
WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

MATTER 7D – PROPOSED HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS – GROWTH VILLAGES AND HOCKLEY HEATH

REFERENCE SITE H28 – NORTH OF BIRMINGHAM ROAD, HATTON PARK

REPRESENTATIONS

For and on behalf of:

THE BURMAN FAMILY

In respect of:

LAND AT BIRMINGHAM ROAD, HATTON

PROPOSED MODIFICATION H28

1. BACKGROUND

- 1) We submitted detailed Representations in April 2016 to the Additional Main Modifications.
- 2) At that time our Clients supported in principle the release of part of their land for housing as H28 "Hatton Park – north of Birmingham Road" for an estimated 120 dwellings.
- 3) In those Representations we registered our formal objections to a number of aspects relating to the size, character and layout of the proposals for H28 and its estimated 120 dwellings.
- 4) We have seen the submission by Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey in respect of this landholding and generally support the proposals made therein.

2. MATTER 7D – PROPOSED HOUSING SITE ALLOCATIONS (SITE H28 – NORTH OF BIRMINGHAM ROAD, HATTON PARK)

- 1) What is the current planning status of the site?
 - 2.1.1. As set out in the Barton Willmore submission.
- 2) How does it fit within the overall spatial strategy?
 - 2.2.1. Given that Hatton is identified as a Growth Village and a Secondary Service Village, it is logical that Hatton accommodates its reasonable share of the proposed housing growth for the District as a whole. The site is located close to Warwick Parkway station and is therefore in a sustainable location. The boundaries of the site are such that the proposals for housing can be seen as a rounding-off of Hatton Park on its south-eastern corner.
- 3) In addition to housing provision, are there other benefits than the proposed development would bring?
 - 2.2.2. Economic, transport via Hatton Parkway, bus services to Warwick / Leamington, an acknowledged local community facility and an opportunity to extend housing provision in this location by a mix of houses and tenures.
- 4) What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site? How could they be mitigated?
 - 2.2.3. This is generally an arable field actively farmed to the edge of the ownership, surrounded on its north-eastern, eastern and south-eastern boundaries by an extensive and high hedge / mature trees to Ugly Bridge Road. The southern boundary is similarly hedged and treed. There will be no undue loss in farming terms from the whole of this field being re-developed. It is highly likely that some of the proceeds of sale will go towards extending the present farming ownerships in the area. This site was acknowledged as having relatively low sensitivity for housing development. The development can be reasonably and positively designed within the framework of the field boundaries and any adverse impacts that there may be are relatively minor and can be accommodated. The gift and incorporation of Smiths Covert in the development scheme will have substantial community / residents benefits for Hatton Park as a whole.
- 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?
 - 2.2.4. This site as a whole was originally indicated for a capacity for 170 dwellings where it was considered that that number was reasonable. As reported in our previous Representations, the reduction in the Allocation is not justified by landscape issues and the present design of H28 simply seeks to reduce the numbers from 170 to 120 to accommodate the change in political view on the basis of an incredibly poor design for the site. Our view has always been that sites should be reasonably developed to their maximum capacity whilst

incorporating any mitigation measures that might be beneficial and assist with the final design. As reported in our previous Representations there is sufficient landscape and buffering along the eastern boundary without the need for any additional buffering. There might be a benefit in providing a small buffer along the edge of Smiths Covert simply to allow access and works to those trees along the edge of the wood and this could be achieved via a footpath / cycle way.

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

2.2.5. See Barton Willmore's Submission.

7) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?

2.2.6. We are clear that the site is viable and deliverable and this was proved by our previous marketing of the land and subsequently by Taylor Wimpey's Option to Purchase the landholding. Taylor Wimpey have a very good track record in Warwick District in building and disposing of market / affordable dwellings.

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

2.2.7. See Barton Willmore's Submission. This is in line with other schemes and proposals of this type in the region.

9) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?

2.2.8. Accepting that Warwick District had to find additional housing sites to facilitate the acceptable level of growth through the Additional Main Modification process, it did so making rational decisions on the acceptability or otherwise of settlements and then individual sites to meet sustainability criteria and where there would be the least effect on the acknowledged purposes for the inclusion of land within the Green Belt. The present site in its role of rounding-off the development would provide long term, stable and beneficial Green Belt boundaries along Ugly Bridge Road to the east and Birmingham Road to the south. It is interesting to note that the existing Green Belt boundary on the western side of the subject land, H28, are extremely poor and lacking in proper definition for the long term, hence the proposal to adopt the substantial hedge / tree line on the edge of Ugly Bridge Road.

10) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?

2.2.9. A substantial part of the existing built Hatton Park lay in the Green Belt. The development on that has been accommodated, generally, without any undue concern. The rounding-off of Hatton Park on its eastern side will, because of the topography, be easily absorbed within the existing landscape given the rounding landscape outside the site's boundary. In our view the compromise on the openness will be relatively minor, easily absorbed and mitigated by planting / open space within the development.

11) Are there exceptional circumstances which justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

2.2.10. See Submission by Barton Willmore. As reported, this is a clear case of appropriate settlements in the hierarchy for the District bearing their reasonable share of the proposed additional requirement for housing need that is required to meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the District. Hatton Park and its proposed for H28 fits appropriately within the Council's reasonable planning strategy for the District as a whole.