

**Warwick District Local Plan Examination
Matters and Issues identified by the Inspector**

The duty to co-operate, soundness in terms of overall provision for housing and the supply and delivery of housing land were considered at the initial hearing sessions in May 2015. The Inspector has concluded that the Council has complied with the duty to co-operate (Matter 1).

Along with other matters, overall provision for housing (Matter 2) and the supply and delivery of housing land (Matter 3) are to be given further consideration in light of the suspension of the examination, additional work undertaken by the Council and the other Coventry and Warwickshire authorities and the Council's suggested modifications.

Matter 2 – Overall provision for housing

Issue

Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the overall provision for housing.

Policies DS2, DS6 and DS20

Questions

- 1) Does the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of September 2015 provide a robust evidence base for Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) in the Housing Market Area (HMA) and individual authorities and is the methodology appropriate?
- 2) What are the assumptions in terms of population change, migration, household size and household formation rates? What is the basis for these and are they justified?
- 3) How has the issue of unattributable population change been dealt with and is this justified?
- 4) Are the figures it arrives at for demographic based housing need appropriate? What would alternative assumptions suggest and is there a justification to use these?
- 5) Now that the 2014 based population projections and 2014 based household projections are available should they be used to review the figures? How do they differ from previous projections and what effect would this have?
- 6) What are the assumptions regarding economic/employment growth and are these justified?
- 7) How have market signals and affordable housing needs been taken into account? Is this justified?
- 8) What effect have all of these factors had on the figures for OAN in individual authorities and the HMA as a whole? i.e. how have demographic projections been adjusted?
- 9) Are the figures in the September 2015 SHMA for OAN in the HMA and Warwick District appropriate? Is there a basis to arrive at alternative figures?
- 10) How will unmet needs from Coventry be met? What is the basis for calculating the distribution of unmet needs to other authorities and is this justified?

Examination into the Warwick District Local Plan

- 11) Does the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between authorities effectively deal with this issue? What does this commit authorities to and is this sufficient? How does this relate to existing and emerging plans?
- 12) What is the position with Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council and the MOU? How does this affect the situation? What are the implications for other authorities?
- 13) What effect does the situation in Birmingham have i.e. in terms of unmet need, the relationship to Coventry and Warwickshire authorities and the Birmingham Development Plan? Has this been taken into account?
- 14) Is the level of housing now proposed by the Council i.e. 932 dwellings per annum appropriate? Would it meet OAN in the District and make an appropriate contribution to meeting unmet needs from Coventry?
- 15) What would be the implications for population change, migration and employment growth? Is this realistic and how does it sit with other aspects of the Local Plan e.g. employment and infrastructure growth?
- 16) Should the amount of housing now proposed (932 dwellings per annum) be increased or decreased? If so to what level and on what basis?
- 17) Is the approach to a review of the Local Plan (Council's suggested modification to Policy DS20) appropriate?

Matter 3 – The supply and delivery of housing land

Issue

Whether the approach towards the supply and delivery of housing land is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policy DS7 and Housing Trajectory

Questions

- 1) Taking the Council's latest Housing Trajectory (June 2016) what is the estimated total supply of new housing in the plan period 2011-2029? How does this compare with the planned level of provision of 932 dwellings per annum?
- 2) What is the estimated total supply in the plan period from
 - a) completions since 2011
 - b) existing planning permissions
 - c) other commitments e.g. sites subject to S106
 - d) proposed site allocations (submitted Plan and Council's suggested modifications)
 - e) other sources specifically identified
 - f) windfalls
- 3) What are the assumptions about the scale and timing of supply and rates of delivery from these various sources? Are these realistic? Has there been any discounting of sites with planning permission for example?
- 4) How has flexibility been provided in terms of the supply of housing? Are there other potential sources of supply?
- 5) Has there been persistent under delivery of housing? In terms of a buffer for a five year supply of housing sites, should this be 5% or 20% in relation to para 47 of the NPPF? How should the level of completions since 2011 be taken into account? What would the requirement be for a five year supply including a buffer?
- 6) Should the annual housing requirement figure be staggered to reflect the need for additional site allocations to meet unmet needs in Coventry and realistic lead in times (see Appendix 4 to Council's Housing Supply Topic Paper June 2016) i.e. a lower figure in the early years of the plan period, increasing later? If so what would be a reasonable basis for the annual figures? Should the early years be based on OAN for Warwick? How would this affect the requirement for a five year supply?
- 7) Would the Local Plan realistically provide for a five year supply on adoption? Will a five year supply be maintained?
- 8) In overall terms would the Local Plan realistically deliver the number of dwellings required over the plan period?

Matter 4 – The spatial strategy

Issue

Whether the spatial strategy is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DS4, DS10, DS19 and H1 and list of Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages

Questions

- 1) What is the basis for the spatial strategy in terms of the location and broad distribution of development set out in Policies DS4, DS10 and H1 i.e. between different parts of the District, between the urban areas and villages and between brownfield, greenfield and Green Belt sites?
- 2) How has this been affected by the Council's suggested modifications?
- 3) Specifically how would the approach to development on the edge of Coventry affect the spatial strategy?
- 4) What alternative options have been considered in terms of the location and broad distribution of development and why were these discounted?
- 5) How were different areas of Green Belt assessed and how has this informed the strategy?
- 6) Is the approach to the location and broad distribution of development appropriate and justified?
- 7) What is the basis for identifying Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages? Is the list of villages in each category justified and appropriate?

Matter 5 – The economy and employment land

Issue

Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to the economy and employment land.

Policies DS1, DS8, DS9, PC0, EC1, EC2 and EC3

Questions

- 1) What is the basis for the overall amount of employment land planned in Policy DS8? Does evidence support this and is it justified? Is it realistic and how does it compare with past take up rates?
- 2) How does it relate to overall jobs growth estimates and what is the relationship between overall housing and employment land provision?
- 3) What is the current situation regarding development so far in the plan period and existing commitments?
- 4) What is the basis for the proposed site allocations in Policy DS9? How were they identified and what options were considered?
- 5) What issues do the sites raise in terms of potential impacts, constraints and infrastructure requirements and how would these be addressed?
- 6) Is the allocation of land currently in the Green Belt at Thickthorn, Kenilworth for employment development justified? What evidence supports this? What effect would this proposal have on openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt? Are there exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt, if so what are they?
- 7) Are the sites realistically deliverable? What evidence is there in this respect?
- 8) Is the approach to new employment development set out in Policy EC1 appropriate?
- 9) What would be the effect of the policy on office development? Is this justified and consistent with national policy? In particular does it fully reflect the sequential approach to main town centre uses?
- 10) What would be the effect of the policy on non-office development? Is this justified and consistent with national policy? In particular does it provide sufficient flexibility?
- 11) Are Policies EC2 and EC3 appropriate? How are they consistent with national policy?

Matter 6 – Sub-Regional Employment Site

Issue

Whether the Sub-Regional Employment Site proposed in Policy DS16 is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policy DS16

Questions

- 1) What is intended in terms of the scale, type and mix of development? What would be the extent of built development in the Green Belt?
- 2) What is the current situation regarding the planning history and status of the site?
- 3) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 4) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 5) What would be the effect in terms of:
 - The landscape and the character and appearance of the area
 - Heritage assets
 - Biodiversity
 - Transport
 - Other issues

How would these be addressed/mitigated?

N.B. In responding to the above the Council should address key concerns raised in representations.

- 6) How does the proposal sit with the need for employment land identified in Policy DS8?
- 7) What is the evidence in terms of the need for such a site? And specifically in this location? How would it relate to wider employment land needs, other sites in the sub-region and economic strategies?
- 8) What would be the benefits in terms of job creation? What evidence is there to support this and is it sufficiently robust?
- 9) Would it be competing with other sub-regional sites or employment land generally?
- 10) Would there be potential for displacement of jobs from existing locations?
- 11) Would there be other benefits, including physical/environmental benefits? If so, what would these be?
- 12) Could the economic benefits of the proposal be achieved from developing elsewhere?
- 13) Would the proposal be realistically viable and deliverable? What are the potential constraints to development and infrastructure requirements and how would these be overcome?
- 14) In overall terms is the proposal justified and are there exceptional circumstances to justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

**Matter 7a – Proposed housing site allocations and safeguarded land
-Warwick, Whitnash and Leamington**

Issue

Whether the proposed housing site allocations and safeguarded land at Warwick, Whitnash and Leamington are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DS11, DS15 and DS NEW2

Questions

Taking each of the following proposed housing site allocations individually:

Urban Brownfield

- H02 (part) – Former sewage works, south of Harbury Lane
- H10 – Station approach, Leamington
- H11 – Land at Montague Road
- H13 – Soans site, Sydenham Drive
- H14 – Riverside House
- H16 – Court Street
- H17 – Garage site, Theatre Street
- H39 – Opus 40, Birmingham Road, Warwick

Greenfield

- H01 – Land west of Europa Way
- H02 – Land south of Harbury Lane (excluding former sewage works)
- H03 – East of Whitnash/South of Sydenham
- H04 – Red House Farm
- H44 – North of Milverton
- H45 – Hazelmere and Little Acre (Golf Lane), Whitnash
- H46A – Gallows Hill
- H46B – The Asps

- 1) What is the current planning status of the site?
- 2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
- 3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- 4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?
- 5) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 6) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- 7) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

In addition to the above, for sites H04 (Red House Farm) and H44 (North of Milverton)

- 8) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 9) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 10) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

For the proposed safeguarded land North of Milverton

- 11) Why was safeguarded land identified, what is it intended to achieve?

Examination into the Warwick District Local Plan

- 12) How was the safeguarded land identified, what options were considered and why was the land in question selected?
- 13) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
- 14) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 15) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 16) What are the potential adverse impacts? How could they be mitigated?
- 17) Are there infrastructure, physical or other constraints to development? If so, how could these be overcome? Is the land realistically developable?
- 18) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?
- 19) Is the overall amount of safeguarded land identified sufficient?

N.B. In responding to the above the Council should address key concerns raised in representations.

**Matter 7b – Proposed housing site allocations
- Kenilworth**

Issue

Whether the proposed housing site allocations at Kenilworth are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DS11 and DS15

Questions

Taking each of the following proposed housing site allocations individually:

Urban Brownfield

- H09 – Kenilworth School Site
- H12 – Kenilworth VI Form College

Greenfield

- H06 – East of Kenilworth (Thickthorn)
- H07 – Crackley Triangle
- H40 – East of Kenilworth (Crewe Lane, Southcrest Farm and Woodside Training Centre)
- H41 – East of Warwick Road, Kenilworth

- 1) What is the current planning status of the site?
- 2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
- 3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- 4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?
- 5) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 6) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- 7) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

In addition to the above, for all sites apart from H09 (Kenilworth School)

- 8) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 9) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 10) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

N.B. In responding to the above the Council should address key concerns raised in representations.

**Matter 7c – Proposed housing site allocations, safeguarded land and direction for growth
- Edge of Coventry**

Issue

Whether the proposed housing site allocations, safeguarded land and direction for growth on the edge of Coventry are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DS11, DS15, DS NEW1 and DS NEW2

Questions

Taking each of the following proposed housing site allocations individually:

- H08 – Oaklea Farm, Finham
- H42 – Westwood Heath
- H43 – Kings Hill Lane

- 1) What is the current planning status of the site?
- 2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
- 3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- 4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?
- 5) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 6) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- 7) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?
- 8) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 9) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 10) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

For the proposed safeguarded land South of Westwood Heath Road

- 11) Why was safeguarded land identified, what is it intended to achieve?
- 12) How was the safeguarded land identified, what options were considered and why was the land in question selected?
- 13) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
- 14) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 15) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 16) What are the potential adverse impacts? How could they be mitigated?
- 17) Are there infrastructure, physical or other constraints to development? If so, how could these be overcome? Is the land realistically developable?
- 18) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?
- 19) Is the overall amount of safeguarded land identified sufficient?

For the Direction of Growth

- 20) Why is a Direction for Growth necessary? What is it intended to achieve?
- 21) Does Policy DS NEW1 provide sufficient clarity and guidance as to the scale, type and location of future development in the area and the factors to be taken into account?
- 22) How will it be implemented in practice?
- 23) In overall terms is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

N.B. In responding to the above the Council should address key concerns raised in representations.

**Matter 7d – Proposed housing site allocations
- Growth Villages and Hockley Heath**

Issue

Whether the proposed housing site allocations at the Growth Villages and Hockley Heath are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DS11 and DS NEW3

Questions

Taking each of the following proposed housing site allocations individually:

Baginton

- H19 – Land north of Rosswood Farm

Barford

- H20 – Land south of Barford House
- H21 – Former Sherbourne Nursery
- H22 – Land off Bemridge Close
- H47 – Land south of Wasperton Lane
- H48 – Land south of Westham lane

Bishops Tachbrook

- H23 – Land south of the School
- H49 – Seven Acre Close

Burton Green

- H24 – Burrow Hill Nursery

Cubbington

- H25 – Allotment Land, Rugby Road
- H26 – Opposite Willow Sheet Meadow
- H50 – Land east of Cubbington

Hampton Magna

- H27 – South of Arras Boulevard
- H51 – Land south of Lloyd Close

Hatton Park

- H28 – North of Birmingham Road
- H53 – Brownley Green Lane

Kingswood

- H29/H30 – Meadow House and Kingswood Farm
- H31 – South of the Stables
- H32 – R/O Brome Hall Lane
- H33 – West of Mill Lane

Leek Wootton

- H37 – Car park east of The Hayes
- DS NEW3 – Former Police HQ (incorporating sites H34, H35 and H36)

Radford Semele

- H38 – North of Southam Road
- H52 – Land at Spring Lane

Hockley Heath

- H18 – Former Aylesbury House

- 1) What is the current planning status of the site?
- 2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
- 3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?
- 4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?
- 5) Is the scale of development proposed compatible with the capacity of the village to accommodate further growth in terms of its character and appearance, the level of services and existing infrastructure?
- 6) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?
- 8) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

In addition to the above, for all sites apart from those in Barford, Bishops Tachbrook and Radford Semele

- 9) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 10) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 11) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

N.B. In responding to the above the Council should address key concerns raised in representations.

Matter 8 – Other proposed site allocations

Issue

Whether the proposed site allocations for education, a country park, a community hub and outdoor sport are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DS12, DS13, DS14 and DS NEW4

Questions

Policy DS12 – land for education

- ED1 – Myton
- ED2 – Southcrest Farm, Kenilworth

In each case

- 1) What is the justification for the proposed allocation? What options were considered and why was this site chosen?
- 2) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?
- 3) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?
- 4) How does the proposed allocation relate to proposed housing sites in terms of phasing, funding etc.?
- 5) Is the proposal realistically viable and deliverable? How will it be funded?
- 6) What is the expected timescale for development?

In addition to the above, for ED2 at Southcrest Farm, Kenilworth

- 7) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
- 8) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?
- 9) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

Policy DS13 – Land for a country park

- 10) What is the justification for the proposed allocation? What options were considered and why was this site chosen?
- 11) How does the proposed allocation relate to proposed housing sites in terms of phasing, funding etc.?
- 12) Is the proposal realistically viable and deliverable? How will it be funded both in terms of initial and ongoing costs? What is the timescale for the country park?

Policy DS14 – Land for a community hub

- 13) What is the justification for the proposed allocation and the specific requirements of the policy in terms of infrastructure and services?
- 14) What is the basis for the limitations of the size of retail development i.e. 500sqm? Does there need to be a limit?
- 15) How does the proposed allocation relate to proposed housing sites in terms of phasing, funding etc.?
- 16) Is the proposal realistically viable and deliverable? How will it be funded?
- 17) What is the expected timescale for development?

Policy DS NEW4 – Land for the provision of outdoor sport

- 18) What is the justification for the proposed allocations? What is the situation regarding the need for additional/improved outdoor sports facilities? How would the additional housing proposed in Kenilworth affect this?
- 19) Why were these locations chosen?
- 20) What is intended to be developed on the sites in terms of sports pitches/facilities? Which communities are they intended to serve?
- 21) Is the proposal realistically viable and deliverable? How will it be funded both in terms of initial and ongoing costs? What is the timescale?

N.B. In responding to the above the Council should address key concerns raised in representations.

Matter 9 – Retail and Town Centres

Issue

Whether the approach towards retail and town centres is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies TC1 to TC18

Questions

- 1) What is the evidence in terms of the overall need for additional retail floorspace and other main town centre uses?
- 2) Is the approach to the development of retail and other main town centre uses set out in Policies TC1-TC3 and TC5 justified and consistent with national policy? How is the sequential approach to be applied?
- 3) What is the basis for the town centre boundaries in Leamington and Warwick? Are they appropriate? Why do they include significant areas primarily in residential use? Is this consistent with the NPPF? How would this affect the application of other policies and the sequential approach? Should they be more focussed on areas of main town centre uses?
- 4) What is the basis for the definition of the Retail Areas in Leamington, Warwick and Kenilworth? Are they appropriate?
- 5) What is the basis for the threshold of 500sqm of floorspace in terms of the need for an impact assessment and the definition of "large scale"?
- 6) Is the proposed allocation at Chandos Street, Leamington (Policy TC4) appropriate and justified? What is the planning history of the site? How would development contribute to meeting the need for additional floorspace? Are there any particular constraints to development and is it viable and realistically deliverable?
- 7) Is the approach to Primary Retail Frontages set out in Policy TC6 justified and consistent with national policy? What is the basis for the figures of 25% and 16m?
- 8) Is the approach to Secondary Retail Areas set out in Policy TC7 justified and consistent with national policy? What is the basis for the figures of 50% and 16m?
- 9) Are the boundaries for the Warwick Café Quarter and the Leamington Spa Restaurant and Café Quarter appropriate? What is the basis for them? Is the approach set out in Policies TC8 and TC9 justified, should it be more flexible?
- 10) Is it sufficiently clear where the Warwick Town Centre Mixed Use Area is? Is the approach set out in Policy TC11 consistent with that in Policy TC2?
- 11) Is the approach set out in Policy TC12 justified, should it be more flexible given the location within Town Centres?

Matter 10 – Culture, Leisure and Tourism

Issue

Whether the approach towards culture, leisure and tourism is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies CT1 to CT7

Questions

- 1) Is the approach to the development of culture, leisure and tourism uses set out in Policies CT1- CT4 justified and consistent with national policy? How is the sequential approach to be applied? Are the policies sufficiently flexible?
- 2) Is the approach set out in Policy CT5 fully consistent with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations? How will the policy be implemented in practice and what evidence is there to assess a deficit of facilities?
- 3) Is Policy CT7 justified in its approach? Does it provide adequate safeguards in terms of heritage assets and the vitality and viability of the Town Centre? Is it sufficiently flexible? Should it more clearly separate out the approach to Warwick Castle and the Racecourse/St Mary's Lands? What is the current situation regarding masterplans and specific development proposals?

Matter 11 – University of Warwick and Major Sites in the Green Belt

Issue

Whether the approach towards the University of Warwick and Major Sites in the Green Belt is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies MS1 and MS2

Questions

Policy MS1 - University of Warwick

- 1) What is the background to development on the site? To what extent is it already developed?
- 2) What is the justification for removing the site from the Green Belt? Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt?
- 3) Is the site boundary appropriate and what is the basis for it?
- 4) What are the potential adverse impacts of further development on the site and how could these be addressed?
- 5) Is Policy MS1 clear enough in terms of what development may be permitted?
- 6) Should the policy itself be clearer about removing land from the Green Belt?

Policy MS2 – Major Sites in the Green Belt (including Former Honiley Airfield, Stoneleigh Park and Stoneleigh Business Park)

- 7) Should the policy be more positive/definite about the prospects of development on the specific sites concerned?
- 8) Should it be more specific about the types of development that may be acceptable?
- 9) Should the sites be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development?
- 10) Is the boundary for the Former Honiley Airfield site appropriate, should the site be extended to include the test track?
- 11) Are the potential implications of the HS2 route for the Stoneleigh Park site adequately taken into account?

Matter 12 – Housing policies

Issue

Whether the housing policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies H0 and H2 to H14

Questions

Policy H0 – Overarching policy

- 1) Should it be amended to reflect the Council's position in terms of accommodating unmet needs from other authorities? How could this be done?

Policy H1 – Directing new housing

- 2) Is the policy itself sufficiently clear in terms of the definition of urban areas/villages and the open countryside i.e. the role of settlement boundaries?
- 3) Is the approach to development beyond settlement boundaries appropriate and justified? Is it sufficiently flexible?
- 4) Are the boundaries themselves appropriate and justified? Are any modifications required?
- 5) Is the approach to housing development in the open countryside and on garden land appropriate and justified, is it consistent with national policy, in particular paragraph 55 of the NPPF?

Policy H2 – Affordable Housing

- 6) What is the evidence in relation to the need for affordable housing? What does this show?
- 7) What is the evidence in relation to the viability of delivering affordable housing as part of market housing schemes? What does it show?
- 8) What is the basis for the requirement for a minimum of 40% affordable housing? Is this figure justified? Does it reflect evidence on viability? Is a single figure for the whole District appropriate and justified? Is there evidence to take a different approach?
- 9) Should the policy be worded to reflect the fact that provision of affordable housing is achieved through agreement or unilateral undertaking? i.e. should it refer to affordable housing being sought?
- 10) In light of current national policy (following the Court of Appeal judgement in May 2016) are the thresholds of 10 and 5 dwellings appropriate and consistent with national policy?
- 11) Is the policy sufficiently flexible, particularly in terms of the effect on viability and the potential for off-site contributions?
- 12) Is the policy consistent with national policy in relation to the definition of affordable housing and the type of provider?

Policy H3 – Affordable housing on rural exception sites

- 13) Is the approach to outline planning applications justified? Would it have any practical effect? What is the justification for a two year limit on detailed permissions?
- 14) What is the basis for the specific figure of 40% market houses? Should a more flexible approach be taken i.e. a simple reference to the minimum necessary?
- 15) Is the policy in other respects justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Policy H4 – Securing a mix of housing

- 16) Is part 2 of the policy appropriate in light of the new National Technical Standards and Building Regulations? Is the approach justified?

Policy H5 – Specialist housing for older people

- 17) Are the criteria for the location of such developments appropriate? Should there be more flexibility to allow for schemes in rural villages with fewer services?

Policies H7-H9 – Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers

- 18) What is the evidence in terms of the need for accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers?
- 19) How is it intended to meet these needs? How will the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation Plan address needs and over what timescale? What about needs in the shorter term?
- 20) Are the criteria in Policy H8 appropriate and justified?
- 21) Overall do Policies H7-H9 set out a clear and effective approach to the provision of sufficient accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers? Are they consistent with national policy?

Policy H10 – Bringing forward allocated sites in the Growth Villages

- 22) Is criterion a) reasonable and realistic?
- 23) Is the approach to housing mix in criterion b) sufficiently clear and justified?
- 24) What is the basis for the phasing approach set out in criterion c)? Is it justified and consistent with national policy?

Policy H11 – Limited infill village housing development in the Green Belt

- 25) What is the basis for criteria a) and b)? Are they justified or should a more flexible approach be taken?
- 26) Is the policy consistent with national policy?

Policy H12 – Housing for Rural Workers

- 27) Is the approach to rural workers housing justified and consistent with national policy? What is the basis for the specific size limit in paragraph 4.83, is this justified or should a more flexible approach be taken?

Policy H13 – Replacement dwellings in the open countryside

- 28) Why are criteria a) and b) necessary, particularly in light of paragraph 89 of the NPPF in relation to replacement buildings in the Green Belt?

Matter 13 – Other policies

Issue

Whether other policies are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Development Strategy – Policies DS3, DS5, DS17 and DS18

Sustainable Communities - Policy SC0

Built Environment - Policies BE1-BE5

Healthy, Safe and Inclusive Communities – Policies HS1-HS8

Climate Change – Policies CC1-CC3

Flooding and Water – Policies FW1-FW4

Historic Environment – Policies HE1-HE6

Natural Environment – Policies NE1-NE7

Neighbourhood Planning – Policies NP1-NP2

Waste – Policies W1-W2

In responding to the following questions the Council should deal with each policy in turn, address key points raised in representations and refer to suggested modifications to overcome issues of soundness.

Questions

For all policies above

- 1) What is the basis for the policy? What is it seeking to achieve?
- 2) How does the policy relate to the evidence base?
- 3) Is the policy sufficiently clear? Will it provide sufficient guidance for decision making?
- 4) How will the policy be implemented? Is this clear?
- 5) How does the policy relate to national policy? How is it consistent? Are there any inconsistencies?
- 6) In overall terms is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

In addition specifically

- 7) Is there a need for an additional policy on telecommunications?
- 8) How does Policy CC2 sit in relation to the Written Ministerial Statement concerning onshore wind energy? Does it need to be amended and if so how?
- 9) Is Policy CC3 justified in light of the new National Technical Standards and Building Regulations?
- 10) Is Policy FW3 justified in light of the new National Technical Standards and Building Regulations?
- 11) Are Policies NP1 and NP2 actually necessary as policies? Could they be included as supporting text?
- 12) Is it appropriate to include Policies W1 and W2 given that the Council is not the Waste Authority and there is a separate Waste Core Strategy? Is it unduly onerous to require a waste management plan for one dwelling or one commercial unit?

Matter 14 – Transport

Issue

Whether the approach to transport is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies TR1 to TR6 and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (in respect of Transport)

Questions

- 1) What is the likely effect of the proposed scale and distribution of development on existing transport infrastructure, traffic levels and air quality? How has this been assessed?
- 2) How does the plan seek to mitigate transport impacts and address issues of transport infrastructure? Is this effective?
- 3) What specific improvements to transport infrastructure are proposed or will be required? What is the likely cost? How will they be brought forward and funded?
- 4) How will the provision of transport infrastructure be related in terms of timing/phasing to development proposals?
- 5) How will other agencies and organisations be involved? What level of commitment/agreement is there?
- 6) What is the current situation regarding a rail station at Kenilworth?
- 7) What is the basis for the areas of search for park and ride? What would be the potential implications of these? Would there be adverse effects? What is the current situation?
- 8) What is the current situation regarding other transport infrastructure projects?
- 9) In other respects are the Transport policies justified by evidence? Are they sufficiently clear? Do they provide adequate flexibility? Are they consistent with national policy?
- 10) Are there modifications to these policies or the wider approach to transport infrastructure which are necessary for soundness?

Matter 15 – Infrastructure, delivery and monitoring

Issue

Whether the approach to infrastructure (other than transport), delivery and monitoring is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policies DM1 and DM2, Delivery and Monitoring Activities and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Questions

- 1) What are the likely impacts of the proposed scale and distribution of development on infrastructure (other than transport)? How have these been assessed?
- 2) How is it intended to address impacts on existing infrastructure and the need for new or improved infrastructure?
- 3) What specific improvements are proposed or will be required? What is the likely cost? How will they be brought forward and funded?
- 4) How will the provision of infrastructure be related in terms of timing/phasing to development proposals?
- 5) How will other agencies and organisations be involved? What level of commitment/agreement is there?
- 6) What role will a Community Infrastructure Levy play? What are the proposals and timescale in this respect?
- 7) Are Policies DM1 and DM2 justified? Are they sufficiently clear? Do they provide adequate flexibility? Are they consistent with national policy?
- 8) Is the approach to delivery and monitoring sufficiently clear? Would it be effective?
- 9) Are there modifications to these policies or the wider approach to delivery and monitoring and infrastructure which are necessary for soundness?

