

Contents

Matter 7d – Housing Site Allocations - Barford

	Page
7d – H20 Land south of Barford House	1
7d – H21 Former Sherbourne nursery	4
7d – H22 Land off Bembridge Close	8
7d – H47 Land south of Wasperton Lane	14
7d – H48 Land south of Westham Lane	20

Warwick District Council
Local Plan Examination
Response to Inspector's Initial Matter and
Issues

Matter 7d

Proposed Housing Site Allocations
Growth Villages and Hockley Heath

H20 – Land south of Barford House
Issue

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

August 2016

Policies DS11 and DS NEW3

NAME OF SITE: H20 – Land south of Barford House

1) What is the current planning status of the site?

- a) The site has planning permission for eight dwellings. See planning application reference number W/15/1294.

2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?

- a) The site is outside the Green Belt on the edge of Barford which has been identified as Growth Village within Policy H1. The site has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA10) within the context of the Spatial Strategy. The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the spatial strategy as follows:
 - i) **Criterion a)** N/A
 - ii) **Criterion b)** The site is consistent with criterion b), being located of the edge a built up areas (Barford). The site is also in close proximity to local village services.
 - iii) **Criterion c)** N/A
 - iv) **Criterion d)** The site is consistent with this criterion as it would not lead to coalescence nor would it undermine the separate identity of the settlement.
 - v) **Criterion e)** The site is deemed suitable for development provided that the design solution / delivered format is appropriate (suitable in the context of its relationship with Barford House and the Conservation Area).
 - vi) **Criterion f)** The site falls within a parcel that has been assessed as high / medium landscape value. The allocation of the site is therefore consistent with this criterion.
 - vii) **Criterion g)** N/A. The site is not within the Green Belt.

3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- a) The development will assist the viability of local services in the village and to meet local housing needs

4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

- a) All potential impacts have been resolved through the planning application process including:
 - i) Landscape: The April 2014 Landscape Assessment (Update) identifies this site as an area of high / medium landscape sensitivity. The approved planning application satisfactorily mitigates these impacts.
 - ii) Heritage: The approved planning application accords with requirements to suitably respect the heritage assets of the locality (Barford House) and the conservation area.

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?

- a) Barford is identified as a Growth Village in Policy H1 of the Local Plan. This is as a direct consequence of the Settlement Hierarchy Report 2014 that identified those rural settlements most suitable for housing according to a range of sustainability indicators. The proposals are consistent with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan (going to referendum in September 2016). It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan identified several sites for development and furthermore the Examiner set out that there should not be a 'cap' on further sites coming forward and that any additional sites should be treated on their merits.
- b) The site and scale of housing within the approved planning application (now being implemented) was deemed to be compatible with the capacity of the village to accommodate further growth.

6) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

- a) All relevant infrastructure contributions for this site have been identified and resolved through the planning application process and the associated Section 106 agreement.

7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

- a) The 2013 CIL Viability Study (IN06) and its 2015 addendum (EXAM3) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policies, including affordable housing. The strongest viability is in rural areas and much of Leamington Spa. This area falls in an area that was assessed as being clearly viable.
- b) The developer has had the confidence to finance and submit a full planning application which further reinforces confidence that the site is deliverable and viable.

8) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

- a) The housing trajectory (Housing Supply Topic Paper Appendix 1 – HO27PM) indicates full completion of the site during the period 2018/19.
- b) Given the scale of the site, the fact it already has planning permission and that there are few constraints on the timing of the development this is considered to be realistic.

Warwick District Council
Local Plan Examination
Response to Inspector's Initial Matter and
Issues

Matter 7d
Proposed Housing Site Allocations
Growth Villages and Hockley Heath

H21 – Former Sherbourne Nursery, Barford
Issue

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

August 2016

Policies DS11 and DS NEW3

NAME OF SITE: H21 – Former Sherbourne Nursery

Also known as Land West of 22 Wellesbourne Road

1) What is the current planning status of the site?

- a) The site has planning permission for 60 dwellings (planning application W14/0693) and is currently under construction.

2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?

- a) The site is outside the Green Belt and located within the settlement of Barford Village. The site has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA10) within the context of the Spatial Strategy. The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the spatial strategy as follows:
 - i) **Criterion a)** N/A
 - ii) **Criterion b)** The site was previously developed land (former Sherbourne Nursery site). The site is in a sustainable location within Barford Village. The site is also in close proximity to local village services.
 - iii) **Criterion c)** N/A
 - iv) **Criterion d)** The site is consistent with this criterion as it would not lead to coalescence nor would it undermine the separate identity of the settlement.
 - v) **Criterion e)** The design and layout of the emerging development is of such a nature that it does not prejudice / have a detrimental impact on the nearby Conservation area.
 - vi) **Criterion f)** The planning application was in accordance with this criterion
 - vii) **Criterion g)** N/A The site is not within the Green Belt.

3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- a) The sustainability appraisal (SA10 and SA11PM) set out the sustainability benefits of each of the proposed allocations. The specific benefits relating to this are:
 - i) The development will provide an element affordable housing provision to help meet local needs.
 - ii) The development will assist the viability of local services in the village.

4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

- a) Any adverse impacts associated with the developing of the site have been addressed / mitigated for in the Planning and design process that preceded the grant of planning approval W14/0693.

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

- a) The Village Settlement Hierarchy June 2013 (V01 to V03) sets out the Council's approach to the classification of villages and rural settlements. The report explores the size of settlements, availability of services and accessibility of services, facilities and employment from the settlement (see section 4.0). It applies a scoring system to these factors to reach an objective view on the relative capacity of each settlement to accommodate development. Table 4.4 of the report shows the resulting score for each village. (NB it should be noted that this score does not take in to account policy and environmental constraints such as Green Belt, landscape, heritage, character and site availability).
- b) Using this model, Barford is identified as the sixth most sustainable village.
- c) The Village Settlement Hierarchy goes on to classify each settlement. Following the Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation (November 2013), these classifications were simplified in three categories: Growth Villages (of which there are 10); Limited Infill Villages (of which there are 24) and other settlements. The Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages are set out in paragraph 4.7 of the Submission Draft Local Plan.
- d) As a result Barford was identified as Growth Village with the potential to accommodate some housing growth and land for 60 dwellings was allocated in Barford.
- e) Since the submission of the Local Plan, the Council has had to identify additional housing land for the modifications submitted in 2016. In preparing the modifications, the Council reviewed the potential of growth villages to accommodate a proportion of the additional requirement. This work is set out in the Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (Doc V18PM).
- f) Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM) explored an indicative capacity for each of the Growth Villages. For Barford, in the context of the need for further Growth to support Coventry's Housing need, the indicative capacity was 181 dwellings. The combination of sites with recent planning permissions and earlier proposed allocations in the village totals 106 dwellings including this site. This suggests that Barford has the capacity to accommodate around 75 more dwellings.
- g) The proposals are consistent with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan (going to referendum in September 2016). It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan identified several sites for development and furthermore the Examiner set out that there should not be a 'cap' on further sites coming forward and that any additional sites should be treated on their merits.
- h) As a result, the scale of the development is considered compatible with the ability of the village to accommodate increased growth without prejudicing the physical and environmental capacity/ attributes of the settlement.

6) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

- a) All constraints have been overcome through the planning application process.
- b) Infrastructure contributions have been agreed through a signed S106 Agreement.

7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

- a) Yes. The site is currently under construction.

8) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

- a) The housing trajectory (see appendix 1 of the Housing Supply Topic Paper – Doc Ho27PM) indicates completion of the site during 2016/17
- b) Given the scale of the site remaining to be delivered this is considered to be realistic.

Warwick District Council
Local Plan Examination
Response to Inspector's Initial Matter and
Issues

Matter 7d
Proposed Housing Site Allocations
Growth Villages and Hockley Heath

H22 – Land off Bemridge Close

Issue

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

August 2016

Policies DS11 and DS NEW3

NAME OF SITE: H22 – Land off Bemridge Close

1) What is the current planning status of the site?

- a) The site is agricultural land.

2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?

- a) The site is within the settlement of Barford Village. The site has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA10 and SA11PM) within the context of the Spatial Strategy. The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the spatial strategy as follows:
 - i) **Criterion a)** N/A
 - ii) **Criterion b)** It is a greenfield site within Barford Village. The site is in a sustainable location with good access to local facilities.
 - iii) **Criterion c)** N/A
 - iv) **Criterion d)** The site is consistent with this criterion as it would not lead to coalescence nor would it undermine the separate identity of the settlement.
 - v) **Criterion e)** Development of this site would have to accord with the requirements of the adjacent Conservation Area.
 - vi) **Criterion f)** The site is high/ medium landscape value, it does not contain any highly sensitive features in the natural environment. The allocation is therefore consistent with this criterion.
 - vii) **Criterion g)** N/A - the site is in not within the Green Belt.

3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- a) The sustainability appraisal (SA10 and SA11PM) set out the sustainability benefits of each of the proposed allocations. The specific benefits relating to this are:
 - i) The development will provide an element affordable housing provision to help meet local needs
 - ii) The development will assist the viability of local services in the village

4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

- a) **Transport and Traffic:** The Highways Authority supports a housing development here. Representations have raised concerns about the impact of the development on the road network and the ability to create a safe / appropriate access to the site. The Highways

Authority and have considered both aspects and are of the opinion that access and traffic volumes are not problematical and that safe / appropriate access arrangements are achievable. Concerns were also raised in representations regarding the impact of the development / construction process on local residences and that parking issues (post development) will cause issues / obstruction to the local highway. The construction phases of this development will require management. Proposals to be put forward by the developer at the planning application phase will have to satisfactorily address parking / internal circulatory arrangements. The management of construction will ensure that the safety of, and residential amenity of existing local residences is maintained.

- b) **Ecology:** Representations expressed concern regarding the bat house currently located on this site. A survey was recently undertaken on behalf of the developers and advice sought from Warwickshire County Council ecologists. The view was that this bat house was being used but with close co-operation/ consultation with ecology officers at Warwickshire County Council there was no particular impediment to it being re-located if required to accommodate the intended housing development.
- c) **Hedgerows:** Concern was also expressed in representations regarding the impact on protected hedgerows. Hedgerows of specific value can be verified, given due consideration and absorbed within an appropriate design solution at the planning application stage.

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?

- a) The Village Settlement Hierarchy June 2013 (V01 to V03) sets out the Council's approach to the classification of villages and rural settlements. The report explores the size of settlements, availability of services and accessibility of services, facilities and employment from the settlement (see section 4.0). It applies a scoring system to these factors to reach an objective view on the relative capacity of each settlement to accommodate development. Table 4.4 of the report shows the resulting score for each village. (NB it should be noted that this score does not take in to account policy and environmental constraints such as Green Belt, landscape, heritage, character and site availability).
- b) Using this model, Barford is identified as the sixth most sustainable village.
- c) The Village Settlement Hierarchy goes on to classify each settlement. Following the Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation (November 2013), these classifications were simplified in three categories: Growth Villages (of which there are 10); Limited Infill Villages (of which there are 24) and other settlements. The Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages are set out in paragraph 4.7 of the Submission Draft Local Plan.
- d) As a result Barford was identified as Growth Village with the potential to accommodate some housing growth and land for 60 dwellings was allocated in Barford.

- e) Since the submission of the Local Plan, the Council has had to identify additional housing land for the modifications submitted in 2016. In preparing the modifications, the Council reviewed the potential of growth villages to accommodate a proportion of the additional requirement. This work is set out in the Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM).
- f) Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM) explored an indicative capacity for each of the Growth Villages. For Barford, in the context of the need for further Growth to support Coventry's Housing need, the indicative capacity was 181 dwellings. The combination of sites with recent planning permissions and earlier proposed allocations in the village totals 106 dwellings including this site. This suggests that Barford has the capacity to accommodate around 75 more dwellings..
- g) The proposals are consistent with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan (going to referendum in September 2016). It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan identified several sites for development and furthermore the Examiner set out that there should not be a 'cap' on further sites coming forward and that any additional sites should be treated on their merits.
- h) As a result, the scale of the development is considered compatible with the ability of the village to accommodate increased growth without prejudicing the physical and environmental capacity / attributes of the settlement.

6) What are the infrastructure requirements/costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

- a) The 2013 CIL Viability Study (IN06) and its 2015 addendum (EXAM3) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policy requirements, including affordable housing.
- b) The studies tested the ability of a range of housing sites (including a sample of strategic sites) within Warwick District to yield contributions to infrastructure requirements through CIL. Appraisals undertaken also incorporated an allowance of £1,500 per unit to address any residual S278 and Section 106 costs, albeit the actual sums sought will vary according to site specific circumstances. On strategic sites that carry higher costs than other developments, there is a higher allowance of £10,000 per unit for on-site infrastructure (site roads, sewers, utilities, drainage etc.) and community infrastructure (schools, community facilities etc.) plus a further £13,000 per unit to contribute towards on-site community infrastructure through S106. This reflects longer build-out rates of larger sites which require developers to carry costs for much longer times than is the case for smaller schemes.
- c) The ability of residential development to absorb infrastructure requirements through Section 106 / 278 contributions (whilst remaining viable) is also evident by the large number of greenfield strategic sites that currently have planning permission and are presently under construction on sites south of Warwick and Leamington Spa.

- d) Specific infrastructure requirements (physical, social and green) associated with the Plan as a whole are identified and costed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IN07PM). Most components of the IDP do not relate directly to a specific site within the Plan and it is anticipated that infrastructure contributions will be negotiated on a case by case basis in accordance with the CIL Regulations. Full details of infrastructure requirements and costs cannot therefore be set out for each site at this stage.
- e) It should be noted that the IDP is a continuously evolving document and will continue to be refreshed as data on infrastructure requirements are refined or new / changing priorities and needs are identified throughout the plan period. It should also be noted that the Council (in partnership with relevant partners) will continue to explore the availability of other sources of external funding to augment developer contributions.
- f) It is anticipated that housing site H22 will be required to make a proportionate contribution to the following requirements:-

Infrastructure type	Comments (but only if clarification required)
Provision of on-site open space and contributions to other open space requirements	✓
Contributions to Health (Hospitals)	✓
Contributions to Health (G.P. services)	✓
Contributions to Highways / Transport	✓
Contributions to Education (Primary)	✓
Contributions to Education (Secondary)	✓
Contributions to other infrastructure requirements in line with the CIL regs	✓

- g) **Infrastructure:** Concerns have been raised through representations regarding the possibility of the allocation causing problems relating to the foul and surface water drainage regime at this location. It is anticipated that appropriately designed SUD's will address surface water issues. Attention to foul drainage details will also be a matter for consideration that can be addressed at the detailed design / implementation phase. Concerns have been raised in the representations that there is a lack of investment in local schools. There has recently been investment in the Local Primary school to improve pupil capacity. Further contributions will be sought as deemed necessary. There has been concern that local doctor's surgeries will not have adequate capacity. This is a matter being addressed through close liaison with the CCG. The CCG are formulating a strategic response to identify where and what is needed to augment existing surgeries (or where new facilities

may be required). It is anticipated that developer contributions will be sought where necessary to assist in the funding of health infrastructure.

7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

- a) The Viability Studies (IN06, EXAM3 and HO24PM) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policies, including affordable housing. The strongest viability is in rural areas and much of Leamington Spa. This area falls in an area that was assessed as being clearly viable.
- b) Given the scale of the site and that there are relatively few constraints, this site is considered deliverable.

8) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

- a) The housing trajectory (see appendix 1 of the Housing Supply Topic Paper – HO27PM) indicates that the site could be commenced and delivered in the period 2018/19.
- b) Given the scale of the site and that there are relatively few constraints on the timing of the development this is considered to be realistic.

N.B. key concerns raised in representations are highlighted **bold**

Warwick District Council
Local Plan Examination
Response to Inspector's Initial Matter and
Issues

Matter 7d

Proposed Housing Site Allocations
Growth Villages and Hockley Heath

H47 – Land south of Wasperton Lane
Issue

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

August 2016

Policies DS11 and DS NEW3

NAME OF SITE: H47 – Land south of Wasperton Lane

1) What is the current planning status of the site?

- a) The site is currently agricultural land.

2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?

- a) The site is on the edge of the settlement of Barford Village.. The site has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA10 and SA11PM) within the context of the Spatial Strategy. The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the spatial strategy as follows:
 - i) **Criterion a)** N/A
 - ii) **Criterion b)** It is a greenfield site on the edge of Barford Village. The site is in a sustainable location with access to local facilities.
 - iii) **Criterion c)** N/A
 - iv) **Criterion d)** The site is consistent with this criterion as it would not lead to coalescence nor would it undermine the separate identity of the settlement.
 - v) **Criterion e)** There are no significant heritage impacts associated with the site.
 - vi) **Criterion f)** The site is not high landscape value nor does it contain any other highly sensitive features in the natural environment. The allocation is therefore consistent with this criterion.
 - vii) **Criterion g)** N/A The site is in not within the Green Belt.

3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- a) The sustainability appraisal (SA10 and SA11PM) set out the sustainability benefits of each of the proposed allocations. The specific benefits relating to this are:
 - i) The development will provide an element affordable housing provision to help meet local needs
 - ii) The development will assist the viability of local services in the village

4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

- a) **Transport and Traffic:** The Highways Authority supports a housing development here. Representations have raised concerns about the impact of the development on the road network and the ability to create a safe / appropriate access to the site. The Highways Authority has considered both aspects and is of the opinion that access and traffic volumes

are not problematical and access arrangements are achievable.

- b) **Surface water flooding:** There have been concerns raised in the representations that the land is (in part) subject to surface water flooding. It is considered that consideration / delivery of a suitable SUD's system will mitigate for this matter. Regarding mains sewers (foul drainage) a connection to the existing network will have to be made as part of the development process.
- c) **Character and appearance of the open countryside:** Concerns have been raised that this development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the open countryside. This is accepted; however, the landscape report (LA08PM) suggested appropriate screen landscaping would provide a new boundary and mitigate for this.
- d) A representation was made by the landowner suggesting that the allocation should be extended to embrace a wider area, to accommodate circa 210 dwellings. The Council does not support this position. Whilst it is considered appropriate to locate a modest development at this site, the extended area is not necessary and would have a negative impact on the appearance of the countryside and would not be compatible with the settlement's built form and capacity. The landscape report (LA08PM) indicates that such a large site would have an unacceptable impact on the countryside
- e) **Green Corridor:** Concerns have been expressed that given Wasperton Lane is identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan as a green corridor, this allocation should be withdrawn / is inappropriate. It is considered that the green corridor could still be maintained with appropriate landscaping / design of any housing development.
- f) **Heritage:** Representations have stated that as Wasperton House (a listed building) is 200 yards from this allocation, therefore development for housing is not acceptable. It is considered that this should not be a significant impediment to the site's delivery as sensitive layout / design will mitigate the impacts on the listed building.

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?

- a) The Village Settlement Hierarchy June 2013 (V01 to V03) sets out the Council's approach to the classification of villages and rural settlements. The report explores the size of settlements, availability of services and accessibility of services, facilities and employment from the settlement (see section 4.0). It applies a scoring system to these factors to reach an objective view on the relative capacity of each settlement to accommodate development. Table 4.4 of the report shows the resulting score for each village. (NB it should be noted that this score does not take in to account policy and environmental constraints such as Green Belt, landscape, heritage, character and site availability).
- b) Using this model, Barford is identified as the sixth most sustainable village.

- c) The Village Settlement Hierarchy goes on to classify each settlement. Following the Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation (November 2013), these classifications were simplified in three categories: Growth Villages (of which there are ten); Limited Infill Villages (of which there are 24) and other settlements. The Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages are set out in paragraph 4.7 of the Submission Draft Local Plan.
- d) As a result Barford was identified as a Growth Village with the potential to accommodate some housing growth and land for 60 dwellings was allocated in Barford.
- e) Since the submission of the Local Plan, the Council has had to identify additional housing land for the modifications submitted in 2016. In preparing the modifications, the Council reviewed the potential of growth villages to accommodate a proportion of the additional requirement. This work is set out in the Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM).
- f) Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM) explored an indicative capacity for each of the Growth Villages. For Barford, in the context of the need for further Growth to support Coventry's Housing need, the indicative capacity was 181 dwellings. The combination of sites with recent planning permissions and earlier proposed allocations in the village totals 106 dwellings. This suggests that Barford has the capacity to accommodate around 75 more dwellings, including this site.
- g) The proposals are consistent with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan (going to referendum in September 2016). It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan identified several sites for development; furthermore the Examiner set out that there should not be a 'cap' on further sites coming forward and that any additional sites should be treated on their merits.
- h) As a result, the scale of the development is considered compatible with the ability of the village to accommodate increased growth without prejudicing the physical and environmental capacity / attributes of the settlement.

6) What are the infrastructure requirements / costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

- a) The 2013 CIL Viability Study (IN06) and its 2015 addendum (EXAM3) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policy requirements, including affordable housing.
- b) The studies tested the ability of a range of housing sites (including a sample of strategic sites) within Warwick District to yield contributions to infrastructure requirements through CIL. Appraisals undertaken also incorporated an allowance of £1,500 per unit to address any residual S278 and Section 106 costs, albeit the actual sums sought will vary according to site specific circumstances. On strategic sites that carry higher costs than other developments, there is a higher allowance of £10,000 per unit for on-site infrastructure (site

roads, sewers, utilities, drainage etc.) and community infrastructure (schools, community facilities etc.) plus a further £13,000 per unit to contribute towards on-site community infrastructure through S106. This reflects longer build-out rates of larger sites which require developers to carry costs for much longer times than is the case for smaller schemes.

- c) The ability of residential development to absorb infrastructure requirements through Section 106 / 278 contributions (whilst remaining viable) is also evident by the large number of greenfield strategic sites that currently have planning permission and are presently under construction on sites south of Warwick and Leamington Spa.
- d) Specific infrastructure requirements (physical, social and green) associated with the Plan as a whole are identified and costed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IN07PM). Most components of the IDP do not relate directly to a specific site within the Plan and it is anticipated that infrastructure contributions will be negotiated on a case by case basis in accordance with the CIL Regulations. Full details of infrastructure requirements and costs cannot therefore be set out for each site at this stage.
- e) It should be noted that the IDP is a continuously evolving document and will continue to be refreshed as data on infrastructure requirements are refined or new / changing priorities and needs are identified throughout the plan period. It should also be noted that the Council (in partnership with relevant partners) will continue to explore the availability of other sources of external funding to augment developer contributions.
- f) It is anticipated that housing site H47 will be required to make a proportionate contribution to the following requirements:-

Infrastructure type	Comments (but only if clarification required)
Provision of on-site open space and contributions to other open space requirements	✓
Contributions to Health (Hospitals)	✓
Contributions to Health (G.P. services)	✓
Contributions to Highways / Transport	✓
Contributions to Education (Primary)	✓
Contributions to Education (Secondary)	✓
Contributions to other infrastructure requirements in line with the CIL regs	✓

7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

- a) The Viability Studies (IN06, EXAM3 and HO24PM) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policies, including affordable housing. The strongest viability is in rural areas and much of Leamington Spa. This area falls in an area that was assessed as being clearly viable.
- b) There is a landowner willing to make the land available for development. A representation has been made stating that a tenant farmer has a lifetime tenancy agreement for agricultural use, and they are opposed to this allocation as it would fragment their land interest. At the point of this document being submitted, the Council has been assured by the landowner's agents that there is a release clause in the tenancy agreement should planning permission for this site be attained.
- c) Given the scale of the site and that there are relatively few constraints, this site is considered deliverable.

8) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

- a) The housing trajectory (see appendix 1 of the Housing Supply Topic Paper – HO27PM) indicates that the site could be commenced in 2019 with 15 units built in 2019/20 and a further 15 units delivered in 2020/21.
- b) Given the scale of the site and that there are relatively few constraints on the timing of the development this is considered to be realistic.

N.B. key concerns raised in representations are highlighted **bold**

Warwick District Council
Local Plan Examination
Response to Inspector's Initial Matter and
Issues

Matter 7d

Proposed Housing Site Allocations
Growth Villages and Hockley Heath

H48 – Land south of Westham Lane
Issue

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

August 2016

Policies DS11 and DS NEW3

NAME OF SITE: H48 – Land south of Westham Lane

1) What is the current planning status of the site?

- a) The site is currently greenfield and in agricultural use.

2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?

- a) The site is within the settlement of Barford Village.. The site has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal (Doc's SA10 and SA11PM) within the context of the Spatial Strategy. The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the spatial strategy as follows:
 - i) **Criterion a)** N/A
 - ii) **Criterion b)** It is a greenfield site within Barford Village. The site is in a sustainable location with good access to local facilities.
 - iii) **Criterion c)** N/A
 - iv) **Criterion d)** The site is consistent with this criterion as it would not lead to coalescence nor would it undermine the separate identity of the settlement.
 - v) **Criterion e)** The site is adjacent to the Barford Conservation area boundary, however as demonstrated by the ongoing successful development on the former Sherbourne Nursery site (immediately to the north of this parcel) it is proven that with good design new development can be assimilated successfully, and therefore be consistent with this criterion.
 - vi) **Criterion f)** The site is not high landscape value nor does it contain any other highly sensitive features in the natural environment. The allocation is therefore consistent with this criterion.
 - vii) **Criterion g)** N/A The site is in not within the Green Belt.

3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits that the proposed development would bring?

- a) The sustainability appraisal (SA10 and SA11PM) set out the sustainability benefits of each of the proposed allocations. The specific benefits relating to this are:
 - i) The development will provide an element affordable housing provision to help meet local needs.
 - ii) The development will assist the viability of local services in the village

4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?

- a) **Transport and Traffic:** The Highways Authority supports a housing development here. Representations have raised concerns about the impact of the development on the road network and the ability to create a safe / appropriate access to the site. The Highways Authority and have considered both aspects and are of the opinion that access and traffic volumes are not problematical and access arrangements are achievable (also via Bemridge Close (see Matter 7d).
- b) **Drainage:** Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of this development on mains drainage. It is considered that adequate connections to the existing system will be attainable/ achievable. This will be a matter for detailed consideration at the planning application stage.
- c) **Heritage:** Concerns have been raised that the allocation does not appear in the Historic Environment Assessment Statement (January 2016) and that there is insufficient evidence to support this allocation with regard to its desirability to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. It should be stated that a precedent has been set by the successful / ongoing development to the north on the former Sherbourne Nursery site that has addressed impacts / the relationship with the Conservation area appropriately.
- d) **Neighbourhood Plan:** Concerns have been raised regarding the acceleration of growth in Barford beyond the sites identified for housing within the Neighbourhood Planning process. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan is scheduled for its referendum in September 2016. It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan identified several sites for development and furthermore the Examiner set out that these sites should not be a 'cap' to further sites coming forward and that any additional sites should be treated on their merits.

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?

- a) The Village Settlement Hierarchy June 2013 (V01 to V03) sets out the Council's approach to the classification of villages and rural settlements. The report explores the size of settlements, availability of services and accessibility of services, facilities and employment from the settlement (see section 4.0). It applies a scoring system to these factors to reach an objective view on the relative capacity of each settlement to accommodate development. Table 4.4 of the report shows the resulting score for each village. (NB it should be noted that this score does not take in to account policy and environmental constraints such as Green Belt, landscape, heritage, character and site availability).
- b) Using this model, Barford is identified as the sixth most sustainable village.
- c) The Village Settlement Hierarchy goes on to classify each settlement. Following the Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries Consultation (November 2013), these classifications were simplified in three categories: Growth Villages (of which there are ten); Limited Infill Villages (of which there are 24) and other settlements. The Growth Villages and Limited Infill Villages are set out in paragraph 4.7 of the Submission Draft Local Plan.

- d) As a result Barford was identified as a Growth Village with the potential to accommodate some housing growth and land for 60 dwellings was allocated in Barford.
- e) Since the submission of the Local Plan, the Council has had to identify additional housing land for the modifications submitted in 2016. In preparing the modifications, the Council reviewed the potential of growth villages to accommodate a proportion of the additional requirement. This work is set out in the Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM).
- f) Village Profile and Housing Allocations Update February 2016 (V18PM) explored an indicative capacity for each of the Growth Villages. For Barford, in the context of the need for further Growth to support Coventry's Housing need, the indicative capacity was 181 dwellings. The combination of sites with recent planning permissions and earlier proposed allocations in the village totals 106 dwellings. This suggests that Barford has the capacity to accommodate around 75 more dwellings, including this site.
- g) The proposals are consistent with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan (going to referendum in September 2016). It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan identified several sites for development and furthermore the Examiner set out that there should not be a 'cap' on further sites coming forward and that any additional sites should be treated on their merits.
- h) The scale of the development (45) houses is considered compatible with the ability of the village (itemised as a Growth Village in the Local Plan) to accommodate increased growth without prejudicing the physical and environmental capacity/ attributes of the settlement.
- i) Although representations have raised concerns that there are **not enough services / facilities** to support this development, Barford is identified as a Growth Village in the Local Plan for the reasons set out above and the Council contends that the work it has undertaken shows that it has the capacity to support the level of development proposed.

6) What are the infrastructure requirements / costs and are there physical or other constraints to development? How would these be addressed?

- a) The 2013 CIL Viability Study (IN06) and its 2015 addendum (EXAM3) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policy requirements, including affordable housing.
- b) The studies tested the ability of a range of housing sites (including a sample of strategic sites) within Warwick District to yield contributions to infrastructure requirements through CIL. Appraisals undertaken also incorporated an allowance of £1,500 per unit to address any residual S278 and Section 106 costs, albeit the actual sums sought will vary according to site specific circumstances. On strategic sites that carry higher costs than other developments, there is a higher allowance of £10,000 per unit for on-site infrastructure (site roads, sewers, utilities, drainage etc.) and community infrastructure (schools, community

facilities etc.) plus a further £13,000 per unit to contribute towards on-site community infrastructure through S106. This reflects longer build-out rates of larger sites which require developers to carry costs for much longer times than is the case for smaller schemes.

- c) The ability of residential development to absorb infrastructure requirements through Section 106 / 278 contributions (whilst remaining viable) is also evident by the large number of greenfield strategic sites that currently have planning permission and are presently under construction on sites south of Warwick and Leamington Spa.
- d) Specific infrastructure requirements (physical, social and green) associated with the Plan as a whole are identified and costed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IN07PM). Most components of the IDP do not relate directly to a specific site within the Plan and it is anticipated that infrastructure contributions will be negotiated on a case by case basis in accordance with the CIL Regulations. Full details of infrastructure requirements and costs cannot therefore be set out for each site at this stage.
- e) It should be noted that the IDP is a continuously evolving document and will continue to be refreshed as data on infrastructure requirements are refined or new / changing priorities and needs are identified throughout the plan period. It should also be noted that the Council (in partnership with relevant partners) will continue to explore the availability of other sources of external funding to augment developer contributions.
- f) It is anticipated that housing site H48 will be required to make a proportionate contribution to the following requirements:-

Infrastructure type	Comments (but only if clarification required)
Provision of on-site open space and contributions to other open space requirements	✓
Contributions to Health (Hospitals)	✓
Contributions to Health (G.P. services)	✓
Contributions to Highways / Transport	✓
Contributions to Education (Primary)	✓
Contributions to Education (Secondary)	✓
Contributions to other infrastructure requirements in line with the CIL regs	✓

7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

- a) The Viability Studies (IN06, EXAM3 and HO24PM) demonstrate that all broad locations in the District are viable in the context of the proposed Local Plan policies, including affordable housing. The strongest viability is in rural areas and much of Leamington Spa. This area falls in an area that was assessed as being clearly viable.
- b) There is a landowner willing to make the land available for development. A site promoter is work on behalf of the landowner to prepare drawings and to work towards bringing the site forward for development quickly.
- c) Given the scale of the site and that there are relatively few constraints, this site is considered deliverable.

8) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?

- a) The housing trajectory (see appendix 1 of the Housing Supply Topic Paper – HO27PM) indicates that the site could be commenced in 2018/19 and completed 2019/20.
- b) Given the scale of the site and the fact that there are relatively few constraints on the timing of the development, this is considered to be realistic.

N.B. key concerns raised in representations are highlighted **bold**