Association	Residents' Association
Crackley Residents Association	Residents' Association
Finham Residents Association	Residents' Association
Hampton-on-the-Hill Residents Association	Residents' Association
Southern Windy Arbour Area Residents' Association	Residents' Association
Whitnash Residents Association	Residents' Association
Barford St. Peter's Primary School	School
Campion School	School
Myton School	School
Ancient Monuments Society	Statutory Consultee
British Gas Trading	Statutory Consultee
British Telecommunications plc	Statutory Consultee
British Waterways	Statutory Consultee
Canal & River Trust	Statutory Consultee
Central Networks	Statutory Consultee
Centro	Statutory Consultee
Defence Estates	Statutory Consultee
DEFRA	Statutory Consultee
Department for Business, Enterprise & Regulatory Reform	Statutory Consultee
Department for Children, Schools and Families	Statutory Consultee
Department for Culture, Media & Sport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Transport	Statutory Consultee
Department for Works & Pensions	Statutory Consultee

Department of Health	Statutory Consultee
E.ON UK plc	Statutory Consultee
Environment Agency (Biodiversity)	Statutory Consultee
E-on	Statutory Consultee
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee
Home Office	Statutory Consultee
HSE Chemical & Hazardous Installations Division	Statutory Consultee
Ministry of Defence	Statutory Consultee
Mobile Operators Association	Statutory Consultee
Natural England	Statutory Consultee
Network Rail	Statutory Consultee
NHS Warwickshire	Statutory Consultee
nPower	Statutory Consultee
Oil & Pipelines Agency	Statutory Consultee
Planning & Development Group	Statutory Consultee
Positive about Young People	Statutory Consultee
Powergen UK plc	Statutory Consultee
Scottish Power	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water (Disposal)	Statutory Consultee
Severn Trent Water (Supply Team)	Statutory Consultee
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire Foundation trust	Statutory Consultee
South Warwickshire PCT	Statutory Consultee
Sport England	Statutory Consultee
The Coal Authority	Statutory Consultee
The Theatres Trust	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire & Northamptonshire Air Ambulance	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Police	Statutory Consultee
Warwickshire Public Health	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Chief engineers and Planning Officers Group	Statutory Consultee
West Midlands Fire Service	Statutory Consultee
Kenilworth Town Council	Town Council
Royal Leamington Spa Town Council	Town Council
Warwick Town Council	Town Council
Whitnash Town Council	Town Council

Appendix 3

General consultation letters issued at the start of each consultation

**Development Services
Paul Pinkney – Head of Service**

PO Box 2178, Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH

direct line: 01926 456504

switchboard: 01926 410410

fax: 01926 456542

email: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk

web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan

our reference: L4/NLP/I/01

respondent number:

18th March 2011

Dear Sir or Madam,

New Local Plan Consultation

Thank you for responding to the District Council's previous consultations on its Core Strategy.


You may be aware that the new coalition Government is making a number of changes to the planning system which affect the Core Strategy, including its intention to remove the housing targets for the district imposed through the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Council is now no longer required to deliver a specified level of growth, but want to establish through consultation with its local communities the right level of growth for the area based on local needs and aspirations. As this is a change to the process, this consultation will contribute towards preparing a new Local Plan for the district.

The consultation will begin on 18th March and we want to know what you think are the important issues and challenges facing local communities today and how you would like the Council to manage new development in the future to address those issues.

To support the consultation, we have published a consultation paper on our website along with an online questionnaire for you to give us your views. Paper copies of both will be available at the venues listed below. We are also holding a series of public meetings and exhibitions around the district. Those already arranged are listed below and the dates for additional meetings will be published on our website. The deadline for responses is 8th July 2011.

Please note that a summary report of the responses received by the District Council to previous consultations on the Core Strategy is also available on the website: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/corestrategy.

Yours faithfully,



Gary Stephens
 Group Leader of Policy, Projects and Conservation
Document venues & questionnaire drop off points

The Council Offices: Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa
 Monday – Thursday 8.45 am – 5.15 pm; Friday 8.45 am – 4.45 pm

The Town Hall: Parade, Royal Leamington Spa
 Monday – Thursday 8.45 am – 5.15 pm; Friday 8.45 am – 4.45 pm

Warwickshire Direct Whitnash: Whitnash Library, Franklin Road, Whitnash
 Monday and Friday 9.30 am – 5.30 pm, Tuesday and Thursday 9.30 am – 7.00 pm,
 Wednesday 10.30 am – 5.30 pm, Saturday 9.30 am – 12.30 pm

Leamington Spa Library: The Pump Rooms, Parade, Royal Leamington Spa
 Monday and Thursday 9.30 am – 8.00 pm; Tuesday 10.00 am – 8.00 pm; Wednesday and
 Friday 9.30 am – 5.00 pm; Saturday 9.30 am – 4.00 pm; Sunday 10.00 am – 2.00 pm

Warwickshire Direct Warwick: Shire Hall, Market Square, Warwick
 Monday to Thursday 8.00am – 5.30pm, Friday 8.00am – 5.00 pm, Saturday 9.00 am –
 4.00 pm

Warwickshire Direct Kenilworth: Kenilworth Library, Smalley Place, Kenilworth
 Monday and Thursday 9.00 am – 7.00 pm; Tuesday and Friday 9.00 am – 5.30 pm;
 Wednesday 10.30 am – 5.30 pm; Saturday 9.00 am – 4.00 pm

Warwickshire Direct Lillington: Lillington Library, Valley Road, Royal Leamington Spa
 Monday and Friday 9.30 am – 1.00 pm & 2.00 pm – 5.30 pm; Tuesday and Thursday
 9.30 am – 1.00 pm & 2.00 pm – 7.00 pm; Saturday 9.30 am – 4.00 pm

Brunswick Healthy Living Centre: 98-100 Shrubland Street, Royal Leamington Spa
 Monday - Thursday 9.00 am – 5.00 pm; Friday 9.00 am – 4.30 pm

Exhibitions*

Date and time	Venue
9 th May : 10am to 3pm	Brunswick Healthy Living Centre, 98 – 100 Shrubland Street, Royal Leamington Spa
10 th May: 2pm to 5pm	Whitnash Library, Franklin Road, Whitnash
12 th May : 10am to 3pm	Brunswick Healthy Living Centre, 98 – 100 Shrubland Street, Royal Leamington Spa
17 th May and 18 th May : 10am to 3pm	University of Warwick (Warwick Arts Centre), Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry
10 th and 11 th June: 10am to 4pm	Royal Priors Shopping Centre, Leamington Spa

Public Meetings*

7.45pm	23 March	Bishops Tachbrook	Sports and Social Club
7.00pm	24 March	Kenilworth	The Hall at St John’s Church
7.00pm	28 March	Finham Residents Assoc. AGM	Finham Primary School

*Further meetings and exhibitions are currently being organised and details of these will be published on our website: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan

Development Services
David Barber – Development Policy Manager

PO Box 2178, Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH

«Name»
«Organisation»
«Address»
«Post_Code»

switchboard: 01926 410410
fax: 01926 456026
email: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk
web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk

our ref: DB/JB
your ref: JDI/«Person_ID»

31 May 2012

Dear Sir or Madam

New Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation

We are writing to let you know about the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation which start on Friday 1st June.

You may have seen in the local papers that the Council's Executive has now agreed its **Preferred Options for a consultation**. The Preferred Options set out the proposed level of growth up until 2029 along with where this growth could go. It also explains the possible policies for issues like housing (including affordable housing), retail, climate change, transport, the economy and green belt. One of the suggested approaches is that the principles "Garden Towns, Villages and Suburbs" should be applied in new developments. A Prospectus has been produced to illustrate how this might work.

Alongside the Preferred Options, the Council is also consulting on a **Draft Infrastructure Plan** which explains some ideas about the infrastructure needed to enable areas of new developments to become thriving communities. This includes road improvements, improvements to cycling networks, green spaces and access to the countryside, schools, health facilities, sports facilities and other infrastructure.

The consultation runs for eight weeks until Friday 27th July. We want to know what you think about:

- Our Preferred sites for development
- Our policy proposals on key issues, including using the principles of Garden Towns, Villages and Suburbs
- The ideas for new infrastructure

To help you find out more and to make comments, we have produced two consultation documents:

- a full version of The Preferred Options with explanation and justifications
- a short booklet summarising the Preferred Options and the some of the infrastructure proposals.

These documents are available on our website (see link below). Paper copies of the full version of the Preferred Options will be available for reference-only at the venues listed below. Paper copies of the summary version are freely available.

In support of these documents there is also a wide range of other information on the website including the Draft Infrastructure Plan, the Garden Towns, Villages and Suburbs Prospectus, an initial sustainability appraisal of our options and lots of supporting evidence and research.

We are also holding a series of public meetings and exhibitions around the district. For details, please see the consultation programme online at the website address below.

How to comment

All the details of this consultation can be found at:

www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan. You can respond online. Alternatively a response form can be downloaded from the website or can be collected from, and returned to, one of the venues listed below

If you need any further information or would like to respond to the consultation by email, please send your email to: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk


You can also respond by post by writing to the Development Policy Manager, Warwick District Council, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH.

The deadline for responses is 27th July 2012.

Please note that a summary report of the responses received by the District Council to previous consultation on issues for the Local Plan is also available on the website: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan.

In future, we will be contacting you wherever possible by electronic means. Please help us by registering on our LDF Consultation System: <http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>

Yours faithfully



Dave Barber
Development Policy Manager

Document Venues and response Form Drop-Off Points

Warwickshire Direct Whitnash: Whitnash Library, Franklin Road, Whitnash

Leamington Spa Library: The Pump Rooms, Parade, Leamington Spa

Warwickshire Direct Warwick: Shire Hall, Market Square, Warwick

Warwickshire Direct Kenilworth: Kenilworth Library, Smalley Place, Kenilworth

Warwickshire Direct Lillington: Lillington Library, Valley Road, Leamington Spa

Brunswick Healthy Living Centre: 98-100 Shrubland Street, Leamington Spa

Finham Community Library: Finham Green Rd, Finham, Coventry, CV3 6EP

Development Services
David Barber – Development Policy Manager

PO Box 2178, Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH

«Name»
«Organisation»
«Address»
«Post_Code»

switchboard: 01926 410410
fax: 01926 456026
email: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk
web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk

our ref: RDS2013
your ref: JDI/«Person_ID»

19 June 2013

Dear Sir or Madam

We are writing to let you know about the above Consultations which started on Friday 14th June.

You may have seen in the local papers that the Council's Executive has now agreed its **Local Plan Revised Development Strategy, Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, Sustainability Appraisal and Gypsy and Traveller Site Options, for consultation**. The Revised Development Strategy sets out the proposed level of growth up until 2029 along with where this growth could go.

Alongside the Revised Development Strategy, the Council is also consulting on Gypsy and Traveller Site Options. Sites are required for 31 pitches in this district over a fifteen year period, 25 of which will be needed within the first five years. The document details some possible sites and some 'areas of search' for public comment.

An accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Document which assesses both Local Plan sites and those suggested for Gypsies and Travellers is also being consulted upon.

Also the Council is consulting on its Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, which details the way in which developers will be expected to contribute toward the required infrastructure for new development both on site and off site.

The consultation runs until Monday 29th July. We want to know what you think about:

- The Revised Development Strategy
- Sites for development
- Potential locations for Gypsy and Traveller Sites
- The Charging Schedule for the Community Infrastructure Levy
- Sustainability of all the sites

To help you find out more and to make comments, we have produced consultation documents:

- Revised Development Strategy (full version)
- Summary Booklet
- Gypsy and Traveller Site Options

- Sustainability Appraisal
- Community Infrastructure Levy – preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

These documents are available on our website (see link below). Paper copies of the full version of the Revised Development Strategy, the Options for Gypsy and Traveller Sites and the Community Infrastructure Levy will be available for reference-only at the venues listed below. Paper copies of the summary version are freely available.

In support of these documents there is also a wide range of other information on the website including the supporting evidence and research for this and previous consultations.

We are also holding a series of public meetings and exhibitions around the district. For details, please see the consultation programme online at the website address below.

How to comment

All the details of this consultation can be found at: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan. You can respond online. Alternatively a response form can be downloaded from the website or can be collected from, and returned to, one of the venues listed below.

If you need any further information or would like to respond to the consultation by email, please send your email to: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk

You can also respond by post by writing to the Development Policy Manager, Warwick District Council, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH.

The deadline for responses is 29th July 2013.

Please note that a summary report of the responses received by the District Council to the previous consultation on Preferred Options for the Local Plan is also available on the website: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan.

In future, we will be contacting you wherever possible by electronic means. Please help us by registering on our LDF Consultation System: <http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>

Yours faithfully



Dave Barber
Development Policy Manager

Document Venues and response Form Drop-Off Points

Warwick District Council Offices, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa

Warwickshire Direct Whitnash: Whitnash Library, Franklin Road, Whitnash

Leamington Spa Library: The Pump Rooms, Parade, Leamington Spa

Warwickshire Direct Warwick: Shire Hall, Market Square, Warwick

Warwickshire Direct Kenilworth: Kenilworth Library, Smalley Place, Kenilworth

Warwickshire Direct Lillington: Lillington Library, Valley Road, Leamington Spa

Brunswick Healthy Living Centre: 98-100 Shrubland Street, Leamington Spa

Finham Community Library: Finham Green Rd, Finham, Coventry, CV3 6EP

Development Services
David Barber – Development Policy Manager

PO Box 2178, Warwick District Council, Riverside House
Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH

switchboard: 01926 410410

fax: 01926 456026

email: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk

web: www.warwickdc.gov.uk

our ref:
your ref:

5 December 2013

Dear Sir or Madam

Warwick District Local Plan: Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries

We are writing to let you know about the above consultation which recently started. You may have seen in the local papers that the Council's Executive has now agreed its **Local Plan Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries, for consultation**. The document sets out the proposed level of housing growth up until 2029 in villages and where this growth could go.

The consultation runs until 20 January 2014. We want to know what you think about:

- The level of growth for each village
- Sites for development

Further information is available on our website (see link below). Paper copies of the documentation is available for you to take away at the venues listed below. In support of these documents there is also a wide range of other information on the website including the supporting evidence and research for this and previous stages of the Local Plan consultations.

We are also holding a series of drop-in sessions around the district, details are on the following page.

How to comment

All the details of this consultation can be found at:

www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan.

You can respond online. Alternatively a response form can be downloaded from the website or can be collected from, and returned to, one of the venues listed below.

If you need any further information or would like to respond to the consultation by email, please send your email to: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk

You can also respond by post by writing to the Development Policy Manager, Warwick District Council, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa, CV32 5QH.

The deadline for responses is 20 January 2014.

In future, we will be contacting you wherever possible by electronic means. Please help us by registering on our LDF Consultation System: <http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/>

Yours faithfully



Dave Barber
Development Policy Manager

Document Venues and response Form Drop-Off Points:

Warwick District Council Offices, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Leamington Spa
Warwickshire Direct Whitnash: Whitnash Library, Franklin Road, Whitnash
Leamington Spa Library: The Pump Rooms, Parade, Leamington Spa
Warwickshire Direct Warwick: Shire Hall, Market Square, Warwick
Warwickshire Direct Kenilworth: Kenilworth Library, Smalley Place, Kenilworth
Warwickshire Direct Lillington: Lillington Library, Valley Road, Leamington Spa
Brunswick Healthy Living Centre: 98-100 Shrubland Street, Leamington Spa

Public Events and Exhibitions

Tuesday 10 December	Shrewley Village Hall	4pm - 8pm
Monday 16 December	Lapworth Village Hall	4pm - 8pm
Tuesday 17 December	Budbrooke Community Centre	4pm - 8pm
Friday 3 January	Cubbington Village Hall	4pm - 8pm
Saturday 4 January	Baginton Village Hall	10am - 2pm
Monday 6 January	Hatton Park Village Hall	7pm - 9pm
Tuesday 7 January	Radford Semele Community Hall	4pm - 8pm
Wednesday 8 January	Bishop's Tachbrook Sports and Social Club	4pm - 8pm
Thursday 9 January	Rural West Forum (Special Meeting), Leamington Spa Town Hall	7pm - 9pm
Friday 10 January	Burton Green Village Hall	4pm - 8pm