

Record count: 79

**71546****Object****RLS17 - Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre****Respondent:** Mrs vivien bryer**Summary:**

Why should the Fire Station become available as a development site? I hadn't heard that it was under threat of closure.

**Attachments:** None**71547****Support****RLS15 - Cycling****Respondent:** Mrs vivien bryer**Summary:**

I support the aim of encouraging cycle use, but would like to point out some of the weaknesses of current cycle tracks.

- 1)The ones which are merely designated by paint lines on roads are too narrow encouraging drivers to pass even more closely than usual, and they often end suddenly.
- 2)Those on pavements cross people's drives but do not have dotted lines asking them to stop before the cycle track so they drive out too fast to stop if a cyclist is passing.
- 3)Those on pavements often are on a blind bend where they are about to cross a junction.

**Attachments:** None**71548****Object****RLS23 - Secondary Retail Areas within the Creative Quarter****Respondent:** Mr Jan Lucas**Summary:**

I cannot find a reference to the farmers' market in this plan. I think it would be a good idea to re-instate the farmers' market - it supports local producers, and we need to encourage buying local produce to cut down our carbon footprint, and the council could easily subsidise this.

The current market no longer appears to be a farmers' market (last time I went I only counted one genuine local producer out of all of the stalls), so it needs a shake up, and the council needs to get more local producers involved.

**Attachments:** None**71549****Object****RLS2 - Housing design****Respondent:** Mr Peter Southgate**Summary:**

As an architect based in and practising in Leamington Spa, I support the aims of this policy, especially the stated sustainability goals. However, the reference to CSH 4 should be reconsidered, given that the Code was withdrawn by Central Government in 2015. It has been replaced by the HQM regime. Energy performance standards for CSH 4 were incorporated into the UK Building Regulations (which now exceed CSH4) so it is pointless to add an extra hoop of compliance into a material planning consideration, especially as such a standard can no longer be meaningfully assessed.

Attachments: None

71550

Support

---

### 5.1 Housing and development

Respondent: Mr Peter Southgate

**Summary:**

Fully support the aims of this overall policy for the good of the town, save for my technical objection on a small part of policy RLS2.

Attachments: None

71551

Support

---

### RLS1 - Housing Development within the Royal Leamington Spa Urban Area

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Whilst supporting this in general, proposals for purpose built student accommodation should in my opinion not only be assessed against the Local Plan and any relevant supplementary planning document, but also be of an architecture particularly sympathetic to the surrounding buildings to enhance the area they are situated in.

Attachments: None

71552

Support

---

### RLS2 - Housing design

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Government Policy and Building regulations are a changing landscape which makes Local Authority requirements a nightmare to impose, but I fully support the aims which should ensure that we encourage/impose as high a standard as possible for new buildings to combat climate change, fuel poverty, resource consumption and recycling.

Attachments: None

71553

Support

---

### RLS3 - Conservation Areas

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I fully support these aims, but in view of the Government's announcement that no new petrol, diesel or hybrid cars are to be sold after 2035 I think a requirement for electric charging points should be added to the car parking requirements.

Attachments: None

71554

Object

---

### RLS2 - Housing design

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

An additional comment: in view of the Government's announcement that no new petrol, diesel or hybrid cars are to be sold after 2035 I think a requirement for electric charging points should be added to the car parking requirements.

**Attachments:** None

71555

Support

---

**RLS4 - Housing Character Outside the Conservation Areas**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I fully support these proposals especially the provision of off street car parking. In view of the Government's announcement that no new petrol, diesel or hybrid cars are to be sold after 2035 I think a requirement for electric charging points should be added to these car parking requirements.

I particularly support the aim that proposals should seek to maintain views of higher slopes, skylines and the wider landscape.

**Attachments:** None

71556

Support

---

**Appendix 2 - Local Green Space Assessment**

**Respondent:** Ms Kristie Naimo

**Summary:**

Please note on site allocation RLS 8/8 instead of 'the site is run by ARC CIC' the words should be amended to read: 'Foundry Wood is co-managed by ARC CIC and the Friends of Foundry Wood'

(Otherwise there is no acknowledgement of the Friends of Group who play a valuable role in managing this space.)

**Attachments:** None

71561

Support

---

**RLS5 - Royal Leamington Spa Housing Mix and Tenure**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I support these proposals as in my opinion a healthy community needs a good mix of housing in each area of the town.

**Attachments:** None

71562

Support

---

**RLS6 - Protection of Community Facilities**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I support these proposals. In particular the provision of reasonably priced meetings rooms for hire by local organisations in all areas is in my view essential for enabling all members of the community to access community, leisure and cultural

opportunities.

Attachments: None

## 71563

## Support

### RLS7 - Public Art

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

#### Summary:

Whilst I support this, I do hope that wherever possible local artists will be commissioned to provide the public art.

Attachments: None

## 71564

## Support

### RLS8 - Protecting Local Green Space

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

#### Summary:

I support the designation as Local Green Spaces all those listed, and hope that, when it is transferred to Warwick District Council, Portabello Fields will also be put forward as for Local Green Space designation.

Attachments: None

## 71565

## Support

### RLS9 - Protecting Open Spaces

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

#### Summary:

Open spaces are in my opinion vital for the enjoyment of the local community, particularly in areas with a high proportion of flats.

Attachments: None

## 71566

## Object

### RLS12 - Leisure, Sport and Recreation Facilities

Respondent: Friends of Victoria Park

#### Summary:

Does this list exclude facilities that are found within the green spaces listed in RLS8? A previous draft had shown Victoria Tennis and Bowls (incorrectly grouped together, not shown separately) in this list of Sport Facilities?

Attachments: None

## 71567

## Object

### 5.3 Green Spaces and Parks

Respondent: Friends of Victoria Park

#### Summary:

RLS8/4 should read Victoria Park

Attachments: None

## 71568

## Object

### Appendix 2 - Local Green Space Assessment

Respondent: Friends of Victoria Park

**Summary:**

RLS8/4 Please note that Victoria Park:

- has an active Friends of Victoria Park organisation (3 of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group belong!)
- hasn't hosted formal cricket matches for many years
- contains a large Bowls Pavilion, a Tennis (previously, Cricket) Pavilion and Victoria Lodge

Attachments: None

## 71569

## Support

### RLS3 - Conservation Areas

Respondent: Canal & River Trust

**Summary:**

The canal network through Warwick District has recently been designated as a conservation area, affording an additional layer of protection to the canal through the Plan area as a heritage asset. Criteria f), n) and o) all specifically reference the importance of planning applications considering the canal and how its character and setting could be affected by new development proposals and we support the inclusion of these criteria which should help to reinforce the protection currently provided through the policies of the adopted Warwick District Local Plan and through the conservation area status of the canal.

Attachments: None

## 71570

## Support

### RLS16 - Canal and Riverside Development

Respondent: Canal & River Trust

**Summary:**

The Trust supports the overall approach set out in the policy and the criteria identified within it. These criteria recognise the multi-functional nature of the canal and towpath and the range of roles it can play in contributing towards regeneration initiatives, leisure, recreation and tourism, heritage, biodiversity and health and well-being. We therefore welcome the clear and explicit support set out within Policy RLS16 for requiring new development to have full regard to the canal and the roles it can play.

Attachments: None

## 71576

## Support

### RLS10 - Royal Leamington Spa Green Infrastructure

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I fully support all these proposals especially noting the desire to create new connections to augment the existing network of Green Infrastructure.

Attachments: None

71577

Support

---

### RLS11 - Allotments

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

Summary:

I fully support the protection of the 5 areas of allotments listed as they not only provide local opportunities for people to grow their own vegetables, but in their own way are valuable community hubs.

Attachments: None

71578

Support

---

### RLS12 - Leisure, Sport and Recreation Facilities

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

Summary:

I support the protection of all the facilities listed especially the Tennis courts, Christchurch Gardens, Beauchamp Avenue which provided a very valuable recreational facility for those living in nearby flats.

Attachments: None

71579

Support

---

### RLS13 - Air Quality

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

Summary:

Air pollution is a significant problem in parts of Leamington, and needs to be tackled.

Attachments: None

71580

Support

---

### RLS14 - Traffic and Transport

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

Summary:

I support all these proposals but particularly improved footpath and cycle links with good signposting, as these alone might significantly reduce car use by making cycling safer in the town.

Attachments: None

71581

Support

---

### RLS15 - Cycling

Respondent: Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I support these proposals, as in my opinion the provision of safe cycleways within Leamington would greatly contribute to a reduction in car use.

**Attachments:** None

**71582**

**Support**

---

**RLS16 - Canal and Riverside Development**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I support these proposals particularly the requirement that development respects the heritage and setting of the canal, Canal Conservation Area, or riverside area, as these are important elements of Leamington's history and setting.

**Attachments:** None

**71583**

**Support**

---

**RLS16 - Canal and Riverside Development**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I support these proposals particularly the requirement that development respects the heritage and setting of the canal, Canal Conservation Area, or riverside area, as these are important elements of Leamington's history and setting.

**Attachments:** None

**71584**

**Support**

---

**Town Supporting Action - Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

I support these proposals particularly the provision of safe cycleways, especially to schools.

**Attachments:** None

**71585**

**Support**

---

**RLS17 - Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Improving the appearance of gateway entrances to the town are long overdue, especially the entrance to the Town Centre from the railway.

**Attachments:** None

**71586**

**Support**

---

**RLS18 - Royal Leamington Spa Creative Quarter**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Additional aims should be to provide affordable rehearsal space for groups including musicians; this is perceived by these groups to be lacking at present.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71587**

**Support**

---

**RLS19 - Old Town Retail Area**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Old Town has special qualities, particularly the independent, artisanal quality of the area which if possible should be developed further to link with the creative quarter.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71588**

**Support**

---

**RLS20 - Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre Shopfronts**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

This is an important policy to retain the distinctiveness of Royal Leamington Spa's retail areas.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71589**

**Support**

---

**RLS21 - Protected Car Parks**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Adequate car parking in Leamington is vital for workers, residents and visitors from further afield. With possible changing transport solutions it is possible that demand will change, and the proposal wisely allows for this.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71590**

**Support**

---

**RLS22 - Local Shopping Centres**

**Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson

**Summary:**

Local shopping centres provide a useful community resource, particularly for the elderly, and save on journeys, which is why I support the addition of the 3 at Brunswick Street, Binswood Street and Lansdowne Street. Recycling provision is useful, but is currently causing flytipping problems at some local shopping centre locations.

**Attachments:** None



**71591****Support****RLS23 - Secondary Retail Areas within the Creative Quarter****Respondent:** Mrs Sidney Syson**Summary:**

This flexible policy will in my opinion enable appropriate development and usage to support and extend the Creative Quarter.

**Attachments:** None**71617****Support****RLS1 - Housing Development within the Royal Leamington Spa Urban Area****Respondent:** Mr Richard Ward**Summary:**

I support the need to increase the provision of sustainable housing. The housing construction industry lags behind other sectors in facing the challenge of global warming.

I agree the support of the provision of purpose built student accommodation. However, the increase in demand is resulting in an over provision in the canalside area and the continued use of 'family' accommodation traditionally around the south of the town but now spreading elsewhere. High density in particular areas creates a social imbalance fostering ill-will and destroying community spirit.

**Attachments:** None**71619****Support****RLS2 - Housing design****Respondent:** Mr Richard Ward**Summary:**

I support the the encouragement of good housing design and the use of design guides. Also the role of the Conservation Area Forum helps this in particularly sensitive areas. (Although this this can be over-ruled by Inspectors, on appeal.)

It is notable that not all developers are motivated to pursue these aims.

**Attachments:** None**71620****Support****RLS8 - Protecting Local Green Space****Respondent:** Mr Richard Ward**Summary:**

I agree with the emphasis on the importance of green spaces to the town - not only the biological values but their social value too. I would particularly refer to Christchurch Gardens where WDC were seriously considering converting the tennis/basketball courts to a carpark. This threat seems temporarily to have receded but the 'Friends of the Christchurch Gardens' are very actively working to secure their long-term future.

**Attachments:** None

**71636****Support****5.1 Housing and development****Respondent:** Kenilworth Town Council**Summary:**

With reference to Policy RLS2 – Housing Design:-

Kenilworth Town Council (KTC) would like to share their experience of the way that KP15 in the Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) has been observed by developers.

“Policy KP15 Environmental Standards of New Buildings

Development proposals are encouraged to adopt higher environmental standards of building design and energy performance such as the Passivhaus or similar approach.

This policy seeks to encourage applicants to incorporate the highest standards of building design and performance. The public sector has an important role to play in demonstrating the practicalities and long term benefits of adopting high environmental building standards.”

The KNP was written under the NPPF 2012 and the Inspector required that the policy was amended as we could not require building standards above the national building regulations at the time.

Hence the word ‘encouraged’ is used.

The result of this, from the viewpoint of the KTC, is that this policy has been effectively ignored by developers whether that be for private developments or public sector builds.

KTC would recommend that policy RLS2 is reviewed to consider whether a clear requirement can be specified without words such as ‘encouraged’, ‘where possible’, ‘not reasonably practicable’ all which may provide developers leeway to not meet the desired intention of this policy.

**Attachments:** None**71637****Support****5.4 Roads and Transport****Respondent:** Kenilworth Town Council**Summary:**

With reference to Policy RLS15 – Cycling:-

KTC would like to positively state their support for the cycleway to connect Leamington to Kenilworth for active travel (K2L) that is referred to in this policy statement.

**Attachments:** None**71639****Support****5.1 Housing and development****Respondent:** Individual**Summary:**

Paragraph 5.1.9 states quote .....”There is also a need to ensure that new housing achieves the highest possible standards in terms of environmental performance, thereby reducing impact on the environment and climate change”

The highest possible standard would be to build to net zero carbon and Policy RLS2 certainly will not deliver this. Setting a net zero carbon standard such as Passivhaus Plus or equivalent would certainly fit with the second commitment of the WDC Climate Emergency strategy namely quote:

2.Facilitating decarbonisation by local businesses, other organisations and residents so that total carbon emissions within Warwick District are as close to zero as possible by 2030.

Retrofitting to net zero carbon is a lot more expensive than setting out with that standard at the start.

The Committee on Climate Change have calculated that the extra cost of building to a 15kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/yr standard (e.g Passivhaus standard or equivalent.) as opposed to the current building regs level would be around £4,800 per dwelling, while the cost of retrofitting to this standard would be £26,300. So taking into account the WDC Climate Emergency strategy why would the Neighbourhood Plan not mandate a 15kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/yr standard to fit with the Climate Emergency ambition?

The statement within Policy RSL2 – quote “Applicants are encouraged to go beyond prevailing sustainable development standards particularly with regard to environmental performance of buildings.....” is probably worthless and developers will just say that they are ‘policy compliant with the Local Plan and build to the out-dated 2013 building regulations.

I use as evidence of this Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan Policy KP15 which has similar wording.

Policy KP15 Environmental Standards of New Buildings

Development proposals are encouraged to adopt higher environmental standards of building design and energy performance such as the Passivhaus or similar approach.

5.69 This policy seeks to encourage applicants to incorporate the highest environmental standards of building design and performance. The public sector has an important role to play in demonstrating the practicalities and long term benefits of adopting high environmental building standards.

To date in every planning application submitted to the WDC Planning Committee developers have completely ignored this policy.

Could I suggest that the LSNP uses words similar to those included in WDC Local Plan Policy CC3 when highlighting decentralised heating networks. I would suggest replacing the words “Applicants and encouraged to go beyond .....” by “The Council will expect the applicants to consider going beyond.....”

I would further suggest adding the following paragraphs:

Development within the scope of the policy will be required for higher environmental standards to incorporate the assessment into the Sustainable Building Statement submitted with the planning application.

Promoting higher environmental standards forms an important part of central government’s decarbonisation strategy and in addition the Council’s Climate Emergency strategy.

Policy RLS2 goes on to state developers should aim to achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. I have two comments to say about this:

1. The Code for Sustainable Homes was abolished by the Conservative administration in 2015.
2. The Code for Sustainable Homes is (or rather was) approximately a 20% improvement above the current building regulations. Why would you ask for a 20% improvement when the current consultation on building regulations was recommending the option for a 31% improvement?

Fabric First

It is important to include a Policy that developers must adopt a Fabric First approach to the design of new buildings

Performance Gap.

It is vitally important to have a policy that addresses the 'performance gap'.

Within the UK, buildings are required to comply with a design standard set by building regulations currently the out dated 2013 regulations. In mainland Europe and elsewhere internationally, buildings are required to comply with a performance-in-use standard. The so called 'performance gap' is the difference in performance between the design intent and what is actually achieved post construction, and this 'performance gap' is of critical importance to the user.....and the planet!

As evidence of the importance of mitigating the performance gap I would refer to an intensive study into new domestic and non-domestic buildings carried out under the Technology Strategy Board/Innovate UK's Building Performance programme which revealed a typical performance gap of between 2.5 and 4 times for energy use. A secondary school that was reviewed recently by a colleague from the Passivhaus Trust found that the building was using 5 times more energy than was predicted.

I would recommend that a policy be added to the Leamington Neighbourhood Plan along the lines as has been develop by Milton Keynes Council.

The Developer must implement a recognised quality regime that ensures the 'as built' performance (energy use, carbon emissions, indoor air quality, and overheating risk) matches the calculated design performance of dwellings. The Developer must put in place a recognised monitoring regime to allow the assessment of energy use, indoor air quality, and overheating risk for 10% of the proposed dwellings for the first five years of their occupancy, and ensure that the information recovered is provided to the applicable occupiers and the planning authority.

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)

No development scheme should take place without a detailed SUDS strategy. This will help with many items of resilience, for example improving flood prevention.

Development Plan Documents. (DPD)

I can see no reference to the DPD currently being developed by Warwick District Council.

**Attachments:** None

71644

Support

## 5.1 Housing and development

**Respondent:** Severn Trent Water

### Summary:

Policy RLS1 Housing Development within the Royal Leamington Spa Urban Area – Severn Trent is supportive of this policy particularly re-use of previously developed brownfield land. We are particularly supportive of the inclusion of the policy wording 'Development of previously developed land shall undertake a surface water outfall assessment, following the Drainage Hierarchy (National Planning Practice Guidance , paragraph 80) to determine if there are viable alternatives to existing connections to the combined sewer network.'

**Attachments:**

71645

Support

## 5.1 Housing and development

**Respondent:** Severn Trent Water

**Summary:**

Policy RSL2 Housing Design – Severn Trent is supportive of this policy particularly the inclusion of the wording 'New housing development should include design features and measures to reduce the impacts of climate change by increasing resilience to extreme weather events, including the increased risk of river and surface water flooding. Applicants should be able to demonstrate that their proposals are water efficient and that unless not reasonably practicable the design includes water efficiency and re-use measures' and the inclusion of the supporting text in paragraph 5.1.17.

**Attachments:**

71646

Support

## 5.4 Roads and Transport

**Respondent:** Severn Trent Water

**Summary:**

Policy RSL16 Canal and Riverside Development – Severn Trent is supportive of this policy, particularly subsections a), c) and h).

**Attachments:**

71648

Support

## 5.3 Green Spaces and Parks

**Respondent:** Marie O'Riley

**Summary:**

Ref: Policy RLS11 – Allotments

I don't see any protection for the Old Milverton Allotments. As a plot holder I wish to make it known that I feel very strongly that these allotments should also be protected from redevelopment.

**Attachments:** None

71650

Support

## 5.4 Roads and Transport

**Respondent:** Marie O'Riley

**Summary:**

Ref: Policy RLS14 – Traffic and Transport

I support any transport schemes that promotes walking and cycling and reduces dependency on cars. Air Pollution is a huge problem.

**Attachments:** None

71651

Support

## 5.1 Housing and development

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS1 – Housing Development Within the Royal Leamington Spa Urban Area

We fully support promoting of high quality, sustainable housing, particularly where it does not lead to the loss of residential gardens, except in the specific circumstances listed.

The Society has been concerned about the provision of so much purpose-built student accommodation within the town, and notes that the Neighbourhood Plan only supports this when positively assessed against Local Plan and any relevant supplementary planning document. We are concerned that any block of student housing should also be of an architecture particularly sympathetic to the surrounding buildings to enhance the area they are situated in.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71652**
**Support**
**5.1 Housing and development**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS2 – Housing Design

Government Policy and Building regulations are a changing landscape which makes Local Authority requirements a nightmare to impose but the Society fully supports the aims which should ensure that we encourage/impose as high a standard as possible for new buildings to combat climate change, fuel poverty, resource consumption and recycling. In view of the Government's announcement that no new petrol, diesel or hybrid cars are to be sold after 2035 we think a requirement for access to electric charging points should be added to any car parking requirements. The Society supports sympathetic design that retains local distinctiveness; which does not preclude innovative designs.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71653**
**Support**
**5.1 Housing and development**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS3 – Conservation Areas

The Leamington Society is fully supportive of all 15 of the criteria listed, requiring those applying to develop within these areas to consider, prepare and describe how their proposed development meets each relevant one.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71654**
**Support**
**5.1 Housing and development**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS4 – Housing Character Outside the Conservation Areas

We fully support this policy and particularly welcome the requirement that development should seek to maintain views of higher slopes, skylines and the wider landscape.

None

Attachments:

71655

Support

### 5.1 Housing and development

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS5 – Royal Leamington Spa Housing Mix and Tenure

The Leamington Society fully supports your desire that in any housing development the proposed housing mix has taken in to account the following:

“(a) The relatively high levels of social and private renting in South Leamington and the need to support affordable owner occupation in this area; and

(b) The relatively high-level of flats and apartments in the neighbourhood area and the potential, in appropriate locations, to provide detached and semi-detached family homes.”

**Attachments:** None

71656

Support

### RLS7 - Public Art

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS7 – Public Art.

As commented in our previous consultation response, the Society would like to see the artists chosen having local connections.

**Attachments:** None

71657

Support

### 5.3 Green Spaces and Parks

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

The Society notes that there is no mention of a tree-planting policy.

**Attachments:** None

71658

Support

### RLS11 - Allotments

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS11 – Allotments

The Society fully supports the protection of the allotments listed, and the hope of creating new ones, and the innovation of support being offered to residents who wish to use their lawns for shared allotment gardens.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71659****Support**

---

**RLS12 - Leisure, Sport and Recreation Facilities****Respondent:** The Leamington Society**Summary:**

Policy RLS12 – Leisure, Sport and Recreation Facilities

The Society supports the protection of all the facilities listed especially the Tennis courts, Christchurch Gardens, Beauchamp Avenue which provided a very valuable recreational facility for those living in nearby flats.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71661****Support**

---

**RLS13 - Air Quality****Respondent:** The Leamington Society**Summary:**

Policy RLS13 – Air Quality

The Leamington Society regards air pollution as a significant problem in parts of Leamington, and welcomes all proposals to help improve the situation.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71662****Support**

---

**RLS14 - Traffic and Transport****Respondent:** The Leamington Society**Summary:**

Policy RLS14 – Traffic and Transport

The Leamington Society support these measures which will, we hope, help improve the air quality of Royal Leamington Spa, particularly the measures to prioritise the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport within the Town Centre whilst still allowing for through traffic. Improved footpath and cycle links with good signposting, alone might significantly reduce car use.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71663****Support**

---

**RLS15 - Cycling****Respondent:** The Leamington Society**Summary:**

Policy RLS15 – Cycling

The Society supports these proposals, as the provision of safe cycleways within Leamington might greatly contribute to a reduction in car use. In our opinion there is an immediate need for more cycle racks in the town centre.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71664****Support**

---

**RLS16 - Canal and Riverside Development**



**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS16 – Canal and Riverside Development

We support these proposals particularly the requirement that development respects the heritage and setting of the canal, Canal Conservation Area, or riverside area, as these are important elements of Leamington’s history and setting. We also particularly support the aim of providing facilities to support the growth and development of recreation and tourism; and supports the wider regeneration aspirations of the Creative Quarter.

Town Council Supporting Action – Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

We support the listed proposals particularly cycling infrastructure, especially the provision of safe cycleways to schools.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71665**

**Support**

**RLS17 - Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS17 – Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre

The Leamington Society supports improving the appearance of gateway entrances to the town, especially the entrance to the Town Centre from the railway.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71666**

**Support**

**RLS18 - Royal Leamington Spa Creative Quarter**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS18 – Royal Leamington Spa Creative Quarter

We support the particular policies relating to the development within the Royal Leamington Spa Creative Quarter, identified on the Policies Map, expressing our concern for the appropriate future use of both the Town Hall and the old Post Office in Priory Terrace.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71667**

**Support**

**RLS19 - Old Town Retail Area**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS19 – Old Town Retail Area

Old Town has special qualities, particularly the independent, artisanal quality of the area which if possible should be developed further to link with the creative quarter.

**Attachments:** None

---

**71668**

**Support**

**RLS20 - Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre Shopfronts**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS20 – Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre Shopfronts

This is an important policy to retain the distinctiveness of Royal Leamington Spa’s retail areas.

**Attachments:** None

71669

Support

**RLS21 - Protected Car Parks**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS21 – Protected Car Parks

Adequate car parking in Leamington is vital for workers, residents and visitors from further afield. With possible changing transport solutions it is possible that demand will change, and the proposal wisely allows for this.

**Attachments:** None

71670

Support

**RLS22 - Local Shopping Centres**

**Respondent:** The Leamington Society

**Summary:**

Policy RLS22 – Local Shopping Centres

Local shopping centres provide a useful community resource, particularly for the elderly, and save on journeys, which is why the Society supports the addition of the 3 more at Brunswick Street, Binswood Street and Lansdowne Street.

Recycling provision is useful, but is currently causing flytipping problems at some local shopping centre locations.

**Attachments:** None

71671

Support

**RLS20 - Royal Leamington Spa Town Centre Shopfronts**

**Respondent:** WDC Conservation and Design

**Summary:**

The draft policy explains: ‘one area that has benefitted from a less controlled approach, an approach which should be fostered further is the High Street/Clemens Street area of Old Town. This area has a more varied selection of shopfronts and colours that go to help create this area’s own distinctive environment. This variety will continue to be supported’. The policy adds that ‘The RLSNDP supports the use of more creative, colourful and active frontages and signage on these shopfronts to develop a more distinct vibrant feel and image for Old Town.’

We would comment that this may encourage advertisements that are harmful character and appearance of the Conservation Area and we are concerned that this policy contrasts with our SPG: Shopfronts and Advertisements for Leamington Spa. This guidance explains specifically for the High St, Clements St and Bath St area that the Council wishes to retain the local character and identity of this area and ‘expects new or replacement shopfronts to be designed to reinforce those particular features and characteristics... they should be of scale appropriate to the building’. Importantly, this guidance is clear in that it states provisions for advertisements here should be similar to the approach applied in Warwick St/Regent St, with illumination and signage at fascia level not permitted.

The wording of this policy may also give rise to inappropriate signage that has a detrimental effect on the scale, proportions and character of historic buildings in these locations, whilst inadvertently giving the impression that premises with existing, unauthorised signage is acceptable.

Attachments: None

## 71672

## Support

### RLS3 - Conservation Areas

**Respondent:** WDC Conservation and Design

**Summary:**

With reference to Paragraph 5.1.18, we note that there are in fact only two Conservation Areas in Leamington Spa - Leamington Spa CA and the Canal CA; Lillington Road North and Lillington Village are in fact character areas 34 and 35 respectively of the Leamington Spa Conservation Area. Although these areas are physically separated from the main designated area and different in character, we understand the areas were approved via an amendment and expansion to the existing Leamington CA boundary. We also note that the Canal Conservation Area is incorrectly referred to as the 'Canalside' Conservation Area.

Attachments: None

## 71673

## Object

### 2.0 Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Development Plan Key Themes and Vision

**Respondent:** Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd

**Agent:** Pegasus Group

**Summary:**

**OBJECTIVE 1**

Spitfire remain concerned about a lack of clarity with regard to some of the terminology used in the targets and actions under Objective 1. A clearer explanation is still required of what is meant by the term 'high quality' in Targets A and B in the context of Leamington Spa.

The reference that housing should be 'more energy efficient' in Target B is meaningless without understanding what the benchmark is – i.e. more energy efficient than what, how is that assessment being measured, by whom and against which criteria? The addition of an expectation that homes incorporate Lifetime Homes / Building for Life standards does not assist in an assessment of the energy efficiency expectations.

Attachments:

## 71674

## Support

### 2.0 Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Development Plan Key Themes and Vision

**Respondent:** Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd

**Agent:** Pegasus Group

**Summary:**

**OBJECTIVE 2**

Target A references the need for new residential development that increases demand for community facilities to 'make additional provision for such facilities and to protect and support the expansion of existing community facilities within the town'. The target could be clarified by expressly stating that its purpose is not to address existing shortfall in provision through cross funding from new development.

Regarding Target B, this should clarify the expected source of the funds referred to therein. S.106 contributions would normally be expected to be delivered through the District Council as planning authority and would not normally be

delivered to a Town Council/NP Group, unless there were specific and identified projects supported through a Development Plan policy. If the reference to funds is to the expected CIL funds to be made available to the Town Council, then draft Policy RLS 16 identifies specific spending priorities for these. However, the priorities listed are all transport related projects rather than 'community facilities/services'. As such it is unclear if the requirement at Target B, is in addition to RLS 16, or is part of it.

The NDP should provide clarity on what is intended. If it is minded to identify specific spending priorities over and above those of the Local Plan, then the policy should be subject to viability review, to ensure that it is not adding to the burden of residential development such that it impacts potential delivery. Without that assessment, then arguably basic conditions a, d and e may have been failed.

**Attachments:**

71675

Support

## 2.0 Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Development Plan Key Themes and Vision

**Respondent:** Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd

**Agent:** Pegasus Group

### Summary:

#### OBJECTIVE 3

Whilst the overall aim of the policy is supported, Target E goes beyond both the Local Plan and NPPF in proposing a blanket opposition to development in the Green Belt. Warwick Local Plan strategic policy DS18 simply references that applications within Green Belt will be determined in accordance with national planning policy. Such an approach is commended to this NDP as well.

NPPF policy sets out the nuances of appropriate and inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and also establishes a context whereby development may be permitted at application through the demonstration of exceptional circumstances. None of this is captured by Target E, which is framed in terms of a blanket opposition to all Green Belt development. The policy is therefore not in general conformity with the Local Plan nor does it flow from national policy, and hence fails basic tests a) and e).

**Attachments:**

71676

Object

## RLS2 - Housing design

**Respondent:** Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd

**Agent:** Pegasus Group

### Summary:

Spitfire's representations to the Informal Consultation Draft consultation raised concerns about Policy RLS2, its relationship and necessity in the context of Local Plan Policy BE1, its lack of clarity regarding sustainable development standards. These concerns remain.

In the Regulation 16 draft NDP, Policy RLS2 has been amended to introduce more clarity on the expectations for housing development in some respects. The first three paragraphs of the policy now include: a requirement for all homes to be Lifetime Homes; an expectation that proposals should aim 'where possible' to achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes; and encouragement for the incorporation of higher environmental standards such as Passivhaus.

The fourth paragraph of Policy RLS2 also requires housing development to include design features that increase resilience to extreme weather events (including increased risk of river and surface water flooding) and for applicants to demonstrate the water efficiency of their proposals including 'where practicable' the incorporation of water efficiency and re-use measures in the design).

Whilst the requirements in the first three paragraphs of Policy RLS2 are less vague than in the previous draft of the policy, the requirements in the fourth paragraph remain imprecise in terms of the prevailing standards required for compliance.

With respect to the requirements in all four of these paragraphs, Spitfire remain concerned that the NDP has not assessed

the viability implications of encouraging compliance with a more rigorous set of standards and requirements than those required by the existing district wide criteria in Local Plan Policy BE1. Spitfire would also reiterate that there is no support for this approach within Local Plan Climate Change policies CC1 or CC3.

The policy is deemed not to meet the basic conditions, in that its requirements and expectations do not flow from national guidance, nor are they in general conformity with the Local Plan strategic policies. They therefore fail basic conditions a) and e).

With regard to the final paragraph of Policy RSL2, it is not considered appropriate for a NDP policy to state certain descriptions of development 'will be refused'. The final paragraph also lacks clarity in its references to 'poor design' and 'the relevant criteria'. Spitfire's recommendation would be that the final paragraph ought to be omitted.

**Attachments:**

71677

Support

### RLS3 - Conservation Areas

**Respondent:** Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd

**Agent:** Pegasus Group

#### Summary:

As per Spitfire's previous representations, the intent of Policy RLS3 as drafted is not contested but the wording of the policy departs from Framework and statutory guidance on the treatment of heritage assets in the way it is worded. It is still suggested that the policy should be reworded to be consistent with Framework guidance in this respect.

Specifically, in addition to referencing the need to assess impact of a development on the significance of the heritage asset, it also indicates that there should be an assessment of the impact on the significance of the asset's setting. This is not the correct approach.

'Setting' is not a heritage asset. Its value is in the contribution it makes to the significance of the asset itself, and the policy should be amended to reflect this. The policy should be clear that the assessment criteria listed within the policy, should be applied in terms of any assessment of the asset's significance, and are not required to be applied to an assessment of the setting of the asset.

With regard to the criteria of the policy the following detailed matters are raised;

a) '...creates a sense of unity...'; it is unclear the sense in which this would be applied. The implication is that only development which mirrors or provides a pastiche of the existing architectural styles of the conservation would be acceptable. However, well designed modern buildings, constructed using materials of appropriate quality, may also have a role within the Conservation Area. Sometimes, buildings which are of their time, and clearly separate out the temporal development of an area, can be appropriate and the policy should recognise this.

e) '...retention of existing gardens...'; the policy refers to the retention of existing gardens, yet policy RLS1 recognises that the loss of gardens is acceptable, if made within the context of strategic Local Plan Policy H1. That policy states that garden loss will be acceptable, where it 'reinforces, or harmonises with, the established character of the street and/or locality...' Criteria e) should be amended to reflect Policy PSL1 and strategic Local Plan policy H1, both of which accept the loss of residential gardens subject to demonstration of design criteria. If the reference to 'gardens' is to the more formal public gardens of Leamington, as protected through draft Policy RLS8, then the policy should make this explicit.

f) Criteria f combines in a single policy tests for treatment of both designated and non-designated heritage assets, whereas statute and Framework guidance treat them both separately and subject to different assessment criteria. It is suggested that the policy be split into two, and that the tests proposed to the different assets be consistent with that contained in the Framework.

g) As with criteria e) the policy should be clearer as to the type of gardens it is seeking to retain. If the policy is simply replicating the protection afforded by draft Policies RLS8 and RLS9, then it is unnecessary and should be deleted.

j) The cross-reference to Policy RLS21 should be corrected to refer to RLS20.

m) 'Proper evaluation...'; the terminology of the Framework para 189 is 'appropriate' assessment, and this should be the terminology followed here.

n) The policy would benefit from clarification of the phrase 'key views'. Is it the intent of the policy that any development proposal should be accompanied by a site specific assessment of whether such views exist, or are there existing 'key views' of principle buildings and assets which specifically are looking to be protected? The policy should be re-worded to

provide greater clarity as to what is desired.

**Attachments:**

## 71678

## Support

### RLS5 - Royal Leamington Spa Housing Mix and Tenure

**Respondent:** Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd

**Agent:** Pegasus Group

**Summary:**

The current drafting of the policy still leaves scope for internal policy conflict and uncertainty. Local Plan Policies H2 and H4 referenced, both cross refer to housing mix being informed by the latest SHMA. Draft Policy RLS5 advises that proposals should follow the strategic policies but also that within the NP area proposals should follow 'any up to date local housing needs assessment'. There is clear potential for confusion here if the SHMA and any local NP area needs assessment provide conflicting housing mix evidence. Moreover, the policy should more clearly define what is meant by 'any up to date' assessment. Who is to have produced such an assessment, and with what oversight, rigour or testing? The policy could benefit from providing greater clarity on what is proposed, and how any potential policy conflict would be resolved.

**Attachments:**

## 71679

## Object

### RLS2 - Housing design

**Respondent:** Taylor Wimpey

**Agent:** Turley

**Summary:**

Taylor Wimpey consider that policy RLS2 can be read as a duplication of key elements from policies SC0 and BE1 of the WDLP, as well as the Warwick District Council Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018). Within the explanatory text to Policy RLS2, the RLSNP notes that "The Warwick Local Plan, through Policy BE1 Layout and Design, sets a framework for assessing the design of planning proposals. This includes all the key features and attributes of what is considered to be good design. Policy RLS2 does not need, or seek, to repeat these, but seeks to add further policy detail." Notwithstanding Taylor Wimpey's comments relating to the duplication of policies from the WDLP, where the RLSNP has included 'further policy detail' is around the requirement for proposals to achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

A Government Deregulation Bill in 2015 revoked the Code for Sustainable Homes from planning policy guidance, meaning that local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging local plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be achieved by new development. Therefore, as currently drafted Policy RLS2 is both a duplication of policies within the adopted WDLP and includes policy requirements which are not in accordance with national policy, thus not meeting basic conditions 8(2)(a) and 8(2)(e).

**Attachments:**

## 71680

## Object

### RLS4 - Housing Character Outside the Conservation Areas

**Respondent:** Taylor Wimpey

**Agent:** Turley

**Summary:**

Taylor Wimpey is concerned that the drafting of Policy RLS4 is both unclear and ambiguous, as well as the policy itself reading as a collection of different, unrelated elements. In addition, draft Policy RLS4 includes references to proposals needing to 'maintain views of higher slopes, skylines and the wider landscape'. There is no document contained within the evidence base for the RLSNP which assesses the landscape surrounding the Town, or indeed providing any identification of what is meant by 'Higher slopes, skylines and the wider landscape'.

In accordance with the PPG, Taylor Wimpey consider that the policy should be re-drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications, and supported by proportionate evidence.

**Attachments:****71681****Support****RLS8 - Protecting Local Green Space****Respondent:** Taylor Wimpey**Agent:** Turley**Summary:**

Policy RLS8 refers to the 'possible' designation of Local Green Spaces within the plan area. Again Taylor Wimpey considers that the wording of the policy should be more prescriptive and clear to allow a decision maker to apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.

While Taylor Wimpey does not seek to make individual comments on the 'possible' local green spaces identified, they are very concerned to see the following reference made within the Policy:

"Development of designated Local Green Spaces will only be supported when consistent with national Green Belt policy (emphasis added)".

While Taylor Wimpey recognises that the reference within Policy RLS8 to Green Belt may be erroneous, they reiterate that Local Green Spaces are much different to the allocation of Green Belt, with NPPF paragraph 135 confirming that "New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances" with such changes being made through strategic plan making. Taylor Wimpey therefore considers that the reference within Policy RLS8 to Green Belt should be removed.

**Attachments:****71682****Support****4.0 Planning Policy Context****Respondent:** Taylor Wimpey**Agent:** Turley**Summary:**

Aside from the policy specific comments set out above, Taylor Wimpey also considers that in accordance with Basic Condition 8(2)(e), the RLSNP should be better aligned to the review policy (DS19) sets out within the WDLP.

Policy DS19 'Review of the Local Plan' commits WDC to either a whole or partial review of the Local Plan prior to the end of the plan period in the event that one or more of the following circumstances arises:

- (a) 'Through the Duty to Co-operate, it is necessary to accommodate the development needs of another local authority area within the district and these development needs cannot be accommodated within the Local Plan's existing strategy;
- (b) "Updated evidence or changes to national policy suggest that the overall development strategy should be significantly changed;
- (c) "The monitoring of the Local Plan (in line with the Delivery and Monitoring Activities section and particularly the monitoring of housing delivery) demonstrates that the overall

4

development strategy or the policies are not delivering the Local Plan's objectives and requirements;

- (d) "Development and growth pressures arising from the specific circumstances in the area to the south of Coventry (as



identified in Policy DS20). The Council has committed to a partial review of this area within five years of adoption to consider whether additional housing is needed and the availability of infrastructure to deliver it; or

(e) "Any other reasons that render the Plan, or part of it, significantly out of date.

"In any event the Council will undertake a comprehensive review of national policy, the regional context, updates to the evidence base and monitoring date before 31 March 2021 to assess whether a full or partial review of the Plan is required. In the event that a review is required, work on it will commence immediately.'

The WDLP identifies a range of circumstances which will be monitored and which could trigger the need for the Council to undertake an early review of their adopted Plan in advance of the statutory requirement to do so (within five years of the adoption of the Plan i.e. 2022) as required by the NPPF.

As identified above, in respect of land at Old Milverton, a review of the WDLP which responds to a change in housing need for the District could ultimately lead to the Council undertaking a full review of their spatial strategy, housing opportunities and Green Belt. At which point the Council will look to the most sustainable settlements within the District, such as Leamington Spa, to meet a proportion of housing need for the District. Such a review would render certain policies of the RLSNP out of date where they conflict with the Local Plan.

There is no requirement to review or update a neighbourhood plan. However, where policies within a neighbourhood plan conflict with policies in a local plan covering the neighbourhood area, and where the local plan is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan, it is the more recent plan policy which takes precedence in decision making.

As noted above, any review of the WDLP would be likely to impact upon key policies within the RLSNP. Therefore, to ensure that the neighbourhood plan remains a consideration in the decision making process, the RLSNP would need to be reviewed at the same time as the WDLP.

Section 7 of the RLSNP 'Monitoring and Review' identifies a series of circumstances which would require a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, but does not frame these comments in a specific policy and so can only be seen as an 'intention'.

Taylor Wimpey therefore considers that while the draft RLSNP generally meets the basic conditions, in order to fully comply with Basic Condition 8(2)(e), Section 7 of the RLSNP should include a specific Review Policy which clearly defines the circumstances which would trigger a review in a way which can be measured against the Local Plan whilst also ensuring that the RLSNP remains effective.

**Attachments:**