

Hearing Statement Matter 4

**Representations
on behalf of the landowners
of
SHLAA site**

C20/proposed allocation H19

**Baginton - Land north of
Rosswood Farm**

August 2016



This Hearing Statement is submitted on behalf of the landowners of SHLAA site C20 which comprises the original Site H19, as proposed in the submitted Local Plan.

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?

We agree with the Council's proposed spatial strategy including the decision to release areas of the Green Belt necessary to deliver the District's housing needs. This is in compliance with paragraph 84 of the NPPF, to take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. Without these releases and providing for the full OAN, the Green Belt boundary would remain under pressure due to unmet housing need and would not endure beyond the plan period. It would consequently fall foul of paragraph 83 of the NPPF and be unsound.

2) How has this been affected by the Council's suggested modifications?

No comment.

3) Specifically how would the approach to development on the edge of Coventry affect the spatial strategy?

The proposed allocations on the edge of Coventry are to address the housing needs of Coventry, as per the Inspectors Interim Report. As such, they do not affect the spatial strategy to provide for Warwick Districts needs.

4) What alternative options have been considered in terms of the location and broad distribution of development and why were these discounted?

No comment.

5) How were different areas of Green Belt assessed and how has this informed the strategy?

No comment.

6) Is the approach to the location and broad distribution of development appropriate and justified?

We support the approach to villages, specifically allowing for, and allocating, growth in the most sustainable settlements.



This should be the case, even in the Green Belt. Whilst the NPPF seeks to protect Green Belt, it states that the appropriate mechanism for altering Green Belt boundaries is via the preparation of a Local Plan. Of particular importance is the reference at paragraph 83 that in considering boundaries, permanence and endurance of the boundary are key. The growing population and increased need as demonstrated by the joint SHMA is likely to put pressure on Green Belt boundaries in the future. It is therefore important that the Council plan for sufficient land to be released from the Green Belt now, in order to avoid pressure and defend boundary amendments in the future.

7) What is the basis for identifying Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages? Is the list of villages in each category justified and appropriate?

The Village Settlement Hierarchy Report, June 2013, demonstrates a robust and justifiable approach to the classifications of village and rural settlements to support the policies and proposals of the emerging Local Plan, particularly the apportionment of housing growth. This identified Baginton as a Secondary Service Village, based on its service provision. It was found to have facilities suitable to accommodate 70-90 dwellings so Baginton can more than comfortably accommodate the 35 dwellings in the submitted Plan and 80 dwellings in the March 2016 Proposed Modifications.

Baginton's place in this hierarchy is considered justified based on its service provision. Whilst it lacks formal educational or medical services it benefits from a village hall, the Royal British Legion, two public houses, a village shop/post office, hot food takeaway, five nurseries, children's playground, Millennium field (used for village events, sports and recreation and includes a community orchard), a village green and ancient Baginton Oak tree and two museums. The Parish also includes the Middlemarch Business Park and airport, both significant employment locations.

BAG1128 209054 Draft Hearing Statement August 2016