

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
H18 – Former Aylesbury 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: H18 – Former Aylesbury House

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

- a) This is a previously developed site. The last use of the Listed Building was as a hotel. The land and buildings are no longer in use and the building is in a poor state of repair, in need of a new use and maintenance to ensure its survival.
- b) **Application No. W/16/1169:** Conversion / extension of Grade II Aylesbury House hotel to form 5 No. dwellings, the demolition of 6 No. existing outbuildings, and the development of 14 No. new dwellings, all with associated engineering, landscaping and access works. This application is still to be determined

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

- a) Although this is a Green Belt site, it is previously developed and therefore it would be in line with Government policy to consider the site for residential use. Added to this, there is a presumption to make use of vacant Listed Buildings to bring them fully back into use thereby ensuring their future.
- b) Although the site is close to Hockley Heath, it is not strictly compliant with the spatial strategy in that it lies outside the built up area. However, the Council has taken the view that exceptions apply in this particular case as the development of the site has the potential to bring a dilapidated listed building back in to use through the development of previously developed land.

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

- a) The development of this site has potential to restore and bring back in to use a Grade II Listed Building by redeveloping poor quality outbuildings. The development also has potential to restore the walled garden in the grounds and through careful design improve the setting of the listed building.

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

- a) The setting of the listed building: development of the site could have a negative impact on the setting of the listed building. However given the poor design and state of some of the outbuildings, with good layout and design improvements to both the building itself and its setting are likely. To assist this, the development should be restricted to the footprint of the existing buildings.

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 site is not directly associated with a village settlement within the District. It is in fairly close proximity to Hockley Heath which is in Solihull Borough. Hockley is a fairly large settlement with shops, a post office, primary school, rail station and bus services. It is

anticipated that it will be able to accommodate the impacts of this development without affecting its character, appearance and services.

b) 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) Subject to a viability assessment on the site in accordance with Policy DM2 it is anticipated that housing site H18 will be required to make a proportionate contribution to the following requirements:-

Infrastructure type	Comments (but only if clarification required)
Contributions to Health (Hospitals)	✓

Contributions to Health (G.P. services)	✓	
Contributions to Highways / Transport	✓	
Contributions to Education (Primary)	Primary school provision would be in Kingswood	
Contributions to Education (Secondary)	✓	
Contributions to other infrastructure requirements in line with the CIL regs	✓	
c) Is the site realistically viable and deliverable?		
<p>a) The site is subject to a planning application and the evidence provided as part of this suggests the site is deliverable (there are no major constraints) and viable (subject to a viability assessments to consider whether flexibility on section 106 requirements should be applied in line with Policy DM2. Since the Listed Building status offers considerable weight to its reuse, it is considered essential to find a use, particularly if this use is one for which it was originally built, to ensure its survival and maintenance. It is fully available and could attract some funding to assist with development – it is therefore deliverable.</p>		
d) What is the expected timescale for development and is this realistic?		
<p>a) The expected timescale for development of all the anticipated 20 units in total is 2017/18.</p> <p>b) Given that this site is currently subject to a planning application and is fully available, this is entirely realistic. Additionally, a speedy resolution will ensure the future of the Listed Building should therefore be encouraged to meet this timescale for completion.</p>		

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

e) What would be the effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?		
<p>a) The site would remain within the Green Belt. The status of the parcel would be unaffected by the development as the footprint of the development will be required to align with the footprint of the existing buildings.</p>		
f) What would be the effect on the openness of the Green Belt?		
<p>a) There would be no effect on the openness of the Green Belt. The site is a previously developed site and with buildings already existing, any necessary additional structures would be required to comply with paragraphs 89 and 131 of the NPPF.</p>		

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

- a) Exceptional circumstances do not apply to this site. The site would be brought forward under paragraph 88 and 89 of the NPPF – Very Special Circumstances. It would remain within the Green Belt.

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