

**To: Members of the Local Development Framework
Sub-Committee**

**(Councillors Reilly, Bell, Lea, Smith, L Dirveiks, and
Sweet)**

For the information of other Members of the Council

This document can be made available in large print and electronic accessible formats if requested.

For general enquiries please contact David Harris, Democratic Services Manager, on 01827 719222 or via e-mail - davidharris@northwarks.gov.uk.

For enquiries about specific reports please contact the officer named in the reports

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUB-COMMITTEE

11 September 2017

The Local Development Framework Sub-Committee will meet in The Committee Room, Council House, South Street, Atherstone on Monday 11 September 2017 at 6.30 pm.

AGENDA

- 1 Evacuation Procedure.**
- 2 Apologies for Absence / Members away on official Council business.**
- 3 Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

4 **Public Participation**

Up to twenty minutes will be set aside for members of the public to put questions to elected Members. Questions should be submitted by 9.30am 2 working days prior to the meeting. Participants are restricted to five minutes each. If you wish to put a question to the meeting please contact David Harris on 01827 719222 or email democraticservices@northwarks.gov.uk .

5 **Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 31 October 2016** - copy herewith to be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

***ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION
(WHITE PAPERS)***

6 **North Warwickshire Local Plan – Report on consultation and Submission version** – Report of the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council

Summary

This report brings to Members a summary of the representations made to the Draft Local Plan, highlighting key issues and making recommendations to be incorporated into the submission version of the Local Plan.

The Contact Officer for this report is Dorothy Barratt (719250).

7 **Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)** - Report of the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council

Summary

This report brings to Board a revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the submission version of the Local Plan.

The Contact Officer for this report is Dorothy Barratt (719250).

8 **North Warwickshire Local Development Scheme (LDS) update** - Report of the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council

Summary

This report brings to Members a revised Local Development Scheme.

The Contact Officer for this report is Dorothy Barratt (719250).

JERRY HUTCHINSON
Chief Executive

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUB-COMMITTEE

31 October 2016

Present: Councillor Bell in the Chair.

Councillors L Dirveiks, Lea, Simpson, Smith and Sweet

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Waters (Substitute Councillor Simpson).

Councillors Chambers, Davey, Davis, Gosling, Hayfield, Humphreys, Lewis, Moss, Payne, Phillips, Reilly, Smitten, E Stanley and M Stanley were also in attendance.

10 **Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

None were declared at the meeting.

11 **Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan**

Members comments were sought on the revised Draft Infrastructure Plan

Recommendation to Executive Board:

- a That a working party be set up to bring together the proposed changes to the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan and that the amended plan be brought to the next meeting of Executive Board for consideration; and**
- b That subject to Executive Board approval at that meeting the re-drafted Infrastructure Delivery Plan be included in the Draft Local Plan consultation.**

12 **Implications of Changes to the Draft Local Plan**

Members were asked to consider the implication of the changes to the Draft Local Plan made at the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 3 August 2016.

Recommendation to Executive Board:

- a That no further changes be made to the Draft Local Plan and that the issues set out in para 2.1 of the report of the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council be re-considered following the public consultation; and**

- b That site visits to major sites identified in the Draft Local Plan be organised.**

13 Governance Arrangement For Dealing With Growth

Members were asked to consider governance arrangements for dealing with growth expected within the Borough.

Recommendation to Executive Board:

That the Governance structure as set out in the report of the Assistant Chief Executive and Solicitor to the Council be amended as follows;

- Growth Board – to be formally recognised in the Council’s Constitution as a public constituted meeting and chaired by the Leader of the Council.**
- Steering Groups – Ward Members for the three main growth areas be included.**
- Thematic Groups – Spokesperson and Shadow Spokesperson be included in the relevant thematic group.**
- Governance Structure be amended to ensure a role for Town and Parish Councils and local communities.**

M Bell
Chairman

Agenda Item No 6

Local Development Framework Sub-Committee

11 September 2017

**Report of the Assistant Chief Executive
and Solicitor to the Council**

**North Warwickshire Local Plan –
Report on consultation**

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report brings to Members a summary of the representations made to the Draft Local Plan, highlighting key issues and making recommendations to be incorporated into the submission version of the Local Plan.

Recommendations to Executive Board

- a That the representations are noted;**
- b That the recommendations on the responses be supported;**
- c That the recommended changes to the Draft Local Plan proposed in the report be supported and be incorporated into a submission version of the Local Plan; and**
- d That a Special Executive Board meeting be called for Wednesday 18 October to consider any outstanding issues and the submission version of the Local Plan.**

2 Consultation

- 2.1 Councillor Reilly has been sent an advanced copy of this report.

3 Consultation on Draft Local Plan

- 3.1 Consultation on the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) began informally following the LDF Sub-committee meeting on 3 August 2016. The formal consultation period commenced on Thursday 10 November 2016 and was originally due to close on 5 January 2016. This was extended until 31 March 2017, to ensure there was time for consideration of the Sustainability Appraisal and to provide as much up to date information on the provision of infrastructure as possible.
- 3.2 From 3 August 2016 until 31 March 2017 there have been a number of events and activities. These included the following:

1. There were 16 consultation events in November and December 2016 with a further 11 in March 2017. These were drop-in exhibitions with officers available to talk through any issues.
2. All the events were publicised through twitter and Facebook.
3. A Member's meeting to talk specifically about infrastructure. This focussed on education.
4. Presentations were made to Area Forum meetings as well as to the Northern Warwickshire Chamber meeting.
5. Officers have gone to Parish Council meetings – Polesworth and Dordon.
6. A booklet on the Draft Local Plan, the Sustainability Appraisal and the Draft Infrastructure Plan was circulated to every house in the Borough.

4 Representations

4.1 Over 2000 representations have been received. There are representations from individuals, from organisations / companies, from Parish / Town Councils and from neighbouring local authorities. Some of these have made multiple comments on a range of policies and the supporting documents that have accompanied the Draft local Plan.

4.2 Summaries of all of the representations have been made and these are in Appendix A. One copy has been made available for all members' in the committee room and one public copy available in main reception.

4.3 Against each representation a suggested response has been given highlighting if this requires a change to be incorporated in the submission version of the Local Plan.

4.4 A number of letters have been submitted multiple times and these are referred to as "proformas". There are 26 in total and these have been summarised in Appendix B with a proposed response.

5 Key Issues

5.1 The following sections deals with the main issues that have been raised during the consultation process. These can be summarised as follows:

- 1) Plan period
- 2) Duty to co-operate including other local authority responses
- 3) Overall spatial strategy – in particular other options for growth
 - i) New Settlement
 - ii) Spread of development
 - iii) Focussing development on the Market Towns outside of the Green Belt
- 4) Green Belt
- 5) Effect of recent appeals
- 6) Meaningful Gap
- 7) Housing – numbers and supply
- 8) Employment land - numbers and supply
- 9) Suggested Sites

- 10) Infrastructure
 - (1) Education
 - (2) Health
 - (3) Highways
 - (4) Flooding
- 11) Ecology Impact
- 12) Historic Setting
- 13) Leisure
- 14) HS2
- 15) Sustainability Appraisal
- 16) Proposed changes

Each will now be looked at in turn.

1) *Plan period*

5.2 A Local Plan needs to have a period of 15 years from the time of adoption. It is therefore proposed to extend the Plan period of the current proposed Plan to 2033. The implication on housing and employment figures is discussed below.

5.3 **Recommendation: Changes are proposed throughout the Plan to reflect the extended plan period.**

2) *Duty to co-operate*

5.4 The Duty to Co-operate is a legal test that must be passed prior to submission of the Local Plan if a Plan is to be found sound. The Inspector during the examination will be looking to ensure the legal test has been passed prior to submission. It is not retrospective. It is important therefore that the Borough Council can demonstrate that it has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of the Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters up to the point of submission. The Duty to Co-operate itself of course does not finish at this point but will continue into the examination process and beyond adoption. A paper will be prepared prior to the examination to set out all of the meetings and activities that the Borough Council has been engaged in during the development of the Local Plan. Officers are confident that the legal test is currently being met but will continue to work to ensure that this continues up to actual submission.

5.5 Some representations have said that the Borough Council has not succeeded in demonstrating that it is working in a constructive, active and on an ongoing basis. This is disappointing in the context of the emerging Plan due to the work that has been undertaken to consider the needs of not only one neighbouring local authority but from the two housing market areas. This has resulted in a Draft Local Plan that develops on the needs of Tamworth identified in the 2014 Core Strategy and seeks to deliver for the needs from both Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Market Area (CW HMA) and Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GB HMA).

- 5.6 There have been representations made that suggest that the Council should slow down / wait on producing a new Local Plan in order that agreement can take place on the overall shortfall within the Greater Birmingham housing market area.
- 5.7 There is however a need for the Council to get a Plan adopted as promptly as possible. The Birmingham Local Plan is now adopted with an identified shortfall. The Borough Council is constructively and actively working to deliver a proportion of this shortfall within the Draft Local Plan. Additional work is being undertaken by GL Hearn to look at the housing shortfall across the whole of the GB HMA and to assess possible options for the future. This is likely to report in October 2017. At the present time it is not recommended that the Plan process is slowed down or stopped to consider this work although reference should be made within the Plan to this additional work.
- 5.8 Within the Local Plan there is a review mechanism that could be invoked. However in the meantime houses need to be delivered. The best way to do this is through an adopted Local Plan so that it is clear where the sites are located and what infrastructure is required as a result of this additional growth.
- 5.9 In addition there is yet to be a GB HMA wide agreement on the split of housing and the best locations for such growth. However the Borough Council has a signed Memorandum of Understanding with Birmingham to aspire to deliver 3790 dwellings housing and this has been included with the Draft Local Plan.
- 5.10 Due to the rural nature of the Borough it is also important to consider what is physically feasible to be delivered within the Borough. As can be seen through the Strategic Transport Assessment there are restraints on the provision of growth until infrastructure is delivered to cater for such growth. It cannot be automatically assumed that the Borough will be able to deliver ever increasing numbers due to market and Green Belt constraints.
- 5.11 **Recommendation: No major change is proposed to the Plan other than to refer to the additional work currently being carried out by G L Hearn. Work will however continue with partners to ensure that the Duty to Co-operate is constructive, active and on-going.**

Other Local Authority Responses

- 5.12 Following on from the above section it is important to consider the views of our neighbours and ensure that where possible their concerns have been, are being or will be addressed. The relevant representations are:

DLP99	Tamworth BC
DLP106	Lichfield DC
DLP313	Solihull MBC

DLP328	Birmingham CC
DLP362	Staffordshire CC
DLP363	Hinckley & Bosworth BC
DLP366	Warwickshire CC
DLP2025	Cannock Chase DC

- 5.13 It is proposed to make minor changes to the Local Plan to assist with representations from the above authorities as outlined in the responses in Appendix A. Discussions and, where possible, Memoranda of Understanding or Statements of Common Ground will be progressed to ensure that ongoing, active and constructive discussions continue wherever possible.

3) **Spatial Strategy**

Overall Strategy

- 5.14 Policy LP2 sets out the spatial strategy for the Local Plan indicating where development can take place. It has been suggested by some that the spatial strategy being proposed in the Local Plan is wrong. There are various suggestions how the spatial strategy should be altered. These include putting most of the growth within a new settlement to spreading development through the Borough in all settlements.
- 5.15 Various options were considered by the LDF Sub-committee in the “Growth Options” paper in April 2016. These were:

Table 1: Options for Growth

<i>Options for growth generated from within the Borough</i>	<i>Options to deal with growth from outside the Borough</i>
IN1: Development in accordance with the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy.	OUT1: Development against the relevant borough, district or city boundary.
IN2: Development in and around the Main Settlements. This option includes Coleshill, the Green Belt Market Town.	OUT2: Develop in and around the closest settlements.
IN3: Focus development along the A5 Corridor.	OUT3: Add the housing to the overall North Warwickshire Borough figures and distribute according to the preferred option for the whole of the Local Plan.
IN4: Development around transport hubs.	OUT4: Development around public transport hubs.
IN5: New settlement.	OUT5: New settlement.

- 5.16 A Sustainability Appraisal was carried out of each of the options and this was part of the evidence used to prepare the Draft Local Plan.

New Settlement

- 5.17 Some have argued that a new settlement should be the way forward. Others have questioned why Daw Mill has not been put forward as such an opportunity.
- 5.18 As can be seen in Table 1 above a new settlement was considered as one of the options in the Growth Options Paper in April 2016. The Sustainability Appraisal that accompanied the Growth Options stated in para 1.49:
“It should also be recognised that a new settlement could take a significant amount of time to plan and deliver, not least the time required to identify an appropriate site where environmental impacts can be minimised and the sustainability benefits maximised, for example through proximity to transport links. It will also require a significant amount of investment in completely new infrastructure, including community services and facilities as well as transport and utilities infrastructure. It will take time to develop a critical mass. For these reasons, this option would not be able to meet the Borough’s predicted increased housing target, at least in the short term, which could be a barrier to the viability of the option.”
- 5.19 It is clear that currently there is not a site large enough that has been suggested as a possible location. If a new settlement is to be self-sustaining then it would require a minimum of 4,000 to 5,000 dwellings to warrant a secondary school going up to 10,000 to have a standalone retail core. There would then need to be employment land to accompany the housing. Ideally a new settlement would require upwards of 350 hectares. (Daw Mill is 40 hectares). Options for this size of settlement would need to be explored as to the best location within the Borough and then land assembly would be required which will take time. The infrastructure requirements would also need to be considered.
- 5.20 **Recommendation: It is recommended that no change is made to the overall strategy. However it is suggested that scoping work is started to investigate where a possible new settlement could be delivered for the Local Plan period beyond 2033.**

Spread Development throughout the Borough

- 5.21 Some have argued that development should be spread around the Borough. One suggestion was to deliver the same amount of development in every settlement. No change is proposed. The delivery of infrastructure would be a real concern with such a proposal. Major infrastructure provision as a result of development could not be secured with a range of smaller sites although there would be the same amount of housing and population. This suggestion would also lead to development within the Green Belt despite sites are available and deliverable outside of the Green Belt.

Focussing development on the Market Towns outside of the Green Belt

- 5.22 Many representations question Polesworth and Dordon being seen through the spatial strategy alongside Atherstone and Coleshill, as a main settlement / Market Town.
- 5.23 Polesworth and Dordon have been closely related for a number of years. The close relationship between the two settlements in planning terms was recognised by the Polesworth and Dordon Local Plan Brief in 1984 and Local Plan in 1989. The 1989 Local Plan linked the two settlements with a continuous development boundary and noted in paragraph 4.19 that "*the built up area of Dordon is an indistinguishable continuation of Polesworth southwards*".
- 5.24 The Warwickshire Structure Plan ("WASP") 1996 – 2011 recognised Polesworth and Dordon as one of the nine main towns within Warwickshire along with Atherstone. Coleshill was not identified as a main town. Within the North Warwickshire Local Plan 2006 Atherstone and Polesworth with Dordon were identified as market towns. The Borough Council tried, during the examination for the 2006 Local Plan, to convince the Inspector to consider Polesworth and Dordon as independent settlements. Coleshill was also identified as a market town. However, the Inspector for that Local Plan considered Polesworth and Dordon as co-joined settlements that would be considered as one, and that he wanted to see the distinction between the settlements outside of the Green Belt and Coleshill, as they could be a focus for growth whilst Coleshill was not. This hierarchy was continued into the Core Strategy and this continues to form the basis for the current Local Plan.
- 5.25 There has been a lot of criticism for putting a large site for development to the east of Polesworth and Dordon. Although there are representations with complete opposition to the proposal there are many that have raised concerns covering the loss of wildlife sites; the loss of open space; the impact on schools; impact on health facilities; flooding; impact on Dunton Hall; impact on wildlife; highway concerns both local and along the A5.
- 5.26 The information included in the Draft Local Plan has clearly not been enough to allay concerns that green infrastructure, health, education and highways in particular would be considerations. As the draft policy wording suggests the intention was to bring forward a concept plan / master plan to show how the larger sites will be developed. It has been possible, through HCA funding, to prepare a concept plan to be included in the Local Plan initially for the site to the east of Polesworth and Dordon. It will lay the foundations to develop the site using the information from the representations and evidence being gathered by the landowners to prepare a master plan for the area. This will involve the Parish Councils and the local community. The exact details of how and what this engagement will involve including timescales are being explored and developed, and will be reported back to Members next month.

5.27 **Recommendations:**

1. **A concept plan is being prepared to be included in the submission version of the Local Plan. Local members, landowners and the two Parish Councils will be asked for their comments prior to it coming to Members for inclusion in the submission version of the Local Plan. The general public will then have the opportunity to make comments during the next consultation period.**
2. **A community engagement plan will be developed and brought back to Members.**

More development should be targeted to Coleshill

5.28 Coleshill is one of the Market Towns within the Borough surrounded by Green Belt. In theory it is a place where development could take place as it has a range of services and facilities, employment opportunities and sustainable transport with Coleshill Parkway. There is increasing pressure for development in this area due to the proposals at UK Central / Arden Cross, the continuing growth and future expansion plans of Birmingham Airport as well as the construction of HS2. However:

- Government has reaffirmed its commitment to the Green Belt especially when there is clear evidence that sites are available outside of the Green Belt and are located adjacent to other large settlements;
- HS2 Phase 2 will be built during the first part of the Plan period within the Coleshill corridor and would be a constraint to development taking place in the short to medium term;
- The plans for the airport are still in their early development;
- The plans for UK Central / Arden Cross are still in their development and;

5.29 For these reasons it is not proposed to consider growth around Coleshill within this Local Plan or within the Coleshill corridor but to direct development away from the Green Belt and thus Coleshill. This does not mean however that no development will take place within the town as redevelopment and change of uses will be possible.

5.30 **Recommendation: Change LP2 to make it clear Coleshill is restrained by the Green Belt.**

Category 2 – Settlements adjoining the outer boundary of the Borough

5.31 The Draft Local Plan incorporated a change to accommodate other available sites located on the outer boundary of the Borough but adjacent to large settlements such as Nuneaton and Tamworth. The new Category 2 in Policy LP2 means that development on the outer boundary of the Borough is possible when located close to other settlements outside of the Borough.

5.32 There have been some representations saying that sites like MIRA are in effect standalone sites and should be considered under Category 5 of LP2 which is development beyond all settlements. However although these sites

may appear to be standalone, development is being proposed in the adjoining local authorities which will bring development up to or close to these sites. For example development across northern Nuneaton will bring development close to MIRA and will only be separated by the former railway line now a footpath and cycle path. At Lindridge Road, Wishaw this will be adjacent to the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension (“SUE”) and land off Robey’s Lane, Tamworth will be adjacent to the former Tamworth Golf course currently under construction by Redrow Homes.

5.33 **Recommendation: No changes are proposed.**

4) Green Belt

5.34 Some developments were proposed in the Draft Local Plan within the Green Belt. These are:

1. housing site adjacent to the proposed Langley SUE (Sustainable Urban Extension of 6000 dwellings) in Birmingham;
2. part of the housing site at the Water Orton Primary School;
3. housing at Kingsbury Hall, Kingsbury; and,
4. employment on the former Power Station B at Hams Hall.

In addition a site to the north of Kingsbury was proposed to be safeguarded for future development in a subsequent Local Plan following the construction of HS2 Phase 2b.

5.35 The site at Lindridge Road, Wishaw is adjacent to the proposed Langley SUE. Langley SUE is included in the adopted Birmingham Local Plan having been accepted by a Planning Inspector and the Secretary of State. It has a clear and strong physical boundary of the M6 Toll Road. It is likely to have been included in the Langley SUE if it were not for administrative boundaries. It is recommended that this site continues as an allocation.

5.36 HS2 Phase 2 will pass close to the existing Water Orton Primary School. Within the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Act 2017 it is proposed that a new school is built off Plank Lane. This means that the existing school will become vacant. The site will be available once the new school has been built. This is expected by autumn 2019. The local community are keen for the old part of the school building to be retained. Part of the site is brownfield and partly within the development boundary for Water Orton. The site has come about due to HS2 being constructed and will have a clear defensible boundary. The playing fields will be replaced at the new school. It is proposed to retain this site within the Local Plan.

5.37 In terms of the site at Kingsbury Hall following discussions with Historic England it is clear that there is insufficient evidence to allocate further land for development to assist the Hall being completed and thus taken off the Buildings at Risk register. An extant planning permission exists to allow some development to assist the refurbishment as a result of exceptional circumstances having been demonstrated. If further development is required then this can be determined on the evidence of viability through the planning application process. It is proposed to remove this site from the Local Plan.

- 5.38 Since the preparation of the Draft Local Plan planning permission has been granted to the site of the former Power Station B, Hams Hall for employment use. The application was not called in by the Secretary of State. This site should thus be excluded from the Green Belt but not listed as an allocation as it now has planning permission but included as an employment commitment.
- 5.39 The site proposed to be shown as safeguarded is to the north of Kingsbury. The current safeguarded site includes all of the area up to the M42. It is important to consider what exceptional circumstances exist for this site to be safeguarded. It is considered that these include:
- i) The route of Phase 2b of HS2 has been announced and when completed will run through the northern part of the site.
 - ii) This area performed relatively poorly in the Joint Green Belt Study which looked at the five purposes of land being within the Green Belt.
 - iii) The boundaries of sites are also important to consider. In this respect the land remaining once HS2 Phase 2b has been implemented will have firm boundaries surrounding the site comprising of built development to the south, Tamworth Road to the east, River Tame to the west and HS2 to the north.
 - iv) Within Kingsbury the County Council and other infrastructure providers are looking into the implementation of the Kingsbury railway station. This is a longer term project. Unlike Coleshill, where redevelopment sites have been brought forward over the last few years, there has been few redevelopment opportunities that have been carried out in Kingsbury.
- 5.40 Taking all of these things into consideration it is recommended that the safeguarded site north of Kingsbury will continue. This site would not come forward for development in the short to medium term. However it may come forward in the longer term but only following the review of the Local Plan. It is therefore not an allocation for development during this Plan period. It will require a review of the Local Plan.
- 5.41 **Recommendations:**
1. **The site at Lindridge Road, Wishaw remains as an allocation.**
 2. **The site at the Water Orton Primary School remains a housing allocation.**
 3. **The site at Kingsbury Hall is deleted as a proposed site allocation.**
 4. **The site at Hams Hall is not shown as an allocation as the site now has planning permission but is shown as part of the employment area at Hams Hall and outside of the Green Belt.**
 5. **The safeguarded site north of Kingsbury continues.**

Additional Sites

- 5.42 A Joint Green Belt Study has been carried out. This was discussed at the 25 April 2016 meeting of the LDF Sub-committee. The Study looked at the five purposes of land being in the Green Belt and scored parcels and broad areas accordingly. It broadly, other than a few minor sites, has confirmed that land

in the Green Belt within the Borough does perform well against the five purposes. Although this information is only part of the picture that is required in determining if land should remain in or out of the Green Belt it provides an direction that retaining the Green Belt broadly across the Borough is the right thing to do.

- 5.43 Sites have been suggested for inclusion within the Local Plan that lie within the Green Belt. It is not expected that any of the sites will be proposed to be allocated in the submission version of the Local Plan.
- 5.44 **Recommendation: It is not proposed that any additional development sites which lie within the Green Belt will be allocated for development in the Plan.**

5) *Effect of recent appeals*

- 5.45 There have been four recent appeals that have an impact on the Local Plan.
1. land south-east of M42 Junction 10 and A5;
 2. land north of B5000;
 3. land off Tunnel Road, Ansley; and,
 4. land at the former Daw Mill colliery.
- 5.46 Both of the first two sites fall within the Meaningful Gap as shown on the Draft Local Plan maps. The first of these is the appeal for land south-east of M42 Junction 10 and A5. This site falls within the Meaningful Gap as shown on the Draft Local Plan maps. The second is within the Meaningful Gap but north of the A5 and off the B5000. The implications from these two applications are considered further below in the section covering the Meaningful Gap.
- 5.47 The appeal by Muller Homes on land off Tunnel Road, Ansley for 79 dwellings was approved. It is in a settlement where the Core Strategy suggested a minimum number of units to be brought forward would be 40 dwellings. Taking into account the other developments that have got approval for the village this amounts to around 200 dwellings. The new Local Plan is seeking to ensure that development takes place on sites allocated and within development boundaries. It has stepped away from allowing development to take place adjacent to development boundaries. This should in the medium to long term, avoid smaller developments being approved in smaller settlements bringing people into communities but without the provision of infrastructure. This is one of the reasons why the current Local Plan has focused on development of larger sites. This does not mean that housing will not come forward as redevelopments and changes of use. These would generally be permitted inside development boundaries.
- 5.48 A decision by the Secretary of State is awaited on the site of the former Daw Mill Colliery. Representations have been received seeking the site for residential development. The site is 40 hectares lying in the Green Belt, located on B roads and not adjacent or close to any settlement within North Warwickshire. It would be a standalone development. It would be unlikely to

be large enough to support any services or facilities. It is not proposed to make any changes to the Local Plan. If a planning application for housing were to be brought forward on this site, very special circumstances would need to be proven.

- 5.49 **Recommendation: No change in this section (please refer to Meaningful Gap section for other proposed changes)**

6) *Meaningful Gap*

- 5.50 It is proposed that the site now with planning permission at the junction of 10 M42 is taken out of the Meaningful Gap. The Meaningful Gap will thus focus on land to the north of the A5.
- 5.51 The Inspector refused the appeal on the site north of B5000 and clearly agreed that the site was within the gap between Tamworth and Polesworth. It is therefore not proposed to make any changes to the Meaningful Gap at this point.
- 5.52 Comments have been made that the proposed allocation to the west of Robey's Lane was in the Meaningful Gap. It is important to understand that the proposed allocation has never been included in the area shown as the Meaningful Gap either in the Meaningful Gap Assessment or in the Draft Site Allocations. It is proposed to continue with the allocation on the land to the west of Robey's Lane.
- 5.53 A report is being finalised looking at the Meaningful Gap and considering how it is measured and perceived. This report will inform what if any changes could take place. This report will be brought to Members for consideration.
- 5.54 **Recommendations:**
1. **The Proposals Map is amended to exclude the site south of the A5 at junction 10 M42 from the Meaningful Gap; and,**
 2. **The Meaningful Gap Report is brought before Members for consideration.**

7) *Housing Numbers*

Numbers

- 5.55 As a result of the proposed recommendation to change the Plan period it is necessary to look to add two additional years to the housing numbers. The main question is how much should be added to the housing requirement particularly as the Borough sits within two housing market areas.
- 5.56 The minimum housing requirement that the Local Plan is seeking to deliver is 5280, an annual requirement of 264 units. It is therefore logical that as a

minimum this is the additional requirement that should be added. For two additional years this would equate to an additional 528 units.

- 5.57 The Local Plan is however aspiring to deliver a further 3790 to assist in dealing with the needs from the wider Greater Birmingham HMA. As mentioned in paragraph 5.7 above GL Hearn are currently looking at strategic options for growth across the whole of the HMA and adjoining Black Country HMA. These are much broader options than the Borough Council alone would consider and it is recommended that at the present time these cannot be determined and should not be included. This would also allow time for the relevant infrastructure implications to be determined.

Supply

- 5.58 Monitoring information for housing is maintained on an annual basis. The information included in the Draft Local Plan is up to 31st March 2016. The updated information can be incorporated as of 31st March 2017. Table 7 in the Draft Local Plan which looks at the supply of housing needs to be updated to reflect the up to date situation in relation to the extended Plan period as well as the numbers of completions and outstanding planning permissions.

Table 3: Revised Table 7: Housing Supply

Housing Supply Sources / Allowances	Explanation	Amount to be Added / Subtracted to reach the requirement for new housing allocations
Housing requirement up to 2033	The amount of housing required over the plan period includes Strategic Housing Market Assessment and redistribution from GB HMA (including Tamworth BC) and CW HMA	9070 +264 +264 = (528) = (9598) 9600
Net housing completions (2011/17)	New homes built in the first part of the plan period	- 1069
Sites with planning permission at 01/04/2017	Remaining capacity on existing planning permissions for new homes	- 1135
Windfall allowance	An allowance of 60 per annum (2018 to 2033)	- 900
Sub-Total of land to be allocated in the Local Plan	Total derived from above five rows	= 6494
5% flexibility rate on site allocations	To ensure flexibility, choice and competition in the market for land	+ 325
Total amount of land to be allocated in the Local Plan	Total taking account of need, net completions to date, planning permissions, windfall allowance and flexibility rate	= (6819) 6820

- 5.59 In relation to the sites listed in Draft Local Plan policy LP39 there are some updates that need to be reflected in the list of proposed allocations. Some sites now have planning permission so are included within the commitments above (1135 figure above). These are:

- Britannia Mill, Coleshill Road, Atherstone;
- Grimstock Hill, Coleshill (COL1);

- land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common (ANSCOMM1); and,
- land rear of Village Hall, Birmingham Road, Ansley

5.60 **Recommendation:**

1. **The revised Table 7 as shown above is included in the submission version of the Local Plan; and,**
2. **The list of proposed housing allocations is updated.**

8) Employment Land

Numbers

5.61 Similar to housing, extending the Plan period by two years will impact on the employment land requirements. Consultants have been engaged to provide a short paper on the implications on employment land requirements. This information is not yet available. It is **not** expected to mean a large increase in the need for more employment land.

Supply

5.62 Since the Draft Local Plan has been prepared a planning application was approved on the former power station B site at Hams Hall. In addition following an appeal planning permission has been granted for a further 25 hectares at junction 10 M42.

5.63 Monitoring information for employment land is maintained on an annual basis. The information included in the Draft Local Plan is up to 31st March 2016. The updated information can be incorporated as of 31st March 2017. Taking into account planning permissions and completions it is recommended that Table 8 is provisionally revised to reflect the up to date situation as follows, subject to the further information on the additional two years on the plan period:

Revised Table 8: Employment Land 2011 - 31

		<i>Lower Requirement 5280 dwellings</i>	<i>Higher Requirement 9070</i>
A	Total Employment Land Requirement	58	91
B	Completions in ha from 2011 to 2016	3.22	3.22
C	Extant Planning permissions / allocations	31.58 + 25 + 20	31.58 + 25 +20
D	Total Supply (B + C)	79.8	79.8
E	Remaining Employment Land Requirement Sum = A – D	-33	11.2

5.64 It is expected that the proposal to extend the Plan period and the effect on employment land can be dealt with by allocating the whole of the MIRA site

rather than allocating some within this Plan period and some within the next Plan period. This

5.65 **Recommendation:**

1. **Table 8 is revised subject to further revisions when the information from the consultants has been received.**
2. **The list of proposed housing allocations is updated.**

9) ***Suggested Development Sites***

5.66 As can be seen in the representations a number of sites have been put forward as potential allocations. These are being looked at in more detail to assess whether they should or should not be included in the submission version of the Local Plan. Any sites that would be positively looked at will not however change the over strategy of the Local Plan.

5.67 **Recommendation: Potential development sites are considered in more detail considered for inclusion within the submission version of the Local Plan.**

10) ***Infrastructure***

5.68 The updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the Local Plan can be found elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

5.69 Infrastructure has been a key issue in many of the representations. There are four main issues of concern raised within the representations and these relate to education provision, healthcare, highways and flooding.

5.70 Many representations are concerned about the capacity of schools to cater for the proposed growth. Details have been supplied from Warwickshire County Council, the education authority, indicating what it is looking for in terms of the proposed allocations or if it is a planning application how much financial contribution and / or land it would require. A presentation was given to members on 9 February and been incorporated into the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

5.71 Information has been received from the George Eliot Hospital. This information will be also incorporated into the IDP however further discussions are required to make it specific to the Plan.

5.72 A presentation was made to members' on 7 July outlining the complex issues associated with the consideration of health care and its future provision by colleagues in the CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group) and WCC Public Health. Similar to the education requirements, the requirements of the CCG have been broken down to the individual sites and an indication given as to whether this is a financial contribution and / or land. Discussions are ongoing to the

- 5.73 Many of the respondents have expressed concern at the amount of traffic on the roads and also specific concerns about certain roads. A Draft Strategic Transport Assessment has been received. A final version is awaited. It will indicate a number of road improvements that are required to be undertaken in relation to specific developments to bring the highways up to the appropriate standard. These will be incorporated into the IDP once the final report and list of schemes have been received.
- 5.74 In addition, the STA will consider sustainable transport opportunities. This will include public transport, both buses and trains, and cycling. WCC has also given a commitment to prepare a Transport Strategy for the Borough. It is envisaged this will be drafted by March 2018.
- 5.75 Flooding is an issue that is recognised in the Local Plan. However it is clear that additional wording is required to ensure that flood zones 2 and 3 are avoided and that there is no greater run-off from a site than if it were a greenfield site.
- 5.76 **Recommendations:**
1. **The IDP is updated and further revisions be made when updated information is available from the STA, and George Eliot Hospital in particular; and,**
 2. **Infrastructure requirements will be further refined over time. Therefore work will continue with all infrastructure providers to get the most up to date information to sit alongside the proposed site allocations wherever possible.**

11) Ecology

- 5.77 Many representations have raised concerns about the loss of ecology especially on the large site allocations. Warwickshire Wildlife Trust has sent a very detailed representation in response to the consultation and it is proposed that as many of their recommendations are incorporated within the Plan as possible. In addition, it is recommended that policy wording will be amended to reflect the importance that the Borough Council places on ecology even though it is pursuing additional growth. These will help to address many of the comments.

In addition, work is being progressed to develop a concept plan which will be incorporated into the submission version of the Plan for the site to the east of Polesworth and Dordon. It will indicate the areas to be safeguarded from development.

- 5.78 **Recommendation: Changes to policy wording for a number of sites and inclusion of concept plan for site to the east of Polesworth and Dordon to indicate more clearly that the Council is looking to protect (where possible), make linkages between sites and improve wherever possible sites of ecological value.**

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

- 5.79 In accordance with the Habitats Regulations, there must be a formal assessment of the implications of any new plans or projects which are capable of affecting the designated interest features of European Sites before deciding whether to undertake, permit or authorise such a plan or project. It is therefore a required part of the process of preparing a Local Plan. For example it would look at sites such as Special Areas of Conservation or SAC's. The HRA is currently being finalised and will accompany the submission version of the Local Plan.

Priority Habitats

- 5.80 Natural England, one of the key statutory consultees for the production of a local plan, has made comments in relation to the Draft Local Plan. This issue will be considered in further reports.

12) Historic setting

- 5.81 Historic England, one of the key statutory consultees for the production of a local plan, has made comments in relation to the Draft Local Plan. A meeting was held with them to discuss a way forward. Although additional work has been commissioned to cover all of the site allocations from an archaeological perspective this did not cover the impact of development on the historic setting of sites. Further discussions will need to take place with Historic England to agree a way forward.

- 5.82 **Recommendation: Further discussions will need to take place with Historic England to agree a way forward.**

13) Leisure

- 5.83 The Leisure Review is continuing. The Green Space Strategy, Playing Pitch Strategy and draft Open Space SPD are all awaited.

- 5.84 **Recommendation: Minor changes will be made to the Local Plan to reference that work is ongoing and will refer to subsequent updates.**

14) HS2

- 5.85 There have been representations saying that because Phase 1 of HS2 is being built through the Coleshill corridor that this is where development should be focussed within this Plan period. Others have said because of the impact of Phase 2b development should be focussed away from Polesworth and Dordon.

- 5.86 As Members are aware both Phase 1 and Phase 2b will be constructed through the Borough. The timescales for the actual building of the route will be from 2017 to 2023 with opening in 2026 for Phase 1 and between 2022 and 2031 with opening in 2033 for Phase 2b. This means that during the life of this Local Plan there will be construction works from one or both parts of the route.

5.87 The size and complexity of this work will influence where development is focussed within the Local Plan period. Whilst HS2 is being developed through the Coleshill corridor it is logical to focus housing delivery away from this area as much as possible to ensure a supply of housing. In addition HS2 has the power to stop developments being delivered if they consider it interferes with their construction schedule. This has to also be a factor.

5.88 **Recommendation: To show the route of Phase 2b on the Proposals Map.**

15) Sustainability Appraisal

5.89 A Sustainability Appraisal must accompany the Local Plan. A full report informed the preparation of the Draft Local Plan and recommendations were made. These are shown in Appendix D. These recommendations have been considered and suggested changes or comments have been made. Some of these require a change to the Draft Local Plan.

5.90 During the consultation process comments have been made on the Sustainability Appraisal. These have been summarised in Appendix E with a suggested response. The comments have been considered by both the Council and its consultants resulting in recommendations to make some additional changes to the Sustainability Appraisal report and Local Plan.

5.91 A final Sustainability Appraisal will be produced to accompany the submission version of the Local Plan. This will include the information from above as well as the audit trail information for site assessments.

5.92 **Recommendation: Changes be incorporated into the submission version of the Local Plan to reflect the recommendations referred to in Appendix D and E.**

16) Proposed changes

5.93 As can be seen from the discussion above and the responses to individual representations it is not being suggested or proposed that there is a fundamental shift in the Local Plan. It is still proposed to focus the majority of the development outside of the Green Belt but towards the bigger settlements either within or adjacent to the Borough. A range of sites remain which will bring forward and maintain a supply of housing whilst also achieving a range of infrastructure provision through the development of larger sites.

6 Submission version of the Local Plan

6.1 Following this meeting a submission version of the Local Plan will be finalised and brought back to Members for consideration. It will include the changes highlighted above. It will also incorporate the changes listed as a response to the representations as well as those recommended through the sustainability process.

- 6.2 The timetable for the production of the Local Plan is broadly outlined in the Local Development Scheme, which is an item elsewhere on this agenda. The next stage for the Local Plan is to go out for a further round of consultation. This consultation is on the version the Borough Council considers to be sound and the best Plan it can formulate with the information currently available and the one it hopes to submit to the Secretary of State for consideration.
- 6.3 This part of the process becomes more technical as responses during this period of consultation can only be made on whether the Plan complies with the “Tests of Soundness”. These tests are:
1. **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
 2. **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
 3. **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
 4. **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the (Minerals and Waste Development) Framework.
- 6.4 The Local Plan will then be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound.

7 **Next Steps**

- 7.1 It is proposed that a submission version of the Draft Local Plan be prepared and brought back to a special Executive Board in mid-October. This will then go out for consultation along with the Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

8 **Report Implications**

8.1 **Finance and Value for Money Implications**

- 8.1.1 The costs of the programme of work have been the subject of other reports and are funded through the Local Development Framework budget. The costs of examination including the Inspector and Programme Officer will be from this budget.

8.2 **Safer Communities Implications**

- 8.2.1 There are not considered to be any specific safer communities’ implications or issues arising from the document or consultation. The Warwickshire and

Worcester Police have provided a representation with their view of the changes it would like to see in the Local Plan.

8.3 Legal and Human Rights Implications

8.3.1 Stakeholder involvement and consultation in the production of the Development Plan process is an important element to ensure constructive consultation takes place as required by regulations.

8.4 Environment and Sustainability Implications

8.4.1 A Sustainability Appraisal will accompany the final document. This will be progressed alongside the document and will form part of the consultation process. In addition a Habitats Regulations Assessment will also be required. Both of these documents will form part of the suite of documents for the 6 week consultation period.

8.5 Health, Wellbeing and Leisure Implications

8.5.1 There are not considered to be any specific Health, Wellbeing and Leisure Implications or issues arising from the document or consultation.

8.6 Human Resources Implications

8.6.1 The document has been drafted by the Forward Planning and Economic Strategy team who will be required to progress the document, including formal consultation, the submission to the Secretary of State and subsequent Examination in Public. There are therefore significant human resource implications for the delivery and completion/adoption of this document. This may require additional support and/or resources, particularly at the Examination in Public Stage.

8.7 Risk Management Implications

8.7.1 The Local Plan will be a new policy document for the Borough. This document will bring forward any relevant saved Local Plan allocations and adopted Core Strategy. The Local Plan will bring forward policies that are considered to be important to assist in the future development of the Borough.

8.8 Equalities Implications

8.8.1 An Equality Impact Needs Assessment has been carried out and is attached to this report.

8.9 Links to Council's Priorities

8.9.1 The Local Plan is linked to all aspects of the Council's priorities.

The Contact Officer for this report is Dorothy Barratt (719250).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act,
2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date

Equality Impact Assessment Summary Sheet

Please complete the following table summarised from the equality impact assessment form. This should be completed and attached to relevant Board reports.

Name of Policy Procedure/Service	North Warwickshire Local Plan – draft submission
Officer Responsible for assessment	Dorothy Barratt

Does this policy /procedure /service have any differential impact on the following equality groups /people

- (a) Is there a positive impact on any of the equality target groups or contribute to promoting equal opportunities and improve relations or:
- (b) could there be a negative impact on any of the equality target groups i.e. disadvantage them in any way

Equality Group	Positive impact	Negative impact	Reasons/Comments
Racial			There is a policy which gives the site criteria by which planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will be considered.
Gender			
Disabled people	Yes		10% of housing on large sites is required to be for special needs accommodation. The policy is flexible and not prescriptive on the exact nature of this requirement as there is a full range of disabilities that could be accommodated. The Borough Council will work proactively with developers to assess this in more detail at the time of a planning application.
Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual people			
Older/Younger people	Yes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A range of house types is being looked for throughout the Borough specifically to assist the young and older people. This will assist the young to remain in the Borough and to help people move into more suitable accommodation. 2. A range of house types will be more achievable on larger sites. 3. In addition there is a policy to improve walking and cycling which can be linked to improving health as well as providing an alternative mode of travel which is more cost effective.
Religion and Beliefs			
People having dependents caring responsibilities			
People having an			

offending past			
Transgender people			

If you have answered **No** to any of the above please give your reasons below

Please indicate if you believe that this document

Should proceed to further Impact assessment?

Needs no further action

Risk Management Form

**NORTH WARWICKSHIRE
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Chief Executive's Division

2009 Cost Centre or Service

Risk Ref	Risk: Title/Description	Consequence	Likelihood (5 = high, 1 = low)	Impact (5 = high, 1 = low)	Gross Risk Rating	Responsible Officer	Existing Control Procedures	Likelihood (5 = high, 1 = low)	Impact (5 = high, 1 = low)	Net Risk Rating
	DELAYED DELIVERY OF STATUTORY PLAN MAKING REQUIREMENT	Development by appeal Possible Government intervention Impact on ability to bring in funding to deliver required infrastructure Core Strategy increasingly becoming out of date	5	4	20	Dorothy Barratt	Statutory process- legislation to comply with Local Development Scheme provides timetable. Monitoring carried out annually Consultation with general public and members- included in timetable Political commitment to timetable LDF sub-committee oversee process Experienced staff trained in process, and updated as things change	3	3	9
Risk Ref	Options for additional / replacement control procedure						Cost Resources	Likelihood (5 = high, 1 = low)	Impact (5 = high, 1 = low)	Net Risk Rating

Completed By: Dorothy Barratt

Date: August 2017

Proforma	Item	Summary of Representation
Proforma 1	Environment, infrastructure	Local Plan really concerns me. I enjoy living in a rural village and want this to continue. beautiful countryside and wildlife surrounds us. Schools are oversubscribed. Where will children from 2000 dwellings go. There are no plans to build more. Hard to get a doctors appointment, without potentially an extra 6000 people on patient list. Already have lots of development with Birch Coppice and housing. A5 and the local roads are in chaos every morning and evening. School parking is horrendous. A5 is the same leading up to the M42 without the potential of an extra 4000 cars. Plan will destroy our village.
Proforma 2	3.2	Core Strategy states key qualities that makes North Warwickshire unique is the quality of the natural and historic environment - why propose to turn some of these areas into a housing estate. If this plan goes ahead Dordon & Polesworth will become the largest Market Town in North Warwickshire, destroying the village life enjoyed by both. Dordon has had some horrendous development - take a trip and see some of the eye sore units that have been built practically in peoples back gardens. What were the planners thinking? - certainly not about the needs of local people. Local Plan (3.2) states "The Borough will accommodate development in a balanced and sustainable way, placing a high priority on quality of life, ensuring the protection and restoration and enhancement of valuable natural and historic resources and providing the necessary supporting infrastructure" - the local plan doesn't take this into account - how is "protecting" ancient woodland achieved by ringing it with a housing estate. I am wholly against the proposed local plan and feel new options need to be explored.
Proforma 3	Environment, infrastructure	Object strongly to the amount of houses - will take away our identity as 2 separate villages. Roads will not be able to cope(Long Street, Whitehouse Road, A5, M42 and B5000) Wildlife will be put in danger and our countryside will be gone. Schools and doctors will also be put under pressure. These are just a few of the worrying consequences
Proforma 4	Environment, infrastructure	Object to the amount of houses proposed for the 2 villages. Area to take the lions share. See no plans for infrastructure and in the case of roads see no way of improving these to take the extra vehicles. Schools and doctors are at full capacity - telephone consultations are very dangerous. More vehicles means more pollution. Our countryside devastated, our wildlife pushed from their habitat.
Proforma 5	Environment, infrastructure	Should be a clear focus on brownfield sites and building higher density closer to public transport and amenities to ensure and reduce car dependency and traffic pollution. Should be a strict brownfield policy to ensure developers do not cherry pick green sites. Allotments are regarded as vital to improve sustainability in North Warwickshire and ensure children are connected with food and farming - believe it is short sighted to allocate Birch Coppice allotments for development. Core Strategy Plan (2.2) states "the rural nature of the borough is very important" - your new plan proposes to obliterate this by building on locally important swathes of countryside. I get the impression that the Borough Council thinks if the correct infrastructure is put in place the people of Dordon/Polesworth will welcome this development with open arms - this is not the case . I urge you to rethink the plan.
Proforma 6	Environment, infrastructure	Concerned that building in this area will cause overlooking of properties and a loss of privacy for people living opposite the build. Massive amount of noise and disturbance which will be intolerable for many years should the build go ahead. Aware sites are greenfield and not green belt - still play host too many species of wildlife. beautiful walks in the area which will be destroyed by the build. Not acceptable to take so much beauty away from local people and then ring a small piece of land and call it a "country park". Site designated for this is probably the most unattractive pieces of land on the whole build. Really angry that these proposals are going to destroy my village way of life. Concerns about lack of infrastructure in the area to cope with a build of this size.
Proforma 7	2.26	Para 2.26 of Plan states there are clear links between issues of poor health, obesity, open space/ recreation, education and the skills gap, rural transport and isolation.
Proforma 8	Environment, infrastructure	Should have been more discussion of the options before deciding to put so many houses in our area. It is going to wreck our area. Lovely countryside concreted over. Lived in Dordon for many years and will totally spoil the village. Not been presented with other options. Has anyone thought about impact of HS2 and the other developments in the area? Not to mention the mega units at Birch Coppice. Must be better proposals that you can put before us?

Proforma 9	Environment, infrastructure	My objections are very valid. It seems infrastructure is a massive problem for planners as to do changes to our roads, if done properly, will costs millions - A5, B5000, M42. Other services need to change substantially - doctors, schools, emergency services all struggling to cope. Where will the wildlife go? No areas left to sustain trees. Public footpaths gone under concrete and housing estates, pollution increased putting peoples' health at risk. Industrial build out of control with no consideration for the villagers who have seen monstrosities of massive proportions going up close to properties. These are just a few of the objections I feel need to be considered.
Proforma 10	Environment, infrastructure	Object to development of 160 ha of land between the two villages of Dordon and Polesworth. I note in planning terms Polesworth and Dordon have been referred to as a "Market Town" thus negating the volumes of development normally allowed for villages. There is neither the services or infrastructure to support such a massive increase in houses. Can not see anything in IDP to convince me - education, health transport networks need improvement. If the Forward Planning Team were to drive through Polesworth between 8am to 9am or around school time they will note the terrible congestion on the roads which were built for horse and carts. Another 2000 houses will cause our roads to grind to a halt. The new road from A5 to B5000 will bring further traffic into the village thus serving the newly proposed Robey's Lane development of another 1800 homes. Proposed build is inappropriate and disproportionate with the character and resources of our villages.
Proforma 11	Environment, infrastructure	Disappointment in the proposal for our area. Traffic already terrible on A5 and B5000. Nightmare in morning to get on to island at A5 / Long Street. Concerned at level of pollution not to mention impact on countryside. Schools have waiting lists and hard to get a doctors appointment. This will get worse. As a resident development being forced on us without any other reasonable alternatives being considered. Also aware of other developments planned for the area - HS2, developments in Tamworth and Polesworth not to mention massive employment units at Birch Coppice. Impact on A5. Urge you to go back to the drawing board to look at other options.
Proforma 12	Environment, infrastructure	Lived in area for many years. Strongly object. Dordon and Polesworth are semi-rural villages. Proposed housing will ruin character of the villages while estate development will overwhelm. Protection of Dordon and Polesworth visual, historic and archaeological qualities are also supported by your policies. Para 64 of NPPF states planning permission should be refused for development of poor design and fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. No available Neighbourhood Plan for the areas. Both Parishes should be given opportunity to develop one respectively before the plan is considered. Proposed siting is ill-considered. It is on a greenfield site used by many villagers and tourists for recreation and walking dogs. Building here would diminish striking views. Both Dordon and Polesworth Parish Councils are against these plans
Proforma 13	Environment, infrastructure	This letter serves to highlight some of the problems which will be caused by building so many more houses on top of the ones already being built on the Grendon Road. Insufficient schools. Do not have capacity to take more. Doctors cannot cope with any more patients. Difficult to get an appointment. Do not have an adequate post office. A counter at the end of the checkout counter does not count - there is no privacy. Road infrastructure is poor. The junction at the Square is an accident waiting to happen. Canal bridges already an accident black spot. Construction traffic is a major issue. Sewers not designed to take so much. People's lives will be unacceptability affected by noise, pollution and lack of privacy. Country villages with surrounding wildlife habitats which will be destroyed. Need to point out that Polesworth is in NW and pay rates and council tax to Warks and want to keep it that way and not part of Staffs. We don't have the amenities of Staffs, why should we be stuck with a Staffs post code? Why should we residents fund a project which will not be beneficial to the lives and wellbeing of the village which is our home. It is a village and we would like to keep it that way.

Proforma 14	Environment, infrastructure	<p>Object to Plan for Dordon / Polesworth. Lived in Polesworth all of my life and shocked at scale to build 2000 east of Polesworth and 1200 on Robeys Lane. Does not represent a fair and realistic amount. Majority of housing in a small radius. Impact on area along with development at Tamworth Golf Course is immense . Urge to reconsider. Beautiful woodland and hedgerows. Abundant wildlife. Government trying to get us outdoors and you are proposing to take away what the villagers can access without driving. Will there be an environmental report published before the build? Will it involve the Woodlands Trust? Bluebell Wood will be destroyed eventually by impact of homes built so close - by cross pollination and by humans who have disregard for nature. Marked increase in traffic including construction traffic. Few stick to speed limit. Bridge Street congested especially in peak times. How will we get out of the village with all the proposed new homes travelling along B5000? Major problems at Long Street. A5 / M42 at critical level. Congestion and health damaging air pollution will be made worse. Also have HS2 on our doorstep. No infrastructure to overcome concerns. Scale of build out of proportion with the size of the villages. Consider myself to be a rural nature and do not want every bit of green space built on. Individual character of villages lost forever. No detail of infrastructure required. Health, dental and education are over stretched. Build will increase flooding in Polesworth. Loss of many trees and impermeable surfaces will impact on rivers, channels, drains and sewage systems. Flooding already arisen as part of St Leonard's development. Plans should be withdrawn and alternative options considered. Have all brownfield sites been considered in our Borough and also Birmingham and Coventry. Daw Mill will make a great housing site as this is a substantial area. Urge you to re-consider.</p>
Proforma 15	Environment, infrastructure	<p>Scale of housing much greater than plan approved a few years ago. This increase has not been justified. Polesworth and Dordon have poor public transport links to employment in cities and towns such as Birmingham, Nuneaton and Coventry. Not considered other locations with better transport links. Traffic congestion along B5000 and A5 already a major problem. Scale of development out of proportion to size of the villages. Limited shopping, leisure and community facilities do not compare to a "market town". Individual character of villages will be lost. Major investment needed on infrastructure to integrate so many people. No detail on infrastructure. Will need better roads, education, health and dental care facilities, open space, playing pitches, shops and community facilities. Will result in loss of open countryside. Harmful to wildlife, landscape, ancient woodland, trees and historic or other archaeological features. Other constraints such as drainage, flooding and past mining.</p>
Proforma 16	Environment, infrastructure	<p>Shocked and saddened by proposals in Plan. Everyone I have spoken to is dead against it. Understand there is a housing crisis and houses are needed but smaller, sustainable developments through the Borough equally distributed is the way to go. Not enough options looked into. Traffic is already a massive problem. Getting difficult to get off drive to go to work. Can only see this getting worse with HS2, other planned developments in Dordon , Polesworth and Birch Coppice. Also other developments in Birmingham (Walmley) which will no doubt have a knock on effect. Please revisit the plan and change it.</p>
Proforma 17	Environment, infrastructure	<p>Lived in Polesworth for many years. Shocked at scale of build on our green spaces of 2000 east of Polesworth and 1200 for Robey's Lane. Does not represent a fair or realistic amount. Majority of housing will be built within a small radius. Live just off B5000 and seen a marked increase in traffic including construction traffic. Traffic already a major problem on Long Street. A5 and junction 10 M42 is at critical level. With the impact of HS2 on doorstep going to be hindered for many years with pollution, noise, uncertainty and disruption. Plan will bring nothing to residents of the villages apart from upset. Plan will decimate area of natural beauty enjoyed by residents. Wildlife is abundant. Please reconsider. All brownfield sites should be developed first both within the Borough and in Birmingham and Coventry. Also a new garden village should be considered because then would not have such as devastating effect on lives of those in the villages of Polesworth and Dordon.</p>

Proforma 18	Environment, infrastructure	Object to proposals and in particular 2000 homes east of Polesworth & Dordon and 12000 at Robeys Lane. 1. I live on B5000 in Polesworth and road already an issue. Marked increase in traffic for construction of St Leonard's build. Few stick to speed limit. Road becoming dangerous. Bridge Street congested especially in peak times. Problems at Long Street, A5, Junction 10 M42. Congestion and health damaging air pollution made worse by major development of this size. Also have HS2 on our doorstep to add to congestion, pollution and disruption for many years to come. No clear infrastructure to overcome these concerns. 2. Scale of build is out of proportion with size of villages. Consider ourselves to be rural. Do not want every bit of green space built on. Loss of significant area of countryside and jeopardise ancient woodland. 3. No details on infrastructure. Health, school and dental services already overstretched. No indication if these facilities will be delivered and who will pay for them. 4. Increase in flooding. Loss of some many trees and impermeable surfaces will have a huge impact on river and its channels and on drains and sewers. Plans should be withdrawn and alternative options considered. Have all brownfield sites been considered. Daw Mill Colliery site would make a great site for housing. Substantial area and better for housing than industrial due to country roads. Urge you to reconsider.
Proforma 19	Environment, infrastructure	Some of objections to the proposed build are recent revelations with cuts to our education system and drastic reduction in funding of almost £1.1 million for the 4 schools in our area. Loss of teachers and classroom assistants, overstretched to breaking point. Roads are not suitable for extra amount of traffic especially at peak times. Doctors and emergency services stretched to the limit, most of these having to come some distance to serve this area. Our Green spaces gone with the wildlife it supports. Disruption with building so many dwellings plus HS2 and all the construction traffic, dirt and noise this will bring.
Proforma 20	Environment, infrastructure	Lived in area for many years and enjoyed wildlife and walks in the area. Strongly object. Devastating effect on wildlife. Nesting barn owls in area - rich bird life and other British wildlife. Sad that there has been no thought of building on brownfield sites in the area.
Proforma 21	Environment, infrastructure	Feel very strongly and object to amount of houses - far too many and will cause endless problems. Amount of traffic. Pollution will cause problems for those residents already with health issues. Doctors already over stretched. Schools struggling to cope now - some children have to go outside of the area. Taking away our green spaces and somewhere to walk and enjoy prolific wildlife. Our environment changed forever. Lose individuality and be lost in concrete jungle.
Proforma 22	Environment, infrastructure	Object to proposals and in particular 2000 homes east of Polesworth & Dordon and 1200 at Robeys Lane. 1. The scale of development will change the landscape of villages. It will double the size of the villages. Out of proportion for the Borough. Will become a concrete jungle especially with Birch Coppice. 2. Information on infrastructure is inadequate - what, when and how will it be paid for? Significant additional infrastructure required - better road/transport links, health and dental care, open space and playing fields, shops, community facilities. 3. Amount of traffic will put pressure on B5000, A5 and M42. At a critical point now without additional traffic. Pressure on other roads of Long Street, New Street and Bridge Street. HS2 will also have an impact. Village will be disturbed for years with pollution, noise and uncertainty. 4. Will result in significant loss of open countryside. Harmful to wildlife and their habitats. Woodland been there for a significant time and will destroy a number of ancient trees. To say woodland will be protected is of little comfort - could still be destroyed. 5. Building will increase flooding in Polesworth. Loss of trees and impermeable surfaces will affect the river dramatically.
Proforma 23	Environment, infrastructure	Object to LP39. Need to protect ancient woodland. Please re-consider and save our ancient woodland and countryside for future generations. It will not survive in amongst housing estate.
Proforma 24	Environment, infrastructure	Proposal is a step to far. Layout and density of proposed development is inappropriate considering the current population. Local infrastructure is not adequate enough. Already have traffic problems in Dordon and roads cannot cope - Birch Coppice and the waste disposal facility are adding to these problems. Proposed development will have a negative effect on wildlife in the area. Work associated with HS2 needs to be taken into account as this will cause disruption for many years. Other constraints such as flooding, past mineral workings, drains and sewerage need to be taken into account. Health problems associated with pollution from extra cars and lorries especially from diesel engines. A lot of people already have breathing problems. Not being presented with much in the way of options to consider. The area is taking more than its fair share of building works with all the industrial units built and proposed off the A5, HS2 and subsequent traffic implications.

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the preparation of the draft Local Plan. A full SA Report was published alongside the Draft Local Plan in February 2017. The SA Report made recommendations to reduce the residual negative effects and enhance the positive effects of the Local Plan. These recommendations are outlined below alongside proposed changes to the Local Plan.

In addition the Sustainability Appraisal has indicated sites which have a residual significant adverse effect against the SA objectives. These are listed with the relevant SA objectives.

Despite the comprehensive range of mitigation measures outlined in the Draft Local Plan's policies, it is recommended that the draft site allocation policies include specific measures that address the potential significant adverse effects identified through the SA process. For example:

	Recommendation	Change
<i>SA1 – Services and Facilities:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the residual significant adverse effect identified under SA objective 1 (Services and Facilities) for site allocation policy POL12 it is recommended that the policy contain measures to improve the local transport network to make the local facilities and services closest to the allocation more readily accessible. The Council might also consider requiring new facilities and services to be located within or in close proximity to this new housing allocation. 	Will add wording to assist with this objective. Also look to have positive policy wording encouraging the provision of new services and facilities particularly within the larger site allocations.
<i>Sites</i>	POL12 Land west of Woodpack Farm	Although this is the only site listed it is suggested that the above recommendation is broadened to other sites particularly the larger sites. Smaller sites may be asked to contribute to the provision of services and facilities where appropriate.
<i>SA7 – Landscape</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 7 (Landscape) it is recommended that the site allocation policies likely to generate significant adverse effects on the character of the wider countryside include detailed, site-specific design measures relating to the sensitive scaling, laying out and landscaping of development sites. 	LP14 deals with landscape proposals – could you suggest what else we need to change?
<i>Sites</i>	AT20 Land at Holly Lane PS213 Land to the north-west of Atherstone POL/DOR1 Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon PS158 Land at Robeys Lane, Alvecote, Polesworth POL23, Land West of Robeys Lane,	Will look to include a sentence drawing attention to these sensitivities and requiring that the detailed design, scaling, layout and landscaping of new developments should be set out in accordance with Policy LP14 for the site allocation policies for

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations

	<p>adjacent Tamworth WIS1 Site at Lindridge Road, adjacent Langley Sue HAR3 Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill ANSCOMM/HAR1 Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common PS139 Land to the south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common ATH15 Land West of Holly Lane DOR22 Land west of Birch Coppice) DOR24 Land to west of Junction 10 M42 at Centurion Park PS235 MIRA – Land South of A5</p>	<p>which significant adverse effects have been identified</p>
<p><i>SA8 – Built Environment</i></p>	<p>• To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 8 (Built Environment) it is recommended that the site allocation policies likely to generate significant adverse effects on the Borough's cultural heritage include detailed, site-specific design measures relating to the protection and where appropriate enhancement of the historic character of the designated and non-designated heritage assets within the immediate vicinity, their setting and any wider historic landscape character. In addition, areas considered to have potential for buried archaeology, should include requirements for appropriate archaeological investigation works.</p>	<p>A Historic Environment Assessment is being carried out to ensure that these sensitivities are considered as part of the development process. The recommendations from the historic setting work and archaeology will be incorporated into the site allocations and be considered as part of any master planning for the sites.</p>
<p><i>Sites</i></p>	<p>POL3 Larger area including former Polesworth High School POL18 Land at Rear Of 5/7 Fairfield's Hill DOR25 Windy Ridge, Dunns Lane HAR3 Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill ANSCOMM1 Land off Coleshill Rd, Ansley Common ANS1 (Part) Land at Village Farm, Birmingham Road</p>	<p>Once these sensitivities are known, similar wording will be included as set out for Landscape sensitivities above – in accordance with Policy LP15.</p>
<p><i>SA9 – Biodiversity</i></p>	<p>• To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 9 (Biodiversity) it is recommended that the site allocation policies likely to generate significant adverse effects on the Borough's species and habitats include requirements for appropriate ecological surveys to determine how sensitive the immediate area is to development change, both in the short term during</p>	<p>Changes have been proposed as a result of representations by Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations

	construction and the medium and long term once the development is occupied, and to put in place mitigation as appropriate to ensure no net loss of biodiversity. In addition, developments in sensitive locations should incorporate green infrastructure.	
<i>Sites</i>	<p>ATH18 Britannia Mill, Coleshill Road, ATH20 Land at Holly Lane PS213 Land to the north-west of Atherstone ATH14 Atherstone Football Ground COL1 Land at Grimstock Hill, Lichfield Road POL/DOR1 Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon POL3 Larger area including former Polesworth High School POL4 Former Polesworth Learning Centre, High St, Polesworth DOR23 Chapel House, Dunns Lane DOR25, Windy Ridge, Dunns Lane POL23 Land West of Robeys Lane, adjacent Tamworth PS158 Land at Robeys Lane, Alvecote, Polesworth BE3 Land north of Grendon Community Hall (former Youth Centre) BE7/8 Land at Church Farm, Baddesley GRE1 Former Sparrowdale School site, Spon Lane Grendon GRE2 Former Recycling centre site, Spon Lane Grendon HAR3 Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill ANSCOMM/HAR1 Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common ANSCOMM1 Land off Coleshill Rd, Ansley Common PS139 Land to the south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common KIN9 Land North of Kingsbury Hall, Kingsbury WO10 Former School redevelopment site (excluding original historic school building) SHUT1 Land South of Shuttington Village Hall ATH15 Land West of Holly Lane EM4 Power station B Site, Hams Hall, Coleshill</p>	<p>Recommendations in the SA Report accompanying the proposed submission Local Plan will be incorporated into the site allocations policies to be considered as part of the master planning of each site.</p> <p>Will look to include similar wording as set out for Landscape and heritage sensitivities above – in accordance with Policy LP16.</p>
<i>SA10 – Efficient Use of Land</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 10 (Efficient Use of Land) it is recommended that the site allocation policies identifying large greenfield sites 	<p>The site east of Polesworth and Dordon has been mined but is now rejuvenated and would be classified as greenfield. There are no other large scale brownfield</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations

	for development should where possible utilise brownfield land, including the reuse of any buildings and their materials on each site, and incorporate appropriate green spaces .	<p>sites in sustainable locations that could be considered for future development.</p> <p>Green spaces will be incorporated in new developments wherever possible or improvements will be sought to sites close by.</p>
<i>Sites</i>	<p>ATH20 Land at Holly Lane</p> <p>PS213 Land to the north-west of Atherstone</p> <p>POL/DOR1 Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon</p> <p>PS158 Land at Robeys Lane, Alvecote, Polesworth</p> <p>POL23 Land West of Robeys Lane, adjacent Tamworth</p> <p>WIS1 Site at Lindridge Road, adjacent Langley Sue</p> <p>HAR3 Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill</p> <p>ANSCOMM/HAR1 Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common</p> <p>PS139 Land to the south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common</p> <p>ATH15 Land West of Holly Lane</p> <p>DOR22 (land west of Birch Coppice)</p> <p>DOR24 Land to west of Junction 10 M42 at Centurion Park</p> <p>PS235 MIRA – Land South of A5</p>	As above
<i>SA11 – Pollution</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 11 (Pollution) it is recommended that the site allocation policies likely to generate significant adverse effects through increased risks of air, water and ground pollution should include measures that attempt to isolate the sources of pollution, minimise the pathways along which the pollution could travel and protect local receptors, including local residents and biodiversity, from harm. 	Policy LP 31 details the issues that need to be addressed in a planning application and this includes reference to fumes. It is proposed to change this to air quality.
<i>Sites</i>	<p>ATH18 Britannia Mill, Coleshill Road</p> <p>ATH20 Land at Holly Lane</p> <p>PS139 Land to the south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common</p> <p>ATH14 Atherstone Football Ground</p> <p>COL1 Land at Grimstock Hill, Lichfield Road</p> <p>COL6 Land at Blythways</p> <p>POL/DOR1 Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon</p> <p>POL3 Larger area including former Polesworth High School</p>	Significant adverse effects against this objective tend to be as a result of development on Grade 1 or 2 Agricultural land i.e. soil loss/pollution or hydrological features or as a result of raised capacity issues in local sewage treatment works. Each site allocation policy might reference the site's soil/water sensitivity and require appropriate mitigation to minimise pollution in accordance

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations

	<p>Pol4 Former Polesworth Learning Centre, High St, Polesworth</p> <p>Pol12 Land west of Woodpack Farm</p> <p>DOR23 Chapel House, Dunns Lane</p> <p>DOR25 Windy Ridge, Dunns Lane</p> <p>POL23 Land West of Robeys Lane, adjacent Tamworth</p> <p>HAR3 Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill</p> <p>ANSCOMM/HAR1 Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common</p> <p>ANSCOMM1 Land off Coleshill Rd, Ansley Common</p> <p>PS139 Land to the south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common</p> <p>ANS1 (Part)</p> <p>Land at Village Farm, Birmingham Road</p> <p>ANS4 Land rear of Village Hall, Birmingham Road</p> <p>WAR12 Land North of Orton Road, Warton</p> <p>WE4 Land south of Islington Farm, r/o 115 Tamworth Rd</p> <p>ATH15 Land West of Holly Lane</p> <p>DOR10 Site of playing fields south of A5 Dordon, adjacent to Hall End Farm</p> <p>DOR22 Land to the immediate west of Birch Coppice Business Park, Dordon</p> <p>DOR24 Land to west of Junction 10 M42 at Centurion Park</p>	<p>with policy LP31 & LP35. Environmental Health Officers have been asked to provide advice on the proposed allocations.</p>
SA12 – Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 12 (Climate Change) it is recommended that the site allocation policies likely to generate significant adverse effects associated with local flood risk should include measures to incorporate appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and prohibit the development of land designated as Flood Zones 2 and 3 in accordance with the sequential test. In addition, flood risk could be further reduced through the incorporation of open green spaces, and other forms of green infrastructure, within new developments. 	<p>It is proposed that changes are suggested that mean that no greater run off is created than if it were a greenfield sites. More explicit reference to SUDs is proposed as well as prohibits development of land designated as Flood Zones 2 and 3 in accordance with the sequential test.</p>
Sites	<p>ATH20 Land at Holly Lane</p> <p>PS213 Land to the north-west of Atherstone</p> <p>WIS1 Site at Lindridge Road, adjacent Langley Sue</p>	<p>As above</p>
SA16 – Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To mitigate the residual significant adverse effects identified under SA objective 16 (Waste) it is recommended that the site allocation policies likely to 	<p>LP31 point 14 has a reference to this point.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations

	<p>generate significant adverse effects as a result of their limited capacity to reuse and recycle existing building materials and brownfield land should include requirements to source materials from the local area where possible and follow sustainable design and construction practices to minimise waste generation during construction and facilitate sustainable waste management in the medium and long term.</p>	
	<p>ATH20 Land at Holly Lane PS213 Land to the north-west of Atherstone POL/DOR1 Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon PS158 Land at Robeys Lane, Alvecote, Polesworth POL23 Land West of Robeys Lane, adjacent Tamworth WIS1 Site at Lindridge Road, adjacent Langley Sue HAR3 Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill ANSCOMM/HAR1 Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common ATH15 Land West of Holly Lane DOR22 Land west of Birch Coppice) DOR24 Land to west of Junction 10 M42 at Centurion Park PS235 MIRA – Land South of A5</p>	<p>Will look to include reference to the requirements of Policy LP31 in the site allocation policies which have been recorded as having potential to generate significant adverse effects against this objective, where possible.</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
DLP222	David Brookes	<p>Concerns raised in relation to the loss of open countryside and ecological habitat, including ancient trees, and the urbanisation and intensification of growth around Polesworth and Dordon.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and flood constraints in Polesworth highlighted.</p> <p>Concerns raised in relation to the capacity of existing road infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate additional growth.</p>	<p>Comments relate to sites POL/DOR1 and POL23.</p> <p>These sites have been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. The assumptions draw on the most up-to-date evidence.</p> <p>Loss of greenfield land has been assessed via SA objective 7 and impacts on biodiversity have been assessed via SA objective 9.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This has been clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.</p>
DLP234	Fleur Fernando	<p>Concerns raised in relation to the capacity of existing infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate additional growth.</p> <p>Concerns raised in relation to the loss of open countryside and ecological habitat.</p>	<p>Loss of greenfield land has been assessed via SA objective 7 and impacts on biodiversity have been assessed via SA objective 9.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This has been clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.
DLP242	Paula Nichols	<p>Concerns raised in relation to the capacity of existing road infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate additional growth.</p> <p>Furthermore, the representation raises concern re: the potential for reductions in air quality associated with increases in road congestion.</p> <p>Concerns raised in relation to the loss of open countryside and ecological habitat.</p>	<p>North Warwickshire contains no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS). AQMAS identify areas which contain particularly poor air quality to justify active management. Without AQMAS to help identify spatial variations in the quality of the air in the Borough, it is difficult to consistently and accurately assess the implications of new development options on local air quality (SA objective 11), including adverse effects on people's health (SA objective 3). Air quality monitoring in recent years has revealed that annual mean levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), often associated with traffic-related pollution, has been declining. However, it is acknowledged that significant growth within the Borough could reverse this trend. SA objective 15 promotes increasing use of public transport, cycling and walking to reduce the use of the private car. The objective assesses the proximity of site options to town centres and public transport links, i.e. the likelihood that new residents and employees will travel via alternative means to the private car. This is considered an appropriate proxy for assessing the likelihood of significant increases in traffic related air pollution. The cumulative effects of the general growth proposed in the Borough on traffic levels and air quality have been assessed in the cumulative effects section in Chapter 6 of the SA Report.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA Report.</p> <p>Loss of greenfield land and landscape impacts have been assessed via SA objective 7 and impacts on biodiversity have been assessed via SA objective 9.</p>
DLP246	Polesworth and Dordon Parish Councils	<p>Concerns raised regarding uplift in housing requirement from Core Strategy and states this change is not justified or assessed in sustainability terms. Alternatives for the housing distribution have not been considered.</p> <p>Concern raised in relation to various sustainability issues which may result from the development of 2,000 new homes at land to the east of Polesworth and Dordon, particularly in terms of infrastructure capacity, landscape and wildlife. Consultee highlights that the site performs negatively against five of the twenty SA objectives with only one of the other 23 assessed sites having more negative effects recorded. Other alternatives have not been seriously considered despite the SA showing that other options perform more favourably.</p>	<p>The Council's justification for the increased housing requirement and SA of the different delivery options considered are presented in Chapter 4 of the SA report.</p> <p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. Overall the representation seems to agree with the SA. Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15. The effects of development on landscape and wildlife are assessed via SA objectives 7 and 9 respectively.</p> <p>In accordance with the PPG, the SA has assessed all options in the same level of detail. The Council's reasons for selecting or not selecting site options</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			are presented in Appendix 8 of the SA Report.
DLP247	Polesworth and Dordon Parish Councils	Same as DLP246 above.	See response to SLP246 above.
DLP266	Pegasus Group on behalf of the Richborough Estates (this representation has been presented across six document and addresses six sites)	<p>Concern raised that the SA has not informed the plan, given that the Local Plan was produced in August 2016 and the SA was produced in February 2017.</p> <p>Concerns raised that the SA has not considered all reasonable alternatives, particularly land West of Packington Lane, Land at Barn End Road and Land North of Blythe Road Coleshill.</p> <p>Land at Barn End Road has not been considered in its entirety (as site WAR7 only contains part of the site) and that the reason for discarding the site is not valid. Land south of Blythe Road, Coleshill scores higher for many of the SA objectives than a number of the sites taken forward at this stage. Only part of this site has been considered through the appraisal of SLA59. The representation also highlights the (++) recorded in the SA for sustainable transport and challenges the (?-) recorded in terms of biodiversity, as well as the scores recorded for cultural heritage, economy and efficient use of land.</p> <p>Queries findings of the SA in relation to land at Birmingham Road, Water Orton for access to services and facilities and sustainable transport and developing and supporting vibrant and active communities as the site is located within 640m of a community centre. The negative effects scores recorded for this site in the SA Report relating to the natural environment, landscape and cultural heritage are all queried in the representation. Effects relating to the economy and efficient use of land and landscape (North of Blythe Road only) have also</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan was consulted on between Thursday 10th November and Friday 31st March 2017. While the SA was prepared alongside the Draft Local Plan and influenced its development, the SA Report was consulted upon in early February up to the end of March. The consultation period was extended until March 2017, to allow consultees time to consider both documents. The delay in the publication of the SA allowed time to reflect the content of the Draft Local Plan published for consultation. Furthermore, chapters 2 and 4 of the SA Report also describe how previous iterations of the SA have fed into the plan-making process. The SA will continue to influence future iterations of the plan.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the SA Report sets out how reasonable alternatives were identified and notes that a number of sites submitted to the Council were not deemed to be reasonable for a number of reasons. Whilst the SA Report explains how alternatives have been identified and assessed, it is the role of the Council to identify reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>Table A8.1 in Appendix 8 of the SA Report states WAR 7 (land at Barn End Road) is no longer considered to be a reasonable alternative as part of the site has planning permission.</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>been queried.</p> <p>The allocation of West of Packington Lane could provide opportunities for landscape improvements.</p> <p>It is stated that that the explanation for not including land east of Packington Lane (PS153) and land south of Blythe Road (SLA59) is not site specific to the site ("Green Belt release not proposed for Coleshill") and has not taken into account the likely landscape and visual effects.</p>	<p>All sites have been assessed in line with the SA framework, which was agreed to ensure consistency across the SA assessments. Not all site options have detailed surveys or development plans; therefore, in order to ensure that all options have been appraised to the same level of detail, all options have been appraised at a high level based on an up-to-date evidence base.</p> <p>Appendix 8 of the SA Report records the Council's reasons for selecting and not selecting site options. There are multiple factors that influenced the Council's decision-making, as reflected in the SA.</p>
DLP288	Natural England	<p>Natural England broadly supports the inclusion of SA Objective 7 in the SA Framework, but recommends that geodiversity should also be considered in this objective.</p> <p>Natural England also recommend that SA objective 9 is strengthened to show that negative effects on European sites and SSSIs have been appropriately considered. There should be a recommendation that any policies or proposals that do not adequately protect SSSI or European sites should be removed or modified. Impact on priority habitats should also be considered using necessary inventories, maps and government policies.</p> <p>Natural England welcome the fact that all significant effects identified through the SA have monitoring proposed but state that it is not clear how indicators will work in practice and if effects of the plan or wider changes are to be monitored. Examples of approaches to monitoring are also included.</p>	<p>The SA objectives are broad, headline objectives. Appendix 6 details how these have been considered in the assessment of sites.</p> <p>Geodiversity is considered as part of SA Objective 9: Valuing, enhancing and protective the biodiversity of North Warwickshire (see Appendix 6 of the SA Report).</p> <p>References to 'international' and 'national' designated conservation sites in Appendix 6 are sufficient to show that effects on European sites and SSSIs have been considered. Future iterations of SA demonstrate that the HRA has been taken into account and include appropriate recommendations regarding protection of these sites. Future iterations of the SA will also review monitoring proposals.</p> <p>SA Objective 9 considers biodiversity in North Warwickshire at a strategic level, which is</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>considered proportionate to the SA process. As explained in paragraph 2.57 of the SA Report, <i>“the strategic nature of the SA meant that it was not possible to investigate this potential for each site and the score was based on designated sites only. This approach was considered to be the best way of ensuring consistency and a comparable level of detail in each site appraisal. Where consultees (for example, Natural England or the Wildlife Trust) have provided specific information on the potential biodiversity value of a site, this has been built into the assessment as far as possible”</i>.</p>
DLP298	Rita Poulsen	<p>Concern raised re: the need to plan for green space and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the growing population.</p>	<p>The SA has assessed green space and recreation via SA objective 3 (health) and SA objective 6 (recreation).</p>
DLP304	Course and Shelton on behalf of residents of Hartshill and Ansley Common area	<p>The representation objects to the residential development for the Hartshill and Ansley Common area. It is stated that much of the information in the SA Report is misleading e.g. the library referred to in the assessment for site HAR3 is within a Church, which would have priority over the use as a library if conflict of need was to arise. One of the two surgeries referred to lies outside of the Borough.</p> <p>The SA Report has highlighted that all of the proposed sites at Ansley Common perform negatively against all environmental objectives and worse than the non-preferred sites. Table 5.7 of the SA report is incorrect, particularly because Ansley Common has limited services and facilities. Also states that the open space at Brett Hal Estate is not used and considered unsafe.</p> <p>Considered misleading to refer to services and facilities outside of the Borough as these are outside of the scope of the LPA.</p>	<p>All sites have been assessed in line with the SA framework, which was agreed to ensure consistency across the SA assessments. The assumptions used in scoring each option are detailed in Appendix 6 of the SA report. SA is a strategic, high-level process and it would not be proportionate to consider issues, such as a potential future conflict of use between the church and library.</p> <p>The SA has considered GP surgeries both within and outside the borough, where they are within the distance thresholds used) as residents could visit either.</p> <p>Appendix 7 of the SA Report presents detailed SA matrices for site options. This presents the</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>Further concerns are raised in relation to the lack of cycle paths which would reinforce car dependency and current employment opportunities in the area. Concerns raised regarding the limited range and capacity of local services and facilities and lack of frequent public transport links.</p> <p>States that ANSCOMM is not within 600m of shops, as the distance from Nursery Hill Primary School to local shops at Chapel is 0.9 miles. Also noted that the site is within an MSA, on greenfield land and lies within an area of medium sensitivity with regards to historic environment. Concerns that there may be capacity issues at Nuneaton Severn Trent Water, an increase in greenhouse gas emissions and adverse effects on biodiversity, particularly at Moorwood Lane Local Wildlife Site and Hartshill Hayes Country Park.</p> <p>ANSCOMM/HAR1: 450 m is a considerable distance to travel for the elderly or less mobile. It is misleading that the site is within 600m of a Town Centre.</p> <p>ANSCOMM/HAR2: Site is considerable more than 300m from Hartshill Hayes. No healthcare services within Ansley Common.</p> <p>PAS139 (PS139?): Liberal Club has selective access. Chapel End Social Club and Chase Public House have ceased trading. Concern about loss of allotments and loss of greenfield land and sensitivity of the historic environment.</p>	<p>reasoning behind the scores presented in Table 5.7 of the main report. Community facilities considered in the SA include schools, GP surgeries and village halls.</p> <p>The strategic nature of SA means that presence and proximity of features are used to assess effects, whereas issues such as current use and perceived safety of existing facilities should be considered through other means.</p> <p>Sustainable modes of transport, such as cycling and public transport are assessed via SA objective 15.</p> <p>Measurements in the SA have been taken from the closest point, which is made clear in the next iteration of SA. These are measured in straight-line distances as walking distance depends on the layout of development. Nursery Hill Primary School is one of the furthest points of the site. The SA has been reviewed to reflect the fact that the Liberal Club has selective access and the Chapel End Social Club and Chase Public House have now closed.</p> <p>Presence of MSAs has been assessed through SA objective 14. Historic environment assessments have been based on the HEA are assessed via SA objective 8. Water quality, including consideration of sewage treatment works where capacity issues are known to exist, are assessed via SA objective 11. Biodiversity is assessed via SA objective 9.</p> <p>The 600m threshold for walking distance was drawn from The Institution of Highways and Transport document. The data limitations section of the SA Report has been updated to give a full account of</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>the reasoning.</p> <p>Town centres were defined by NWBC and utilised in this SA. Distance to services include services in adjoining settlements, providing they are within the distance thresholds set out in the assessment assumptions (Appendix 6).</p> <p>Site PS139 is not believed to include the allotments, therefore these will not be lost to development.</p>
DLP307	Savills UK on behalf of Cathedral Agriculture Partnership and White Family	<p>Focussing in particular on the area of Polesworth and Dordon, it is unclear from the main (SA) report why the sites on the west of the large allocation have been identified as 'not preferred' other than being over 5ha in size.</p> <p>We consider that some of the criteria which mean that they perform less well than those which are 'preferred' such as master planning to protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Further clarification is therefore sought for what this means for the allocation.</p>	<p>This comment appears to relate to sites POL11, POL10 and PS158. Table A8.1 in Appendix 8 of the SA Report gives the Council's reasons for selecting each residential site options or otherwise and Table 8.2 in Appendix 8 gives the Council's reasons for selecting each employment site options or otherwise.</p> <p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. The assumptions draw on the most up-to-date evidence. Not all site options have detailed development plans; therefore, in order to ensure that all options have been appraised to the same level of detail, all options have been appraised at a high level based on an up-to-date evidence base.</p>
DLP311	Alan Wilson	Concerns raised in relation to the loss of character in the town.	The potential impact of new development in North Warwickshire (specifically policies and site

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>Concerns raised in relation to the capacity of existing infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate additional growth.</p>	<p>allocations included in the Draft Local Plan) on the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment (including the cultural heritage) are considered by the SA Report through SA objective 8 while impacts on landscape are considered through SA objective 7 in Appendix 6. As explained in Appendix 6 of the SA Report the Historic Environment Assessment (HEA) for the Borough have been used to inform the appraisal of individual site options in relation to SA objective 8. The scoring of SA objective 7 has considered the potential loss of greenfield land in the Borough with larger greenfield sites scoring less favourably than smaller greenfield sites and brownfield sites. The SA framework has been agreed to ensure consistency across the SA Report in relation to the sites and policies of the Local Plan and reasonable alternatives which have been considered.</p> <p>Issues relating to existing infrastructure have also been addressed in the SA Report through the appraisal of options against SA objectives 1, 2, 3, 6, 15 and 20 which collectively consider the accessibility of new site options to existing infrastructure and services and facilities, specifically community, health, recreational and culture, sustainable transport and education.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.
DLP325	Peter Bateman (Framptons Town Planning) on behalf of KNG Developments	The representation supports the methodology of the SA Report however the appraisal of site SLA40 is queried. In relation SLA40 the scores relating to health, landscape, built environment, biodiversity, efficient land and waste are all suggested to be amended. These updated scores are presented in comparison with other sites considered as part of the SA.	<p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. This ensures that all sites are assessed in the same way, as required by the PPG.</p> <p>Developmental design is uncertain at this stage, as allocation of a site in the Local Plan does not mean that the design put forward by the promoter at this stage will be realised. In addition, site-specific surveys, details of developmental design and proposed mitigation are not available for all sites. In order to ensure consistency and transparency in the SA process a precautionary approach has been taken in the SA, therefore developmental design, detailed survey results and potential mitigation measures have not been taken into account.</p>
DLP326	Neil Cowley (Castlewood Property Ventures)	<p>Consultee is promoting Land South of Birmingham Road, which includes site SLA116 along with a field to the west of this and one to the north of that.</p> <p>Concerns raised that the SA Report is not based on an updated scoping report. The requirement for growth at land adjacent to settlements is only briefly analysed in the SA Report but this provides only a weak evidential base for the creation of a new settlement category.</p> <p>It is stated that Table 4.4 of the SA Report suggests that the</p>	<p>The information included in the Scoping Report formed the basis of the SA Report and has been updated at each stage of the SA process. An updated review of plans, policies and programmes is presented in Appendix 2 of the SA Report and updated baseline information is presented in Appendix 3.</p> <p>The SA of all growth options considered by the Council is presented in Chapter 4. This was</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>proposed spatial strategy has been guided by the need to protect the Green Belt rather than a consideration for the most sustainable strategy to deliver growth and option OUT2 (which would provide housing at settlements nearest where shortfalls lie) was discounted inappropriately.</p> <p>Concerns raised that as the Growth Options Paper was not consulted upon and pre-determined the conclusions of the Draft Local Plan SA the process was not transparent. Concerns that the blanket approach of preventing development in the Green Belt prejudices the SA Report and does not accord with the NPPF approach to Green Belt at paragraphs 83 and 84 of that document as well as failing to promote sustainable development.</p> <p>Concerns that the SA Report does not detail how the Green Belt evidence available has informed the spatial strategy or site selection.</p>	<p>assessed according to the methodology and SA framework set out in the SA report. The SA has assessed all options in the same level of detail, which is proportionate to the scale of the options considered. Table 4.4 presents the Council's rationale for selecting the growth options included in the Local Plan and not selecting other options. It is the role of the Council, not the SA, to select the option deemed most appropriate and this may include factors other than the SA.</p> <p>The Growth Options Paper was subject to SA in June 2016 and it is the results of this SA that are reflected in the SA of the Draft Local Plan. Note that the SA is an independent process, carried out by external consultants and that a number of factors may influence the Council's decision-making, alongside SA.</p> <p>The SA presents the Council's reasons for selection or non-selection of sites in Appendix 8.</p>
DLP327	Mathieu Evans (Gladman)	<p>States that the SA process should clearly justify policy choices. It should be clear from results of the SA why some policy options have been progressed and others rejected.</p> <p>Concerns raised that the SA was produced after the completion of the plan and therefore did not inform the options chosen in the plan. Concerns that no consideration was made for the overall quantum of development, particularly to include the remaining unmet needs of Coventry, Birmingham and Tamworth.</p> <p>It is stated that site PS187 is a sustainable option and that many of the issues raised through the SA (particularly access to services, natural environment, heritage, biodiversity, efficient</p>	<p>The SA report represents a record of the SA of all options considered for inclusion in the Local Plan, which informs decision-making along with a number of other factors. It is often not possible to 'rank' options in terms of sustainability and the Council may not choose to proceed with the option perceived as most sustainable if there are other, overriding factors. Appendix 8 of the SA Report explains the Council's reasoning for selecting or not selecting site options.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan was consulted on between Thursday 10th November and Friday 31st March</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>use of land and waste) and SHLAA might be mitigated or are issues which face all greenfield sites.</p>	<p>2017. While the SA was prepared alongside the Draft Local Plan and influenced its development, the SA Report was consulted upon in early February up to the end of March. The consultation period was extended until March 2017, to allow consultees time to consider both documents. The delay in the publication of the SA allowed time to reflect the content of the Draft Local Plan published for consultation. Furthermore, chapters 2 and 4 of the SA Report also describe how previous iterations of the SA have fed into the plan-making process. The SA will continue to influence future iterations of the plan.</p> <p>The Council's justification for the housing requirement and SA of the different delivery options considered are presented in Chapter 4 of the SA report.</p> <p>The SA has been reviewed to take account of nearby bus stops highlighted in the representation.</p> <p>All sites have been assessed in line with the SA framework, which was agreed to ensure consistency across the SA assessments. The assumptions used in scoring each option are detailed in Appendix 6 of the SA report.</p> <p>Mitigation is likely to depend on developmental design and there is no guarantee of possible mitigation measures coming forward. In addition, details of developmental design and proposed mitigation are not available for all sites. In order to ensure consistency and transparency in the SA process a precautionary approach has been taken in the SA, therefore potential mitigation measures</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>have not been taken into account in the selection of sites for allocation.</p> <p>However, mitigation measures for the site allocation policies set out in Chapter 14 of the Draft Local have been considered in the SA of the Draft Local Plan in Chapter 6 of the SA Report.</p>
DLP341	Spawforths on behalf of the Harworth Group	<p>The representation objects to Policies LP2: Settlement Hierarchy and LP39: Housing Allocations, specifically demanding that the spatial distribution of development in the Borough be reconsidered, moving development away from the A5 and disseminating it more evenly between the Borough's Category 3 'Local Service Centres' to provide a more balanced settlement hierarchy and to meet the development needs of the wider Borough and alleviate the highway capacity issues on the A5...Rather the Draft Local Plan has prioritised Green Belt over...the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.</p> <p>Objection to policies LP12: Employment Areas, LP39: Housing Allocations and LP40: Employment Site – The former Daw Mill Colliery Site has key locational characteristics that make the opportunity afforded by the existing rail connections significant.</p> <p>Objection to Policy LP40: Employment Allocations as the 'Land at MIRA' employment allocation should be reallocated from a 'Category 2 – Adjacent adjoin settlement' site to a new Category 5 site as the site does not sit adjacent to an adjoin settlement.</p>	<p>Table 4.4 of the SA Report presents the Council's justification for taking forward the selected growth option and not selecting alternatives to this. Table A4.1 in Appendix 4 of the SA Report details how policies in the Draft Local Plan have developed. Decision making was influenced by the results of the SA, as well as other considerations such as the need to accommodate growth from neighbouring authorities and other evidence base documents. Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15.</p> <p>The Former Daw Mill Colliery Site has been included in the site audit trail table in Appendix 8.</p> <p>The heading 'Adjacent Adjoining Settlements' in the SA Report has been reworded to 'Sites Adjacent to Neighbouring Local Authorities'</p>
DLP349	Tim Plagerson (RPS) on behalf of St Modwen Development	<p>It is stated that the SA Report does not consider sites which are included in the updated SHLAA and there does not assess all reasonable alternatives. The representation relates to site Dairy House Farm which has not been included in the SA Report although it was submitted for consideration as part of the SHLAA. The consultee has undertaken an appraisal of the site in</p>	<p>Table A8.1 in Appendix 8 of the SA Report gives the Council's reasons for selecting each residential site options or otherwise and Table 8.2 in Appendix 8 gives the Council's reasons for selecting each employment site options or otherwise. Whilst the SA details the reasonable alternatives considered</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		question in line with the SA methodology and this is presented in the representation document. It is suggested by the consultee that the scoring compares favourably with the proposed allocations in the emerging Local Plan. Site GRE4 which was appraised in the SA Report contains land at Dairy House Farm. This site is the same distance from services and facilities as site GRE1 and GRE2 and therefore the same score should be recorded for these sites in relation to SA objective 1 (services and facilities) and SA objective 2 (vibrant communities).	and assesses these, it is the role of the Council to identify reasonable alternatives. For GRE4, review SA objectives 1 and 2 based on facilities mentioned for GRE1 and GRE2 (i.e. Grendon Village Hall).
DLP350	Tim Plageron (RPS) on behalf of St Modwen Development	Concerns raised that the site at Dairy House Farm (which the consultee wishes to see allocated for 1,000 new homes) has not been appraised. The site adjoins the settlement boundary and would score well against the SA objectives thereby meaning it should be considered as a reasonable alternative.	Table A8.1 in Appendix 8 of the SA Report sets out the reasoning for why each site option considered was deemed to be reasonable. Chapter 2 of the SA Report sets out how reasonable alternatives were identified and notes that a number of sites submitted to the Council were not deemed to be reasonable for a number of reasons. Whilst the SA Report explains how alternatives have been identified and assessed, it is the role of the Council to identify reasonable alternatives.
DLP354	William Gallagher Town Planning Solutions on behalf of Holiday Extras and Airparks Services Ltd	It is contested that Policy LP36 which addresses airport parking in the Borough is too restrictive. The representation states that the SA Report has not considered the airport parking policy wording appropriately and has not been tested against reasonable alternatives.	The appraisal of all policies has been undertaken in line with the agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report.
DLP364	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Concerns that as the SA has scored all sites negatively in relation to biodiversity it is very difficult to differentiate the findings presented. It is stated that mitigation and avoidance might be adopted at some sites and that the SA should be	SA is a strategic process, which focuses on identifying significant effects. Mitigation is likely to depend on developmental design and there is no guarantee of possible mitigation measures coming forward, therefore a precautionary approach has

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>updated to reflect this.</p> <p>WWT has provided commentary on each site assessment individually and suggested changes to assessment results and scores in some cases.</p>	<p>been taken in the SA. The exception to this is where other Local Plan policies are likely to mitigate potentially negative effects, which has been assessed in the Cumulative Effects section of Chapter 6.</p> <p>All sites are assessed in line with the assumptions set out in Appendix 6, which were subject to consultation in earlier iterations of the SA. This ensures that all sites are assessed in the same way, as required by the PPG.</p> <p>Assessments of sites ATH14 and ATH20 have been reviewed to address inaccuracies identified by WWT. Other specific comments suggesting a change of score to site appraisals have been acknowledged in the SA assessment matrices (except those that only suggest a score change if policies are updated).</p> <p>Furthermore, effects on national and local Priority Habitats are considered in the next iteration of the SA Report.</p>
DLP371	Ruth Ellis	Concerns raised in relation to the potential for adverse effects on the natural and historical assets within close proximity to site POL/DOR1.	<p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. The assumptions draw on the most up-to-date evidence. The full appraisal matrix for this site is presented in Appendix 7.</p> <p>The Council's Historic Environment Assessment</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>(HEA) has been used to inform the appraisal of sites in relation to potential impacts on the historic environment (SA objective 8). However, this site option was not covered in the HEA. Therefore an uncertain effect has been recorded for SA objective 8. This data limitation is acknowledged in Chapter 2 of the SA Report. An updated HEA is taken into account in the iteration of the SA Report.</p> <p>The site has been recorded as having a significant negative effect on SA objective 9 (biodiversity) given that the site sits within an area of ancient woodland and a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).</p>
DLP375	Tom Shakespeare	<p>Concerns that health and education facilities are over-subscribed, the Council are unable to maintain green spaces and sport and recreation facilities are very poor and neglected.</p> <p>Road links are strained and development would increase congestion on the A5. Concerns that a new through road to the A5 will increase demand on the A5 between Dordon and Grendon and encourage more traffic through Grendon Road, Polesworth.</p> <p>States that rail links to Polesworth are 'almost non-existent'. Suggests reinstating a police station in Atherstone.</p> <p>Suggestions that Polesworth and Dordon have "a good range of existing local services and facilities" comparable to Atherstone and Coleshill are mistaken.</p>	<p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.</p> <p>Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15. SA is a strategic, high-level process, which assesses all options in the same level of detail. The general growth proposed in the Borough on traffic levels and air quality have been assessed in the cumulative effects section in Chapter 6 of the SA Report.</p> <p>All sites have been assessed in line with the SA</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>framework, which was agreed to ensure consistency across the SA assessments. Assumptions on how this was applied to assessments are presented in Appendix 6 of the SA.</p> <p>Consideration of existing services and facilities considers each in its own right, rather than in comparative terms. As explained above, information on the quality and capacity of facilities is not consistently available, therefore the SA, as a strategic process, can only account for the presence of facilities.</p>
DLP379	Stella Doggett	<p>Concerns regarding the significant positive effect recorded in relation to health for the site at Dordon and Polesworth. The proposed new distributor road which will create more pollution and that the proximity of a health centre to the site should not be used as an indicator of the potential benefits of locating new housing at this location. There will be less space for walking and exercise due to the development.</p> <p>Concerns raised that sustainability criteria are inappropriate and do not take account of the reality of the changes development would bring. Concerns that the consultation process is no more than a 'tick box exercise' relating this to the loss of greenfield land which development would result in.</p> <p>Comments include reference to a lack of infrastructure to accommodate the number of houses proposed, stating that Polesworth and Dordon have been 'artificially' designated as market towns and questioning why the Council is not pursuing a policy of allowing for more incremental growth at the villages in North Warwickshire.</p>	<p>All sites have been assessed in line with the SA framework, which was agreed to ensure consistency across the SA assessments. The assumptions used in scoring each option are detailed in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. The site does not consist of open space, nor is it open access land. It has been assumed that the footpaths running through the site will be protected, in line with national legislation.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA Report.</p> <p>It is not clear why the consultee believes the</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>sustainability criteria to be inappropriate, as no specific examples are given. The Sustainability Framework was subject to consultation in previous iterations of the SA.</p> <p>The SA of all growth options considered by the Council is presented in Chapter 4. Table 4.4 presents the Council's rationale for selecting the growth options included in the Local Plan and not selecting other options.</p>
DLP380	Dr John Mark Doggett	<p>Concerns raised in relation to the appraisal of the sites at Dordon and Polesworth in terms of potential health impacts related to increased air pollution due to higher levels of congestion and loss of green space. States that development would be better located spread out in smaller villages across the Borough, particularly to the South, West and North where deprivation is less pronounced. Also suggests this development pattern would be more efficient for education provision.</p> <p>Concerns that development will not be accompanied by appropriate transport infrastructure to improve road safety and congestion issues.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised in relation to sites at Dordon and Polesworth in terms of the adverse impacts raised in the SA Report which relate to landscape, built environment, biodiversity, efficient land use and pollution with suggestion made that the sites should therefore not be included within the plan.</p> <p>Also raises concerns that a shortage of GPs may reduce the possibility of opening new medical facilities.</p>	<p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report and include SA objectives relating to landscape (SA objective 7), cultural heritage (SA objective 8), biodiversity (SA objective 9) and efficient use of land (SA objective 10). The assumptions draw on the most up-to-date evidence.</p> <p>Effects of development on health are assessed through SA Objective 3. The assumptions presented in Appendix 6 of the SA state that as there are no AQMAs in the Borough (therefore air quality in the Borough is in line with national objectives). While current air quality levels are not likely to affect the health of residents and workers, the Council will continue to monitor levels of air pollution and action would be taken if air quality degrades below target levels.</p> <p>Effects on green space are assessed via SA</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>objective 3 (health) and SA objective 6 (recreation).</p> <p>Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15.</p> <p>Table 4.4 of the SA presents the Council's justification for taking forward the selected growth option and not selecting alternatives to this.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.</p>
DLP388	Michael Stanley	<p>Concerns raised in relation to the capacity of existing road infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate additional growth.</p> <p>The Council does not appear to take into account the housing already passed at the former golf course in Tamworth adjacent to the Proposed Robey's Lane site. This would put a possible 2,500 houses in that area alone. The resulting traffic coming down the B5000 and also through other villages such as Shuttington would be significant.</p> <p>The Council has not considered, (given the number of houses required) creating a new village with appropriate infrastructure.</p>	<p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.</p> <p>The permitted site at the former golf course in Tamworth was taken into account in the SA of sites POL23 and PS158. This site will provide a primary school, open space and new bus services which</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>may redirect traffic that would otherwise pass through Polesworth. The full appraisal matrices for these site options is presented in Appendix 7 of the SA.</p> <p>A new settlement was considered by the Council as an option for growth, as explained in Chapter 4 of the SA Report. Table 4.4 explains that this was not selected by the Council due to concerns this could not deliver a substantial amount of the Borough's housing need over the plan period. This was associated with long lead-in times and a lack of suitable sites large enough to be considered for new settlements.</p>
DLP405	Polesworth Group Homes Ltd – Leigh-Anne Smith	<p>There does not appear to be a clear rationale of why Polesworth and Dordon have been selected for significant housing allocation rather than the provision being more fairly spread across category 1 settlements...For example Coleshill is much closer to Birmingham with substantially better road transport system.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and flood constraints in the centre of Polesworth highlighted.</p> <p>Concerns raised in relation to the capacity of existing infrastructure, services and facilities to accommodate additional growth.</p> <p>A number of landscape, heritage and ecological assets have been cited as at risk from adverse effects as a result of the strategic growth at Polesworth.</p>	<p>Table 4.4 of the SA presents the Council's justification for taking forward the selected growth option and not selecting alternatives to this.</p> <p>Traffic, flooding and infrastructure issues are noted. SA assessments have been carried out in line with the assumptions in Appendix 6. The potential of new site allocations to help reduce use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15. The cumulative effects of the general growth proposed in the Borough on traffic levels and air quality have been assessed in the cumulative effects section in Chapter 6 of the SA Report.</p> <p>The SA identifies impacts on landscape, heritage and ecological assets in line with the assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA report.</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
DLP413	Jacky Chambers (Councillor for Dordon and Shadow Health spokesperson for NWBC)	<p>Concerns that alternative growth strategies were not consulted on. A systematic appraisal of other possible green belt sites or other distribution options does not appear to have been undertaken.</p> <p>Concerns that the housing development at Dordon and Polesworth performs much less favourably than the delivery of a new settlement closer to the settlements (Birmingham and Coventry) at which new houses are most needed. This is related to the findings of the SA Report for access to services, vibrant and active communities, health, recreation and culture, climate change, sustainable transport and employment. It is stated that the protection of landscape and the Green Belt have been given undue weight in the selection process.</p> <p>It is also stated that the SA Report supports the view that the proposed site performs very poorly against five of the twenty SA objectives with only one of the twenty three other sites having more negative scores recorded.</p> <p>The representation also contests the findings of the SA Report in relation to site POL/DOR1. Specific issues are raised in relation to these scores for services and facilities, vibrant communities, health, recreation, sustainable transport, employment and skills. Particular issues have been raised in relation to access to healthcare services in this area.</p>	<p>The Council's justification for the increased housing requirement and SA of the different delivery options considered are presented in Chapter 4 of the SA report. Paragraphs 2.34 to 2.43 explain how site options were identified by the Council.</p> <p>The first part of the representation appears to agree with the SA findings. The Council's reasons for selection or non-selection of sites are detailed in Appendix 8 of the SA.</p> <p>All sites are assessed in line with the SA framework and assumptions set out in Appendix 6, which were subject to consultation in earlier iterations of the SA. This ensures that all sites are assessed in the same way, as required by the PPG. Detailed matrices, which give explanations of the scores assigned to each SA objective with reference to the SA objectives and assumptions, are presented in Appendix 7 of the SA.</p> <p>Information on the capacity of services and facilities is not available on a consistent basis across the Borough to be used in the SA. It has therefore been assumed that developments would contribute to ensuring sufficient capacity is available to meet the needs of the new communities, either through investment in existing facilities or the development of new services and facilities. This is clearly explained in the next iteration of SA.</p>
DLP415	David Butcher	Concerns raised that the increase in housing requirement from the Core Strategy (2014) has not been justified or assessed in sustainability terms. The Council has not adequately considered	The Council's justification for the increased housing requirement and SA of the different delivery options considered are presented in Chapter 4 of the SA

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
		<p>whether alternative strategies for delivering this growth might be more appropriate and sustainable.</p> <p>Concern raised in relation to various sustainability issues which may result from the development of 2,000 new homes at land to the east of Polesworth and Dordon, particularly in terms of inadequate transport infrastructure, impacts on landscape and wildlife and limited local service provision. Highlights that the site performs negatively against five of the twenty SA objectives with only one of the other 23 assessed sites having more negative effects recorded. Other alternatives have not been seriously considered despite the SA showing that other options perform more favourably.</p>	<p>report.</p> <p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. Overall the representation seems to agree with the SA. Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15. The effects of development on landscape and wildlife are assessed via SA objectives 7 and 9 respectively.</p> <p>In accordance with the PPG, the SA has assessed all options in the same level of detail. The Council's reasons for selecting or not selecting site options are presented in Appendix 8 of the SA Report.</p>
DLP427	Derek Tattersall	<p>Concerns raised that the SA leaves the "door wide open to carry on regardless of environmental and quality of life values in light of increasing 'development pressures'" and suggests such pressures can be moved, whereas the environment and quality of life cannot.</p> <p>Concerns raised that road infrastructure is not adequate for the proposed increase in traffic. Concerns that an increase in traffic will also have negative effects through increases in pollution. Concerns that wildlife corridors will be destroyed and stresses that habitats need to be joined up.</p>	<p>It is unclear which aspects of the SA the consultee is concerned about as no examples are given.</p> <p>The SA has followed best practice guidance and the framework and methodology have been consulted on through previous iterations of the SA.</p> <p>Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15. Requirement for new road infrastructure is beyond the scope of the SA, as this depends on traffic associated with growth within and outside the Borough. Reducing use of the private car, which is likely to reduce traffic and congestion, is assessed through SA objective 15.</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			<p>The cumulative effects of the general growth proposed in the Borough on traffic levels and air quality have been assessed in the cumulative effects section in Chapter 6 of the SA Report.</p> <p>Biodiversity is assessed through SA objective 9. Due to the strategic nature of SA, this has relied on assessment of effects on designated sites, as described in paragraph 2.57 of the SA, although it is acknowledged that habitat connectivity is important.</p>
DLP2021	Hannah Godley (Fisher German LLP) on behalf of A Arnold	<p>The representation supports the proposed development for residential use at land south of Shuttington Village Hall (SHUT1). To support the allocation of this land the consultee has provided a review of the appraisal of this site against the agreed SA objectives and has also presented the subsequently updated SA scores for this site in comparison to those for other sites in close proximity to Shuttington.</p>	<p>With regards to SA objective 1, community facilities considered were schools, GPs and community centres/village halls. Public houses were not included. This is made clear in the next iteration of SA.</p> <p>The assessment of SA objective 2 has been updated to reflect the fact that the site is adjacent to the Village Hall.</p> <p>Each option has been appraised using clearly defined and consistently applied assumptions set out in Appendix 6 of the SA Report. These assumptions are based upon an agreed SA Framework that has been subject to consultation and is set out in Table 2.2 of the SA Report. This ensures that all sites are assessed in the same way, as required by the PPG.</p> <p>SA objective 6 has been updated to acknowledge the sport pitches provided by Shuttington Village Hall.</p> <p>Mitigation is likely to depend on developmental</p>

Table of Comments on Sustainability Appraisal and Proposed Response

Consultation reference	Consultee	Consultation comments – summarised where appropriate	Response/action taken to address consultation comment in this updated SA Report
			design and there is no guarantee of possible mitigation measures coming forward. In addition, site-specific surveys, details of developmental design and proposed mitigation are not available for all sites. In order to ensure consistency and transparency in the SA process a precautionary approach has been taken in the SA, therefore potential mitigation measures have not been taken into account.

Agenda Item No 7

**Local Development Framework
Sub-Committee**

11 September 2017

**Report of the Assistant Chief Executive
and Solicitor to the Council**

**Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan
(IDP)**

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report brings to Board a revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will accompany the submission version of the Local Plan.

Recommendation to the Sub-Committee

That the Infrastructure Delivery Plan be agreed to accompany the submission version of the Local Plan.

2 Updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- ...
- 2.1 As a result of the consultation process and further work undertaken attached as Appendix A is the most up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 2.2 Since the consultation version which accompanied the Draft Local Plan a presentation was given to members on Friday 7 July 2017 by health colleagues from the CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group) and WCC Public Health. The presentation was circulated to members. The information has been included in the revised IDP.
- 2.3 As mentioned previously the IDP is a living document and can be updated when new evidence on infrastructure emerges. It will continue to become more detailed as planning applications are progressed. Only when sites are finally developed will the full details of the infrastructure be absolutely clear. This is because there may be different ways to deliver services and facilities that cannot be foreseen today.

Highways

- 2.4 The missing part of the IDP is the information relating to highways. This was raised as a key issues through eh Draft local Plan consultation. Further work was commissioned to fully understand the issues. A STA is now close to being finalised. The draft needs to be finalised and agreed by Highways England before it is made public. If this is received by the meeting this will be circulated to Members.
- 2.5 Suggested mitigation will be included in the final STA along with the cost of this infrastructure. It is clear that certain major schemes will need to be

implemented to achieve the full amount of development within the Local Plan. The most substantial is works to the A5.

3 Next Steps

- 3.1 Discussions have been ongoing with WCC and Highways England in relation to the A5. In addition ATLAS part of the Homes and Communities Agency has also been highlighting the issues the Borough faces. The West Midlands Combined Authority is also aware of the A5 issues. A bid for Housing Infrastructure Fund is being prepared in partnership with all of these organisations. Other funding routes will continue to be explored.

4 Report Implications

4.1 Environment and Sustainability Implications

- 4.1.1 An updated Sustainability Appraisal is required to be prepared to accompany the Draft Local Plan to ensure that it does not have any adverse effects. This document will form part of the consultation and comments will be referred back to Members.

The Contact Officer for this report is Dorothy Barratt (719250).

North Warwickshire

INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN



North Warwickshire
Borough Council

September 2017

Contents

Chapter

1. Introduction and Context
2. Policy Context
3. Local Context
4. Funding
5. Definitions and Assumptions used in the IDP
6. Methodology adopted for the IDP
7. Monitoring of the IDP
8. Conclusions
9. Appendices
 - Appendix A** - Infrastructure Details By Topic
 - Appendix B** - Summary Infrastructure DELIVERY TABLE
 - Appendix C** – Summary of Borough-wide Infrastructure
 - Appendix D** – Summary of Infrastructure by Settlement
 - Appendix E** – Education
 - Appendix F** – Health
 - Appendix G** – Highway requirements – to be inserted

1. Introduction and Context

- 1.1 Infrastructure planning is an essential element in ensuring that the Local Plan for North Warwickshire is robust and deliverable. It forms part of the evidence base helping to ensure that the plans are 'sound'.
- 1.2 The term infrastructure is broadly used to define all of the requirements that are needed to make places function efficiently and effectively and in a way that creates sustainable communities and where people want to live. Infrastructure is commonly split into three main categories, defined as:
- **Physical:** the broad collection of systems and facilities that house and transport people and goods, and provide services e.g. transportation networks, housing, energy supplies, water, drainage and waste provision, ICT networks, public realm and historic legacy.
 - **Green:** the physical environment within and between our towns and villages. A network of multi-functional open spaces, including formal parks, gardens, woodland, green corridors, waterways, street trees and open countryside.
 - **Social & Community:** the range of activities, organisations and facilities supporting the formation, development and maintenance of social relationships in a community. It can include the provision of community facilities (education, healthcare, community centres, sports & leisure facilities), local networks, community groups, small scale funding to assist local projects, skills development and volunteering.
- 1.3 In general, infrastructure requirements can also be divided into strategic and local:
- **Strategic infrastructure** refers to facilities or services serving a wider area that may be the whole Borough or beyond - for example improvements to trunk roads or investment in water, sewerage, gas and electricity networks. It may be needed where broader strategies are required to accommodate the cumulative impacts of growth, for example in a sub-region, rather than simply to accommodate the needs of the development proposals of a particular town or village.
 - **Local infrastructure** is about facilities or services that are essential in meeting day-to-day needs of the population - for example schools, affordable housing, community facilities and local green spaces. These are often essential for a development to occur and/or are needed to mitigate the impact of development at the site or neighbourhood level.
- 1.4 Improvements to infrastructure will be fundamental to achieving our ambitions for shaping the Borough to 2033 and beyond. They are considered necessary to cater for a growing and changing population. It is recognised that any proposed growth within North Warwickshire must be supported by improvements to physical, social and green infrastructure, and where necessary, be delivered in advance of development. This infrastructure will include facilities needed for development to function and to ensure the integration and creation of sustainable communities.
- 1.5 It should be recognised that the delivery of the full range of infrastructure needs of existing and new communities is dependent on partnership working between a variety of public and private sector agencies. Where new development creates a need for new or improved infrastructure, contributions from developers will be sought to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Contributions will be assessed in accordance the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 to ensure that

they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and to the contribution to the cumulative impact arising from the relevant scheme.

- 1.6 The new Local Plan (made up of the Core Strategy, Site Allocations and Development Management Plan) will set out, where development will be located up to 2031.
- 1.7 The Local Plan must be capable of being delivered to agreed timescales, in a way which addresses the vision, so that it properly meets the needs and aspirations of the local community as well as providing for more strategic needs. In order to do this, developments must be supported by the appropriate infrastructure, which can range from improvements to road networks to the provision of a new school or community centre. A sound infrastructure plan can therefore only be effectively developed through extensive consultation alongside the consultation on the emerging Local Plan for North Warwickshire.
- 1.8 The engagement process for infrastructure needs within North Warwickshire commenced in 2010 with a wide range of stakeholders being consulted on topics that covered environmental, social, community and physical issues.
- 1.9 Government funding has been reviewed through the Government Spending Review. It is clear that this will impact on the ability of public sector organisations to support capital projects, including the delivery of infrastructure. This requires us to look at innovative approaches to delivery and make an assessment on which infrastructure projects should be afforded particular priority.
- 1.10 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will need to be regularly reviewed and monitored for its effectiveness.

2 Policy context

- 2.1 The production of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is an essential part of the evidence base in developing and delivering a sound Local Plan.
- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to: Assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, waste water and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.
- 2.3 The NPPF also places considerable emphasis upon viability and ensuring that the cumulative impact of proposals and policies 'should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development through the economic cycle'. Viability assessment is a key element of evidence relating to the delivery of the Local Plan, including the delivery of infrastructure
- 2.3 The consistent themes throughout the various guidance documents is the importance of the upfront identification of infrastructure necessary to support the development proposed in the Local Plan, testing the risks associated with that infrastructure and setting out contingencies to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility when required to overcome any future delivery problems that may be experienced.

- 2.4 NWBC considers that its IDP fully reflects the requirements set down for infrastructure planning, and responds to the guidance available.

3. Local context

- 3.1 The context in which spatial planning and infrastructure delivery takes place in North Warwickshire is important to consider. The socio-economic profile, the economy, geographical location and urban structure are all important factors which influence the approach taken to infrastructure planning.

- 3.2 Existing infrastructure provision within North Warwickshire is to a great extent related to the settlement pattern and population centres that already exist. Infrastructure and services are concentrated more within the Market Towns, with lower levels of accessibility within the remaining settlements. This infrastructure pattern is not likely to change significantly over the lifetime of the emerging Local Plan for North Warwickshire.

4 Funding

- 4.1 Infrastructure requirements will be funded by a variety of different mechanisms which will vary over the plan period. The following set out infrastructure needs and indicate potential sources of funding for each where this is possible, based upon appropriate available evidence, together with timescales for the phasing of delivery.

- 4.2 The key sources of funding over which the planning system can have a direct influence are as follows.

Community Infrastructure Levy - The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) provides a fair and consistent mechanism for pooling contributions from all eligible developments. It provides certainty so that developers can calculate, prior to land deals taking place, the level of contribution necessary.

Section 106 Agreements - Section 106 contributions can only be obtained when they meet three statutory tests. They must be:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

- 4.3 In addition, from April 2015 the pooling of contributions for S106 funding is not allowed i.e. no piece of infrastructure is able to be funded by more than five separate S106 obligations. This will have an impact upon the ability to deliver strategic infrastructure such as roads, open spaces, or educational facilities for example. Affordable housing will continue to be delivered through Section 106 obligations and are not subject to the pooling restrictions

5. Definitions and assumptions used in the IDP

- 5.1. Infrastructure has a very broad definition and infrastructure in which the Council is involved in delivering can cover anything from large scale transport schemes to streetscape improvements. It is important to be clear about what infrastructure is needed to support the emerging Local Plan and what is not, in order to be able to prioritise and manage funding and resources

5.2 This IDP therefore considers infrastructure requirements within the following service headings:

Transport

- Road Network
- Rail Network
- Public Transport
- Cycling and Walking Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure

- Canal towpath improvements
- Improved pedestrian and cycle routes
- Parks, Open Spaces and Play Areas

Housing

- Affordable Housing
- Gypsy and Traveller Sites

Education

- Provision of new schools/classrooms
- **ADD ABOUT TRAINING SKILLS**

Health

- Provision of primary, secondary and community care

Social Infrastructure

- Community, Arts, Culture and Leisure
- Sports Centres and Pitches
- Village Halls, Community Facilities/Services

Public Services

- Libraries
- Cemeteries and Places of Worship
- Emergency Services
- Waste Management

Utility Services

- Water and Waste Water
- Energy Supply (gas, electricity and renewable energy)
- Flood Defences

Digital Technology

- Broadband
- Digital Infrastructure

5.3 These service areas have been used as the basis for the detailed schedules in this IDP.

- 5.4 NWBC recognises that whereas some infrastructure types such as essential utility infrastructure, schools etc are critical to ensuring that sufficient services are available to meet the needs of existing and future residents, there are other infrastructure categories that are more directly related to quality of life and biodiversity enhancement objectives. NWBC recognises that whilst it may wish to secure the delivery of all infrastructure items, prioritisation may be required particularly at the development control stage on applications for development in the emerging Local Plan to reflect development viability, availability of public sector funding sources and service priorities at that time.
- 5.5 In light of this, the IDP has adopted a categorisation for each infrastructure item, to reflect its importance to the delivery of the Local Plan in terms of the level of risk it poses to the Local Plan. The categories used are:

CRITICAL	The identified infrastructure is critical , without which development cannot commence.
NECESSARY	The identified infrastructure is necessary to support new development, but the precise timing and phasing is less critical and development can commence ahead of its provision.
PREFERRED	The delivery of the identified infrastructure is preferred in order to build sustainable communities. Timing and phasing is not critical over the plan period.

6. Methodology adopted for the IDP

- 6.1 The methodology adopted for the IDP comprised the following stages.
- 6.2 NWBC identified relevant service providers for each infrastructure type. In most cases, this was building upon earlier discussions regarding infrastructure which had taken place during the earlier stages of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations process with infrastructure providers. This has subsequently been updated again alongside the Local Plan.
- 6.3 Draft schedules were compiled for each infrastructure service area, to identify:
- responsible delivery bodies
 - existing plans and strategies
 - existing infrastructure provision
 - planned infrastructure provision
 - Costs (where possible) and funding mechanisms
- 6.4 The draft schedules were sent to the relevant infrastructure service providers to review and comment on.
- 6.5 Service providers were requested to consider opportunities to deliver new infrastructure or opportunities for expanding existing provision, including costs where known.
- 6.6 The information from service providers was all compiled into the draft final Infrastructure Topic Schedules and Infrastructure Delivery Schedules.

- 6.7 These draft schedules were sent out to the service providers in a consultation process for their comments. Amendments were made to the schedules, as appropriate, following which the IDP was finalised (the final schedules are enclosed in the Appendices).
- 6.8 The final element of the IDP is the identification of mechanisms to ensure that it remains as a living document and is subject to regular monitoring and periodic review. The monitoring proposals are set out in Chapter 7 .

7. Monitoring of the IDP

- 7.1 NWBC already has a duty to undertake regular monitoring through annual monitoring.
- 7.2 It is considered that the most appropriate mechanism for ensuring that the IDP is regularly monitored will be to incorporate this into the annual monitoring process. The annual monitoring would then include a separate section specifically on the IDP, reviewing the progress made against the IDP Delivery Schedules and identifying whether this gives rise to concerns such that a more formal periodic review of the IDP is necessary.
- 7.3 It will be important to ensure that there is liaison with the service providers as part of the monitoring process each year.
- 7.4 The annual monitoring is reported to relevant Board of the Council. This process ensures there is corporate and political recognition of the progress that has been made on infrastructure planning in the preceding year, and commitment to any corrective or additional actions necessary to ensure the continued delivery of the Local Plan.
- 7.5 The annual monitoring is published on NWBC's website, ensuring that the information on progress on infrastructure delivery is publicly available.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1 This is a revised IDP taking forward the information that has been updated following consultation with stakeholders. It considers that the methodology that it has adopted reflects Government and other guidance and is proportionate to the scale and infrastructure development identified as necessary to support the development strategy set out within the Local Plan.
- 8.2 The detailed Infrastructure Topic Schedules set out in Appendix A identify the existing plans and strategies already in place to facilitate and secure the delivery of necessary infrastructure in North Warwickshire. They also identify the requirements arising from the Local Plan development proposals.
- 8.3 The detailed Infrastructure Delivery Schedules in Appendix B and C identify the individual items of infrastructure that will underpin the implementation of the Local Plan. The schedules identify responsibilities and funding for the items of infrastructure.
- 8.4 It will be essential that the IDP is regularly monitored, in close consultation with service providers, to ensure that any implications for the IDP arising from changes in

funding or service delivery methods are identified at an early stage and, where appropriate, action taken.

- 8.5 This revised IDP now accompanies the Local Plan and will be submitted as part of the Evidence Base.

Appendices

Appendix A	Infrastructure Details By Topic
Appendix B	Summary Infrastructure – Delivery Table
Appendix C	Summary of Borough-wide Infrastructure
Appendix D	Summary of Infrastructure by Settlement
Appendix E	Education
Appendix F	Health
Appendix G	Highway requirements – to be inserted

TRANSPORT

ROAD NETWORK	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	Highways England WCC
EXISTING PROVISION	North Warwickshire lies at the crossroads of the country, with the M6, M42 and A5 forming part of the Strategic Road Network which is managed by the Highways England. The numerous A, B and C roads across the Borough are the responsibility of Warwickshire County Council. The A5 is an important Strategic route through the Borough
PLANNED PROVISION	Improvements have been made at the A5/A444 Royal Redgate junction as part of the proposed redevelopment/expansion of the MIRA site.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	Improvements to the highway network, especially the A5 will be crucial in facilitating the development included in the Local Plan. These will take place alongside the promotion of sustainable means of travel, with the intention of reducing congestion and emissions. Work has been undertaken by WCC and Highways England to identify what highway improvements will be required to support the delivery of the Local Plan. Improvements to the A5 will be subject to them being identified in the Road Infrastructure Strategy (RIS), with the next on being RIS 2020-2025. This is assessed at a national scale and will need to demonstrate how it meets Highways England's 5 key business objectives
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	Local Plan Policy LP2 focuses development within the Market Towns where the extent and capacity of supporting infrastructure, services and facilities is greatest to facilitate walking, cycling and the use of public transport in order to reduce car dependence and increasing congestion on the road network. NWBC will seek contributions towards off-site improvements such as new and improved highway infrastructure including a through road in Dordon as development takes place, and in Hartshill if the preferred site at Church Road/Nuneaton Road is approved and a traffic calming, lighting and associated landscaping to mitigate the potential transport impact of a development. NWBC is part of the A5 Steering Group, which comprises of MP's, local councillors, Local Authority representatives and Highways England which is a forum promoting future investment on the route
COSTS	TBC
FUNDING	Developer contributions, LTP funding, HE funding (not committed) , Single Local Growth Fund, RIS

RAIL NETWORK	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	DfT Rail, Network Rail, Train Operators (passenger and freight), WCC
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>Atherstone and Polesworth are located on the Trent Valley section of the West Coast Main Line. Atherstone is served by hourly semi-fast trains on the Crewe - London Euston corridor provided by London Midland. Polesworth is only served by one train per day towards Tamworth.</p> <p>A regular rail service was restored to Atherstone in December 2008 following completion of the West Coast Main Line upgrade. Car parking at the station was increased by Network Rail and now totals 18 spaces. Network Rail also provided a drop off point on the western side of the station. The station no longer has a footbridge which has been removed by Network Rail for safety reasons.</p> <p>Water Orton and Coleshill Parkway are located on the Birmingham - Derby and Birmingham - Leicester line, and are served by Arriva Cross Country services between Birmingham, the East Midlands and Stansted Airport.</p> <p>The junction at Kingsbury serves the adjacent oil terminal, as well as the Birmingham Intermodal Freight Terminal (BIFT) at Birch Coppice.</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	<p>Committed</p> <p>The DfT's July 2007 White Paper 'Delivering a sustainable railway' proposed the development of a Strategic Freight Network (SFN) in England and Wales as part of its high level strategy to address the growing demands on the network for moving passengers and freight. The SFN will provide an enhanced core trunk network capable of accommodating more and longer freight trains, with a selective ability to handle wagons with higher axle loads and greater loading gauge. To support the development of the SFN a scheme is being progressed in Control Period 4 to enhance the gauge clearance between Doncaster and Water Orton to W12. This will enable 9'6" wagons to be transported on the route. The scheme is planned to be delivered in 2014.</p> <p>Recommended but currently undergoing further development and still unfunded</p> <p>The West Midlands and Chilterns RUS made recommendations to meet forecast passenger and freight demand on the line between Derby and Birmingham New Street and between Nuneaton and Birmingham New Street up to 2020.</p> <p>The RUS recommends an additional local service per hour between Tamworth and Birmingham New Street and an additional hourly local service between Nuneaton and Birmingham New Street. There is also a requirement to facilitate forecast freight growth on these lines. The RUS recommends infrastructure interventions on the line between Water Orton and Wichnor Junction to enable the recommended passenger and freight services to operate.</p>

	<p>In order to accommodate the additional passenger and freight services infrastructure improvements are being considered. The recommended improvements will be considered as part of the planning work currently being undertaken for CP5. The infrastructure works are being assessed as a package of interventions known as ‘Water Orton Capacity Enhancements’, and those under consideration include a turnback facility at Tamworth and improved access to both Kingsbury oil terminal and Birch Coppice from the north. The results of this analysis work will determine what infrastructure interventions are required and their priority status for funding bids for CP5.</p> <p>Detailed work has now been completed on behalf of Centro, Birmingham City Council, Warwickshire and Staffordshire County Councils into the feasibility and business case for a longer term enhancement of local passenger services between Birmingham, Water Orton and Tamworth (known as TASLs – Tamworth and Sutton Lines). The best performing TASLs scheme would provide a half-hourly service from Birmingham Moor Street calling at the existing stations at Water Orton, Coleshill Parkway, Wilnecote and Tamworth and new stations at Fort Parkway, Castle Bromwich and Kingsbury. This scheme includes the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Camp Hill Chords in central Birmingham to allow access to Birmingham Moor Street from the Tamworth line; and - An upgrade to the Whitacre Loop (the rail line between Whitacre Junction and Kingsbury Junction) to allow Tamworth services to call at Coleshill Parkway. <p>This scheme is currently unfunded. Gaining funding support for this major project in these difficult financial times is clearly going to be challenging.</p> <p>The County Council is continuing to pursue the delivery of a new station at Kingsbury.</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN</p>	<p>Suggested rail improvements:</p> <p>Provision of a new rail station at Kingsbury;</p> <p>Provision of a new footbridge at Atherstone rail station;</p> <p>Provision of additional parking at Atherstone station;</p> <p>Provision of a new footbridge and car park at Polesworth station;</p> <p>Expansion of Coleshill Parkway car park;</p> <p>Refurbish and improve DDA access at Water Orton rail station; and</p> <p>Contribution towards the TASLs scheme – North Warwickshire elements include Kingsbury station (if this has not been delivered before implementation of TASLs), Water Orton station improvements and infrastructure improvements to the Whitacre Loop.</p> <p>Improved freight access to Kingsbury oil terminal and Birch Coppice.</p>

ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	
COST	Arley Station £8m, Kingsbury Station £8m
FUNDING	NETWORK RAIL, DEVELOPERS

PUBLIC TRANSPORT	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	WCC, Bus and train operators, Community/Voluntary Transport Providers, DfT Rail, Network Rail
EXISTING PROVISION	The public transport network within the Borough consists of a combination of rail, bus and community transport services. Rail services within the Borough are described in the relevant section of the IDP above. Bus services within the Borough consist of a mixture of inter-urban services (e.g. Nuneaton - Tamworth), intra-urban town services and services which link the smaller villages with the main towns. Whilst a number of routes are provided on a commercial basis by Stagecoach and Arriva, many are operated on contract to the County Council. Community Transport services are principally provided by the voluntary sector with some financial support from the County Council. These supplement the Flexibus network which operates on certain days of the week in lieu of conventional bus services.
PLANNED PROVISION	<p>The LTP process provides the opportunity to reduce transport related carbon emissions by encouraging residents to use their private cars less and increase their use of sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling, public transport and more sustainable car based travel (e.g. car clubs and car sharing). The provision of hard and soft transport measures, for example, school and workplace travel plans, provision of new cycle lanes, improved signing for pedestrians and improved public transport facilities can all contribute to a reduction in overall car use</p> <p>Bus - The County Council will continue to support the existing minimum level of bus service provision within North Warwickshire, in order to sustain and increase level of access to key facilities and thus reduce social exclusion. Along with improvements to bus services which will come forward as part of new development, the main proposal in this area of the County is for a further inter-urban Quality Bus Corridor between Nuneaton, Atherstone and Tamworth. It is envisaged that this scheme will be implemented in partnership with Staffordshire County Council.</p> <p>Community Transport - The following specific interventions are proposed within North Warwickshire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance facilities for community transport passengers at Atherstone Railway Station and Atherstone Bus Station, consistent with the aims set out in the Public Transport Interchange Strategy; and • Incorporate community transport service information where relevant, at existing and new Bus Information Points (see below). <p>Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles - Enhanced facilities for taxis and private hire vehicles will be provided at key interchanges consistent with the aims set out in the Public Transport Interchange Strategy. The County Council will develop Taxibus services to meet specific demand in the County where conventional public transport is neither operationally or economically appropriate.</p>

	<p>Public transport information - Bus Information Points have been delivered to date at a number of locations within the area. Further new Bus Information Points are proposed at Chapel End and Water Orton Railway Station.</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN</p>	<p>Bus service improvements and better infrastructure and facilities at stops will help to deliver a sustainable Local Plan. These will be implemented in conjunction with WCC, transport operators and developers.</p>
<p>ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN</p>	<p>The Local Plan will provide a framework to enable the Council to seek to improve public transport networks and thus provide a greater and more reliable travel choice.</p>
<p>COST</p>	<p>Yet to be determined</p>
<p>FUNDING</p>	<p>LTP, Developer Contributions</p>

CYCLING AND WALKING INFRASTRUCTURE	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	WCC, NWBC, Sustrans
EXISTING PROVISION	Current facilities for pedestrians in the main towns of the Borough consist of footways, controlled and uncontrolled crossings, dropped kerbs, raised table crossings and some limited areas of pedestrian priority (e.g. Market Square, Atherstone). Cycle facilities within the Borough are limited to some bespoke cycleway provision (including Safer Routes to School schemes), signage and cycle parking at key facilities (e.g. libraries). Kingsbury Water Park is served by a network of routes which are suitable for both pedestrians and cyclists. Parts of the Sustrans National Cycle Network also pass through the Borough. There is also the North Arden Heritage Trail
PLANNED PROVISION	Improvements for cyclists and pedestrians in North Warwickshire's principal towns will be sought as and when opportunities arise from new development. To maximise the use of the cycling facilities installed at Coleshill Parkway (which include a cycle lane over the bridge), the County Council will keep under review the need for further improvements to the local cycle network to provide employees at Hams Hall with better links to/from the interchange. Recreational cycling is increasing in popularity and is an affordable and accessible activity. Strategic commuting and recreational cycling routes are important for health and wellbeing as well as sustainable transport, and new routes into and around the larger settlements will be identified through the Development Plan including development briefs and applications for larger housing sites. Opportunities to secure funding towards these improvements from further development in the area will be pursued where possible. Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists to Birch Coppice and MIRA will also be sought through the planning process. In addition to the pedestrian and cycle improvements identified, the County Council will invest in Safer Routes to School schemes within North Warwickshire on a priority basis as resources permit.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	Infrastructure to support walking and cycling will need to be implemented across the Borough to ensure that new development is delivered in a sustainable way. LP29 of the Draft Local Plan highlights the need to develop a Walking and Cycling Strategy.
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan focuses the majority of development to the market towns where the extent and capacity of supporting infrastructure, services and facilities is greatest to facilitate cycling and walking and that new facilities should be provided to meet the identified needs arising from growth. Larger developments will, where appropriate, need to provide on-site and/or make a contribution to, local and strategic recreational and commuting cycling routes.
COST	Yet to be determined
FUNDING	LTP, Developer contributions, developers on-site provision, external grants

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	<p>NWBC WCC Town and Parish Councils Voluntary and Community Sector Warwickshire Wildlife Trust. (WWT is also the lead partner on the Tame Valley Wetlands Partnership, of which there are 18 partner organisations, including NWBC). RSPB. Natural England (NE) The Canal & River Trust (formerly British Waterways) Forestry Commission, Environment Agency, Landowners/developers</p>
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Wellbeing and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date existing provision. The 2008 PPG17 Study identifies existing parks, open spaces; play area and allotment provision in 11 sub-areas of the Borough and identifies areas of need. The Green Space Strategy, Play Strategy (currently being updated) and Allotments Policy set out frameworks to address those needs, focusing primarily on improving quality and accessibility</p> <p>A Sub Regional GI has been undertaken and identifies assets within North Warwickshire. The HBA identifies any GI Assets such as linear corridors and local sites</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	<p>The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Wellbeing and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date planned provision and costed and phased future needs. The 2008 Green Space Strategy prioritises improvements to 19 specific parks and open spaces and proposes the establishment of 6 Local Nature Reserves. The 2008 Green Space and Play Strategies also prioritise 14 play areas for replacement/refurbishment and identify a need for 5 new play facilities. Play area provision is advanced through the Play Area Development Programme, which also provides for the replacement of facilities on a 15 year cycle.</p> <p>The Borough Council will be preparing a Tree Management Policy in respect of its own tree stock.</p> <p>The Tame Valley Wetlands Landscape Partnership Scheme (TVWLPS, focusses on a 104km² area of landscape (NCA 69 & 97) following the River Tame, its floodplain and the Birmingham & Fazeley Canal in North Warwickshire and south-east Staffordshire (between Birmingham and Tamworth). Between 2014 and 2018, the TVWLPS will deliver projects that aim to conserve, enhance and restore built and natural heritage, reconnect local people with the landscape, improve access and learning, and provide training opportunities (see the TVWLPS LCAP for more information and outputs).</p> <p>There will be enhancement of the Arden Landscape Area which will</p>

	focus especially on the wooded landscape
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Wellbeing and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date planned provision and costed phased future needs. These needs will inform the Development Plan Policy development and the master planning and all planning applications for new development (especially new larger housing sites) are required to take these into account and these will also inform developers on-site provision and /or off site contributions.</p> <p>Delivery of the Green Space Strategy</p> <p>Delivery of the Play Strategy and the Play Area Development Programme</p> <p>Delivery of the Allotments Development Programme A range of projects need to be identified, based on the identified GI baseline data – these will need to be identified in the NWBC development briefs for housing and other development and also costed and phased for delivery through the various funding mechanisms and where relevant through on site provision.</p>
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>The Local Plan recognises the importance of creating a strong network of well-connected and multi-functional green infrastructure to provide an attractive environment, providing benefits for health and opportunities for formal and informal recreation and new facilities should be provided to meet the identified needs arising from growth. The Local Plan also seeks to improve the biodiversity value of existing/new Green Infrastructure.</p>
COST	<p>Delivery of the Play Area Development Programme - £950K Delivery of the Allotments Development Programme - £20K Delivery of the TVWLPS - £2.5 million (including in-kind and volunteer support, other funding <i>TBC</i> and £1.7 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund).</p>
FUNDING	<p>NWBC, Developer Contributions, developer’s on-site provision, Environment Agency External Grants (including the Heritage Lottery Fund for the TVWLPS).</p>

HOUSING

AFFORDABLE HOUSING	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	NWBC, Developers, RSL's
EXISTING PROVISION	NWBC has responsibility for enabling the provision of new affordable housing, which includes properties to rent from Housing Associations, low cost or shared ownership options.
PLANNED PROVISION	<p>Housing seeks to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes including both affordable and market housing to meet the needs of the community and stipulates that Local Development Documents should set an overall target for affordable housing. Funding for affordable housing is available from a variety of sources.</p> <p>The Council have now built 20 x 2 bed bungalows in Atherstone and are currently building Phase 2 of Lister Road, which will see 3 new shops and 4 maisonettes consisting of 3 x 2 bed and 1 x 1 bed along with 11 houses consisting of 4 x 2 bed houses and 7 x 3 bed houses.</p> <p>The Council has also been purchasing additional properties on S106 sites for Spon Lane, Grendon and St Helena Road, Polesworth. At Spon Lane, the Council will be purchasing 9 x 2 bed houses, 4 x 3 bed houses and 3 x 4 bed houses and at St Helena Road, we will be purchasing 20 x 2 bed houses, 2 x 4 bed houses, 8 x 1 bed maisonettes and 4 x 3 bed houses.</p> <p>The Council are constantly reviewing land and working with partners to increase council stock and affordable housing throughout the borough.</p>
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>Affordable housing is to be provided as part of well-designed mixed tenure schemes helping to create sustainable mixed inclusive communities.</p> <p>In the countryside the Council will continue to operate the Government's rural exception site policy to meet the specific housing needs of small settlements.</p>
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>Affordable housing is fundamental to the creation of balanced communities</p> <p>Policy LP9 of the Draft Local Plan provides the policy framework to enable the Council to seek an affordable housing contribution from residential development proposals that fall within the size site thresholds specified in that Policy.</p>
COST	Various
FUNDING	Developer Contributions

GYPSY AND TRAVELLER NEEDS	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	NWBC, WCC
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>NWBC in conjunction with WCC share a range of responsibilities concerning Gypsies & Travellers, broadly including accommodation, health and welfare, which are delivered through a breadth of the services provided to the community.</p> <p>North Warwickshire has one socially rented gypsy site and three private sites. The site at Alvecote is managed by the County Council, providing 17 permanent pitches for settled accommodation. Of the three remaining sites, one provides 3 pitches, one provides 7 pitches and one has recently been granted planning permission for 4 pitches.</p> <p>A temporary stopping provision due to be managed by the County Council for 12 caravans has recently been granted planning permission.</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	The GTAA identified the need for an additional 9 residential pitches and for 5 transit pitches for Gypsies and Travellers within North Warwickshire during the plan period. Planning permission has recently been granted for 6 of these residential pitches and for all of these transit pitches required
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Council will undertake work to identify suitable sites to meet GTAA requirements working in partnership with the travelling community and other relevant bodies. Specific sites will then be allocated within that Plan.
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The role of the LDF is to identify preferred locations for new gypsy and traveller residential pitches.
COST	Yet to be determined
FUNDING	WCC, NWBC

EDUCATION

EDUCATION	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	WCC, NWBC School Academies Private and Voluntary Sector providers
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>North Warwickshire is currently served by 5 secondary schools and 24 schools serving primary age pupils. In addition, there is a maintained Nursery School in Atherstone and a Special Educational needs School in Coleshill.</p> <p>Seven of the 24 primary schools have nursery classes.</p> <p>In addition, there are 32 early years’ providers across North Warwickshire who work in the private, voluntary or independent sector, and 80 childminders.</p> <p>The Governance of the schools is varied with Local Authority Schools, Church Aided Schools and a growing number of Academy Schools all serving the communities of the Borough.</p> <p>A number of the schools currently admit pupils from outside the County, as do many of the early years’ providers.</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	<p>Current pupil forecasts suggest that the birth rate across the majority of North Warwickshire hasn’t seen an upward trend as in other parts of the county. However, planned residential development will impact on existing school provision and it is likely that expansion of places will be required longer term.</p> <p>Queen Elizabeth School in Atherstone has been rebuilt as part of the Government’s Priority Schools Building Programme. The school has been developed on one site to better meet the needs of the local community.</p> <p>There are a number of schools within the Borough which attract a significant number of pupils from outside the area. We believe this will mean that for a number of schools at least, future small scale housing development is unlikely to require of additional school places. Schools affected would simply not be able to accept as many pupils from outside their own priority areas.</p> <p>With The Borough bordering a number of other Local Planning Authorities, discussions with neighbours is crucial to ensure planned housing development in other areas doesn’t have an unexpected impact on the provision of places within North Warwickshire.</p> <p>ADD ABOUT TRAINING SKILLS</p>
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan is likely to require the provision of an additional 147 pre-school, 1032 primary school places together with 737 secondary and 144 post 16 places. In addition there are likely to be XX(To be updated) pupils who present with Additional educational Needs who will either require a place at a Special School or will require an adapted place at a mainstream setting
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan seeks to improve the skills and education of all the Borough’s communities by providing adequate training and educational

	facilities and services, protecting and enhancing, existing education and childcare facilities including nurseries/crèches, schools, adult and higher education premises, and encouraging nursery providers and businesses to establish additional childcare facilities.
COST	The anticipated cost of the additional pupil places at Primary and Secondary required as a result of new housing development is likely to be in the order of £21.2 million at current price levels. Cost for early Years and Post 16 is still to be determined (See Appendix D for further information)
FUNDING	WCC Capital Funding, Developer contributions, CIL

HEALTH

HEALTH	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warwickshire North Clinical Commissioning Group (WNCCG) • George Eliot Hospital (GEH) Trust • NHS England • Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust (CWPT) • South Warwickshire Foundation Trust (SWFT) • University Hospital Coventry and Warwickshire (UHCW) • Warwickshire County Council (WCC) • North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC)
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>At present North Warwickshire Borough hosts the following:</p> <p><u>GP Practices</u> There are 7 GP practices within the Borough, 4 of which have branch surgeries making a total of 11 GP premises</p> <p><u>Opticians</u> There does not appear to be a shortfall in optometry services in the area. Below is a list of current optometry services in the district: <i>J&B S Breakwell, T/A Whitehouse & Son Opticians</i>, 35 Long Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire <i>Maginnis Opticians</i> 163 Long Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire <i>A B Optics Ltd</i>, 25 Bridge Street, Polesworth, Warwickshire <i>Scrivens Opticians</i>, 91 High Street, Coleshill</p> <p><u>Dental provision</u> Below is a list of current dental provision:- <i>Dental Surgery</i>, 165 Long Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 1AD <i>Dental Surgery</i>, 60 Long Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 1AU <i>Coleshill Dental Centre, Dental Surgery</i>, 118-120 High Street, Coleshill, Birmingham, B46 3BJ <i>Kingsbury Dental Surgery</i>, 5 Jubilee Court, Kingsbury, Staffordshire, B78 2LL <i>Polesworth Dental Centre</i>, 11 Bridge Street, Polesworth, Staffordshire, B78 1DR <i>Dental Surgery</i>, 76 New Road, Water Orton, Birmingham, B46 1QU <i>Dental Surgery</i>, 5 Station Buildings, Birmingham Road, Water Orton, B46 1SR</p> <p><u>Pharmacies</u> A Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment produced by the Warwickshire Health and Wellbeing Board is produced every two years. The latest update was published in March 2015 and for North Warwickshire did not highlight any significant serious barriers to access in this locality. In summary the assessment concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pharmaceutical services are relatively easy to access from 08.30 until 18.00 from Monday to Friday. A service can be accessed somewhere in the locality from 06.00 until at least 22.00. • A service is accessible all day on a Saturday and from 07.00 until 20.00 on a Sunday. • There are currently 29 contractors per 100,000

population, including dispensing GPs which is considered adequate in relation to the local geography and size of locality.

- The pharmaceutical service provided by community pharmacies in the locality is supplemented by five dispensing GP practices serving the more rural areas
- Cross border availability of pharmaceutical services is significant in this locality

Hospitals

There are no hospitals within the borough. George Eliot Hospital is in the neighbouring borough of Nuneaton and Bedworth and serves the population of North Warwickshire.

George Eliot Hospital

George Eliot Hospital NHS Trust (GEH) is an integrated acute, community and primary care service provider. The GEH is a small busy district general hospital on a 32 acre site based on the outskirts of Nuneaton. The hospital has 300 acute beds and provides a range of clinical services. As well as being a A&E department, the GEH offers a range of primary care services including:

- Blood Tests
- Cardiology
- Colorectal
- Diabetes
- GP Services
- Orthopaedics
- Paediatrics
- Physiotherapy

It also hosts a range of community services:

- Community Dental Service
- GUM (Genital Urinary Medicine)
- Nuneaton and Bedworth Health and Wellbeing Service
- Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC)
- Stop smoking service

University Hospital Coventry & Warwickshire

UHCW is one of the largest acute teaching hospitals in the UK. It provides both local and acute services to around 500,000 people from Coventry and Rugby. The hospital also provides further tertiary and secondary specialty hospital services to over 1 million people from Coventry, Warwickshire, West Midlands, Leicestershire, Worcestershire and Northamptonshire.

There is a strong relationship between GEH and UHCW and patients may be referred between the two hospitals for certain clinical pathways patients such as:

- Maternity, children and young people
- Cardiovascular, including cardiac, stroke, renal and diabetes
- Mental Health, dementia and neurological conditions
- Cancer Care
- End of Life care

Sir Robert Peel Community Hospital

The Sir Robert Peel Community Hospital offers a range of healthcare services including:

- 24/7 minor injuries unit
- x-rays
- ultrasound scans
- Endoscopy unit
- Day surgery for non-complex procedures

The hospital also provides rehabilitation, care of older people, general medical care and palliative care.

Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership Trust (CWPT)

CWPT offer a range of age-independent mental health services for adults in both community and acute services

Mental Health Support Services

Warwickshire Wellbeing hubs are available in local communities and offer support if people are stressed, worried, or concerned about their mental health through the following services:

Specialist Mental Health Support Services

Mental health services are offered across Warwickshire and include inpatient and community focused services. The services are organised into Integrated Practice Units (IPUs), which are teams of clinical staff working more closely with patients to meet their individual needs. In relation to North Warwickshire local residents are most likely to be using cross-border mental health services.

These are located in:

Type of service	Location
Inpatient Services	Pembleton Unit, Manor Court Avenue, Nuneaton, CV11 5HX (mixed gender, 12 bed ward for patients suffering from a functional mental illness, and physical complexity)
Community Mental Health Teams	Avenue House, Manor Court Road Nuneaton, CV11 5HX Mirah House, Manor Court Road, Nuneaton, CV11 5HX
Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment Teams	North Warwickshire Crisis Resolution and Home Treatment team, Mirah House, Manor Court Avenue, Nuneaton, CV11 5HX
Day Treatment Facilities	Oakwood Day Treatment Service, 3 Manor Court Avenue, Nuneaton, CV11 5HX
Rehabilitation and Recovery	Highfield House, 55 Highfield

	<p>Road, Nuneaton, CV11 4PW (mixed gender, 8 beds)</p> <p><u>Mental Health Services and Support for Young People</u></p> <p>Child Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) offer services to children and young people up to their 17th birthday. Children and young people are referred to the service through professionals such as GPs and educational psychologists. The team working across Warwickshire North CCG is located in the Whitestone Centre, Magyar Crescent, Nuneaton, CV11 4SG. The service is open Monday to Friday 8.30am to 5pm.</p> <p>South Warwickshire Foundation Trust (SWFT) SWFT offer Children, Young People and Family Services across North Warwickshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Children Nursing • Child Development Service • Physiotherapy • Family Nurse Partnership • Dietetics • Community Paediatricians • School Health • Occupational Therapy • Looked After Children • Speech and Language Therapy • Health Visiting • Birth to Three Portage <p>Many of the services also offer home visits to families and offer support and expertise in improving family’s needs, protection and well-being. The children’s community services in North Warwickshire are listed below</p> <p>Atherstone Clinic – Long Street, Atherstone, CV9 3AY, - 01827 722983 Atherstone Clinic – Kings Avenue, Atherstone, CV9 1JZ, - 01827 717204</p>
<p>PLANNED PROVISION</p>	<p>The growth in population arising from new housing developments across North Warwickshire will inevitably place increased demand upon healthcare services within the Borough.</p> <p>Plans for developing primary, secondary and community health care provision in North Warwickshire over the Plan period are being progressed with all key responsible bodies through the Local Estates Forum and through strategic discussions on estates utilisation and capacity.</p> <p>There is a new Extra Health Care Facility in Mancetter is now complete</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS</p>	<p>The Council will continue to engage with all key responsible bodies to understand the site specific implications the planned growth will have</p>

TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	on healthcare services across the Borough.
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan seeks to provide adequate health care facilities and services in partnership with the NHS. The monitoring of this will ensure that provision meets these targets.
COST	The costs of additional infrastructure requirements are still to be determined

SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

COMMUNITY, ARTS, CULTURE AND LEISURE, SPORTS, PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND PLAY AREAS	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	NWBC WCC Schools and Academies Town and Parish Councils Voluntary and Community Sector Sport England
EXISTING PROVISION	The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Well-being and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date provision. The latest 2008 PPG17 Study identifies 8 sports halls, 2 swimming pools and 22 village halls and community buildings in the Borough and highlights some deficiencies in sports hall and swimming pool provision. The PPG17 Study also identifies existing outdoor sports pitch provision in 11 sub-areas of the Borough comprising 63 football pitches, 16 cricket pitches, 11 rugby pitches, 10 bowling greens, 30 tennis courts and 9 netball courts (8 on school sites). An Artificial Grass Pitch, accommodating football and hockey and available for community use, has recently been installed in Atherstone. There are also 8 golf courses and the Aston Villa training ground in the Borough
PLANNED PROVISION	The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Well-being and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date planned provision and costed and phased future needs. The latest position is that Coleshill Leisure Centre has been rebuilt. Refurbishments will also be required for Atherstone Leisure Complex and Memorial Hall, Arley Sports Centre and Kingsbury and Polesworth Sports Halls. The 2010 North Warwickshire Outdoor Sports Assessment Report provides a qualitative analysis of outdoor sports provision and a detailed supply and demand analysis, which informs the priorities for action set out in the North Warwickshire Playing Pitch Strategy. These principally comprise pitch improvements, refurbishment / replacement of changing facilities and more community use of school facilities.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Well-being and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date planned provision and costed and phased future needs. These needs will inform the Development Plan policy development and the master planning and all planning applications for new development (and especially new larger housing sites) are required to take these into account and these will also inform developers' on-site provision and /or off-site contributions. The extant strategies identify the Delivery of a programme of refurbishments at leisure centres and sports halls Delivery of the Playing Pitch Strategy
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan identifies that existing community facilities should be protected and enhanced and that there should be no overall loss of community facilities and that new facilities should be provided to meet

	identified needs arising from growth
COST	The new leisure strategies (including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Leisure Services Strategy, Green Space Strategy and Health, Well-being and Leisure Strategy) will identify the up to date infrastructure costs and phasing of delivery. The extant policies identify Leisure Centres and Sports Halls - £4.9 million Delivery of the Playing Pitch Strategy - £1.5 million
FUNDING	NWBC, Developers Contributions, developers' on-site contributions, External grants

PUBLIC SERVICES

LIBRARIES	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	WCC
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>Warwickshire Library Service was reconfigured following the implementation of the Library and Information Service Transformation 2010/2014. County run libraries have been re-branded under the Warwickshire Direct banner as part of the Council's One Front Door Policy which aims to provide a wider range of services under one roof. In North Warwickshire there are 3 County run libraries: Atherstone, Coleshill and Polesworth. In addition, infrastructure and on-going support is given to Community Managed Libraries. In NW community managed libraries were established at Baddesley, Dordon, Hartshill and Water Orton.</p> <p>The Library direct service also comprises of an on-line library service which is accessible 24/7, plus mobile, outreach and housebound reader services.</p> <p>The Library Service purchases and manages stock in a wide range of formats. IT facilities are available at all libraries and a programme of events and activities is delivered at most libraries. In order to provide attractive and accessible community spaces, there has been a programme of building works and the 3 North Warwickshire libraries have benefitted from significant building refurbishment.</p> <p>The library service is focussed on supporting and delivering locally the Universal Offer framework. This framework covers four essential key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health- contributing to the health and wellbeing of local communities. • Reading - planning a framework to develop, deliver and promote reading services within libraries • Digital Offer- recognising that the development of digital services, skills and access underpins so much of a modern library service. This objective supports the Government's "Digital by Default" agenda. • Information offer- enabling people to access information & on-line services in life critical areas such as careers, job searching, health, personal financial information and benefits. A core thread will be assisting people to use vital government online information and services. <p>The LIS has a long history of successfully working with volunteers and this role will continue to expand</p> <p>Warwickshire Direct and Libraries objectives are aligned to the Council's core purpose and priorities. Targeted provision of services will contribute to the development and sustainability of a society that looks after its most vulnerable members, delivers appropriate, quality services at the right time, and seeks opportunities for economic growth and innovation.</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	WCC has reviewed all library premises and the service will continue to explore opportunities to share space or co-locate with partners in other buildings thus resulting in benefits for local people and providing cost efficiencies.

	The service continues to explore external funding. Sub-regional working already exists with Solihull and there is constant engagement with other neighbouring authorities to identify opportunities to deliver shared services.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	Infrastructure needs are identified by the Library Management team when service priorities are determined.
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The County Council is tasked with making savings whilst targeting resources at those with the greatest need and creating opportunities for growth. Libraries remain an important community facility.
COST	To be confirmed when needs are identified
FUNDING	WCC, Developer contributions, CIL

CEMETRIES AND PLACES OF WORSHIP	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	Parish and Town Councils
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>Places of Worship Places of worship are managed by the individual faith groups and in most instances the buildings are also owned by the respective faith organisations e.g. the Church Commissioners in the case of Church of England Churches. Some faith groups' lease or rent rooms in other buildings, including school halls used for evening or weekend worship.</p> <p>Cemeteries There are numerous cemeteries throughout North Warwickshire that are generally publicly provided and managed by the respective town and parish councils.</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	The Council has not been made aware of any significant proposals to increase provision of cemeteries within the District or to provide new places of worship. The new Local Plan has allocated a site which could be potentially be used by Coleshill TC. Coleshill Town Council have identified the need to purchase land in order to extend their burial ground and Ansley Parish will need additional land within 10 years.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Council will continue to work closely with Town and Parish Councils. Any future requirement for additional land for burial space that is identified by Town and/or Parish Councils over the Plan period will need to be brought to the attention of NWBC. Consideration will then be given in assisting its delivery through a review of the Local Plan or other planning document. The main costs associated with cemeteries are the land and associated infrastructure (road network, footpaths). Crematoria tend to be provided as part of a public/private partnership.
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule will be regularly updated and reviewed. Any requirements that arise over the Plan period will be met through the preparation of an appropriate planning document or subsequent reviews of the LDF.
COST	None identified as yet
FUNDING	Town and Parish Councils, Developer contributions

EMERGENCY SERVICES

EMERGENCY SERVICES	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	WCC, Warwickshire Police
EXISTING PROVISION	<p>Fire – there are 3 fire stations within North Warwickshire, none of which are manned 24 hours of the day. Atherstone and Coleshill both have day crews, whilst Polesworth operates as a retained station</p> <p>Police – Policing in the Borough is delivered by 4 Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs), which are based within the Council House in Atherstone. These 4 SNTs form part of the wider North Warwickshire Policing Area, along with SNTs in Nuneaton & Bedworth and Rugby. Other local services are provided from the Leamington Justice Centre, and call management and the co-ordination of incident responses is carried out through an Operational Command and Control Centre currently based at Leek Wootton. Additional police services are provided from Hindlip Park in Worcester as part of a strategic alliance between Warwickshire Police and West Mercia Police.</p> <p>Ambulance – there are no Ambulance stations in North Warwickshire.</p>
PLANNED PROVISION	<p>Police As the number of households and population increases there will be an increasing need for police infrastructure to supplement the existing Safer Neighbourhood Teams. Key requirements will be for the equipping of officers and the provision of vehicles to enable increased provision to police the proposed new developments. There may also be a need for Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras in the Borough as development increases</p>
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	Infrastructure related to key ‘emergency services’ provided by the Police, Fire and Ambulance services constitutes an essential element in the creation of well functioning, safe and sustainable communities
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan seeks to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure in line with new development, and to ensure that all new development is designed so as to create safe environments, prevent crime and contribute to community safety
COST	<p>Fire Station upgrades £121 per dwelling</p> <p>Police – the costs of police infrastructure, including equipment and vehicles, will be assessed for each development and requests for developer contributions will be directly related to the developments proposed</p>
FUNDING	WCC, developer contributions, CIL

Waste Management

	Waste Management
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	Warwickshire County Council North Warwickshire Borough Council
EXISTING PROVISION	North Warwickshire is currently served Lower House Farm Household Recycling Facility.
PLANNED PROVISION	Further housing growth in the Borough and the adjoining Council areas is likely to have a cumulative impact on the capacity of the infrastructure at the current facility during the period of the IDP. Therefore, redesign of the facility to improve capacity, or additional capacity elsewhere, may be to be required to meet the demands of housing growth.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>The Waste Disposal Authority is required to make arrangements for the disposal of waste collected by the Waste Collection Authority Summary.</p> <p>The role of Local Plan is to provide places where the public can take their own household waste for disposal.</p> <p>A need for expanded or more efficient (redesigned) waste infrastructure at the existing and/or other location(s) to serve future development has been identified with developer contributions being secured through the Local Plan and IDP.</p> <p>At our present day costs based on average visits, we expect the cost of disposing of waste increase by about £149,148, without staff cost for extended hours estimated at increasing the opening hours to 6.30pm for 6 days, so increasing the hours of opening by 1/3. Estimated cost for extra cover to be in the region of £58,000.</p> <p>Waste generated is based on population of area, so each added person within the catchment will generate extra waste and recyclables.</p> <p>Approximately 1 tonne per household is generated per year.</p> <p>Using experience of comparable expansions elsewhere in the County to identify the likely size and cost of increased capacity required for each new household leads to an average cost of £43.92 per new household.</p>
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The role of Local Plan is to provide for infrastructure required to support growth, including infrastructure for the management of collected waste and places where the public can take their own household waste for disposal.
COST	£ 43.92 per new household
FUNDING	Developer Contributions Community Infrastructure Levy WCC Capital Funding

UTILITY SERVICES

ENERGY SUPPLY (GAS/ELECTRIC/RENEWABLE)	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	National Grid
EXISTING PROVISION	
PLANNED PROVISION	No needs identified
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>Renewable Energy installations in North Warwickshire are likely to be incorporated into new development rather than being commercially run energy plants (eg wind farms etc). The nature of demand may result in surplus electricity generation at certain times of the day or at the weekend when electricity demand in offices drops. In order to benefit from future changes in “feed in” tariffs, connection to the grid will be required.</p> <p>Gas</p> <p>Electric</p> <p>The distribution of new development in North Warwickshire, as set out in the Local Plan, should not have a significant effect on the Grid’s infrastructure, both gas and electricity transmission. The network should be able to cope with this additional demand.</p>
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Council intends to maintain an Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifying any key infrastructure projects required to support the delivery of the Local Plan.
COST	NA
FUNDING	

WATER SUPPLY	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	Severn Trent
EXISTING PROVISION	Severn Trent are the statutory water undertakers for the majority of the North Warwickshire area, however South Staffordshire Water cover areas to the west and the north of the district. As a statutory water undertaker there is an obligation to provide a supply for domestic purposes in the STW area. Water supply is concerned with the delivery of the available water resource to the end user and can tackle issues regarding infrastructure requirements potentially based on hydraulic modelling and connections to mains supply.
PLANNED PROVISION	As part of the Water Resource Management plan, Severn Trent has developed the high level strategy to meet forecast demand up to 2035. For providing water to specific developments, the requirements are more localised and subject to network modelling. It is usual therefore that the infrastructure is identified on a site by site basis.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	There is no hydraulic capacity at Atherstone STW to accommodate growth, and STW need to confirm when capacity can be provided. The phasing of development in Atherstone/Mancetter will be influenced by the timing of infrastructure provision. There are also issues at Hartshill and to the West of Dordon and STW will need to confirm capacity issues here which may also influence the timing and phasing of development in these locations.
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	STW is keen to work with NWBC to keep up to date with development proposals so that water supply issues are known in advance
COST	The funding of water supply infrastructure is provided by the Water Act 1991. It is usual that costs are met by developers and STW through the requisitioning procedure and scheme of charges
FUNDING	Severn Trent, Initial Studies to be funded by developers

FLOOD DEFENCES	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	Environment Agency
EXISTING PROVISION	The EA has statutory responsibility for flood management and defence in England, responsible for forecasting and mapping flood risk, providing warnings, building and keeping defences in good order and taking part in emergency planning and response
PLANNED PROVISION	The River Tame Strategy identifies a proposed project at Whitacre Heath which is scheduled for 2013/2014 at the earliest. Within the Trent CFMP and the Mid Staffs and Lower Tame area we plan to set a framework to deliver a sustainable approach to flood risk management that considers the natural function of the river and reduces long term dependence on raised flood defences. This includes identifying opportunities to better utilise areas of natural floodplain to store floodwaters and to attenuate rainwater that will reduce flood risk within this sub area and downstream
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	No infrastructure needs identified as yet
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	The Local Plan ensures that flood risk associated with new development is considered both when land is allocated for new development and in development control decisions taken on individual planning applications, in accordance with NPPF
COST	Varied
FUNDING	Environment Agency and Developers. Developers will be required to fund and submit individual site specific FRA's. Level 1 SFRA, funded by LPA. This will apply the basis for applying the Sequential Test. Level 2 SFRA's are required when LPAs are considering allocation of sites within the floodplain.

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY

BROADBAND	
RESPONSIBLE DELIVERY BODIES	NWBC, WCC, Telecoms Infrastructure Companies
EXISTING PROVISION	North Warwickshire’s broadband infrastructure is largely delivered and managed by private sector. The availability, quality and costs of broadband vary substantially across the Borough. Based on the Governments assessment and known supplier plans (up to 2015), North Warwickshire has 11020 premises, out of 28792(both residential and commercial) who have slow (less than 2mbp) or no Broadband service. This is particularly an issue in the rural areas.
PLANNED PROVISION	Telecoms providers have already set out their superfast broadband development plans to 2015 as part of their response to the Open Market Review that was undertaken for the CSW Broadband Project http://www.cswbroadband.org.uk The detail of that information is subject to commercial confidence. The planned delivery is unlikely to include new sites and so it is recommended that dialogue with Openreach and other Communications Infrastructure providers should take place at the earliest opportunity.
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE DELIVERY OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>Developers should ensure that their future home owners have access to a sustainable communications infrastructure giving appropriate thought to the choice/availability of UK communications providers which can offer High Speed data connections</p> <p>The policy expects homes, employment uses and main town centre uses to be able to connect to fibre optic broadband infrastructure. It is recognised that the availability of such infrastructure will vary considerably across the district. The expectation is that even where such infrastructure is not readily available that provision is made for local infrastructure of ducting and cabinets to enable connection when the strategic connections are put in place.</p> <p>Proposals including homes, employment or main town centre uses should support and help implement the aims and objectives of the CSW Broadband initiative. This will be achieved through provision of on-site infrastructure, including open access networks to industry standards, to enable all premises and homes to be directly served by fibre optic broadband technology. Exceptions will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that making such provision would render the development unviable.</p>
ROLE OF THE LOCAL PLAN	<p>NWBC will seek to work with infrastructure providers to identify and deliver any necessary infrastructure needed to support the level of growth proposed within North Warwickshire</p> <p>The Council can only determine applications on planning grounds and will not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure.</p>
COST	Varied
FUNDING	Developer

INFRASTRUCTURE TYPE	LOCATION	LEAD DELIVERY	SOURCE OF FUNDING	COST	RISK
TRANSPORT					
Traffic Modelling will be needed to assess all sites	Borough Wide	Highways England WCC	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions		NECESSARY
Improvements to A5 (Dordon roundabout)	Dordon	Highways England WCC	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions	TBC	CRITICAL
Improvements to A5 (Birch Coppice)	Dordon	Highways England WCC	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions	TBC	NECESSARY
Improvements to Island at Spon Lane/Boot Hill (Grendon)	Grendon	Highways England WCC	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions	TBC	NECESSARY
Improvements to Island at Holly Lane (Atherstone)	Atherstone	Highways England WCC	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions		NECESSARY
Improvements to Holly Lane Bridge	Atherstone	Highways England, WCC,	Developer Contributions	TBC	NECESSARY
Creation of through road in Dordon/Polesworth as development takes place (first part of road already started)	Dordon/Polesworth	NWBC WCC	Developer Contributions		Critical
Creation of through road at Church Road-Nuneaton/Camp Hill Rd allocated site	Hartshill	NWBC, Highways England (advisory)	Developer Contributions	TBC	Critical
Improved services including provision of a footbridge and parking	Polesworth	Network Rail	Developer contributions	TBC	PREFERRED

facilities at Polesworth Railway Station					
Improved car parking at Atherstone Railway Station	Atherstone	Network Rail	Developer contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
Improved facilities at station – footbridge, ticket office	Atherstone	Network Rail	WCC, Network Rail,	At least £1.5m	
Improvements to bus services	Borough wide	WCC, Voluntary Sector	Developer contributions, WCC	TBC	NECESSARY
Arley Station	Arley		WCC, Network Rail,	£8M	PREFERRED
Kingsbury Station	Kingsbury	NWBC owns part of site	WCC, Network Rail,	£8M	PREFERRED
Walking and Cycling	Borough Wide	NWBC, WCC	Developer contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE					
Canal Towpath improvements	Borough wide	British Waterways NWBC	Developer contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
Improved green linkages Borough wide	Borough wide	NWBC	Developer contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
Delivery of Play Area Development Programme	Borough wide	NWBC	Developer contributions, NWBC, Grant Aid	£950K	NECESSARY
Delivery of a a hub containing retail, community and health facilities	Dordon/Polesworth	NWBC	Developer contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
Delivery of Allotments Development Programme	Borough wide	NWBC	Developer contributions, NWBC, Grant Aid	£20K	PREFERRED
TVWLPS	Tame Valley	WWT plus 18 partner organisations including NWBC	NWBC, Developer Contributions, Environment Agency External Grants (including the Heritage Lottery Fund for the TVWLPS).	£2.5 million (£1.7 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund).	PREFERRED

HOUSING					
Affordable Housing	Borough wide	NWBC Housing Association Preferred Partners	Developer contributions (land at nil cost or off-site financial contributions) Housing Associations (private finance) HCA (Social Housing Grant) CSW Sub-region - various enabling grants)	TBC	CRITICAL
Requirement of 9 residential and 5 transit gypsy and traveller pitches	Borough wide	NWBC, WCC, Private	Developer Contributions, Government Grant, WCC		CRITICAL
Requirement of 1 pitch for travelling showpeople to be allocated within Warwickshire Districts	Within Warwickshire	CSW Local Authorities, Private, WCC	Developer Contributions, Government Grant, WCC	TBC	CRITICAL
Extra Care Accommodation	Borough Wide	WCC, RSLs/SDC	WCC, Developer Contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
Housing for Vulnerable Adults	Borough Wide	WCC	WCC, Developer Contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
EDUCATION					
New Primary Schools	Atherstone, 2 x Polesworth/Dordon	WCC	WCC, Developer Contributions	TBC	NECESSARY
Additional school places	Borough Wide	WCC	WCC, Developer Contributions	£21.2M	NECESSARY
Water Orton (Primary School)	Water Orton	WCC,HS2	HS2	TBC	NECESSARY
Hartshill School	Hartshill	WCC	WCC, Developer Contributions	TBC	PREFERRED
HEALTH					
Additional health care facilities to include additional clinical rooms	Borough wide	CCG, NHS England	Developer contributions		

SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE					
Community Venue(upgrade or new facility)	Borough Wide	NWBC	Developer contributions	Will vary on scale and detail	PREFERRED
Replacement/refurbishment of other Leisure Facilities	Atherstone, Arley, Kingsbury and Polesworth	NWBC	NWBC, Developer contributions, grant aid	£4.9M	PREFERRED
PUBLIC SERVICES					
Fire Station Upgrades	Borough Wide	WCC	WCC, Developer contributions	£121 (per new dwelling)	CRITICAL (BUT will be dependent on evidence at time of development)
Waste Management	Borough Wide	WCC	WCC, Developer contributions	£43.92 (per new dwelling)	PREFERRED
UTILITY SERVICES					
Hydraulic Modelling will be needed at some sites	Borough Wide	SEVERN TRENT	Severn Trent,	Varying	NECESSARY
Additional capacity will/may be required to accommodate future expansion	Atherstone and Mancetter, Hartshill, Shustoke and West Dordon	SEVERN TRENT	Severn Trent,	Varying	CRITICAL/PREFERRED
Broadband	All locations	NWBC, WCC, Telecoms Infrastructure Companies	Developers	VARIOUS	PREFERRED

Borough Wide	Infrastructure Needs Identified	Provider
	Traffic Modelling will be needed to assess all sites	Highways England, Developer Contributions
	Improvements to bus services	Developer Contributions, WCC
	Canal Towpath improvements	Developer contributions
	Improved green linkages Borough wide (including improved connectivity between railway stations to ensure integrated facilities for buses, walking and cycling)	Developer contributions
	Delivery of Play Area Development Programme	Developer contributions, NWBC, Grant Aid
	Delivery of Allotments Development Programme	Developer contributions, NWBC, Grant Aid
	Delivery of Landscape restoration and countryside access improvements along the Tame Valley	Tame Valley Wetlands Partnership. NWBC, Developer Contributions, Environment Agency External Grants including the Heritage Lottery Fund for the TWLPS.
	Requirement of 9 residential and 5 transit gypsy and traveller pitches	NWBC / Developer Contributions / WCC / Central Government grant and Private Delivery
	Affordable Housing	Developer contributions (land at nil cost or off-site financial contributions) Housing Associations (private finance) HCA (Social Housing Grant) CSW Sub-region - various enabling grants)
	Extra Care Accommodation	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Housing for Vulnerable Adults	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Delivery of Playing Pitch Strategy	NWBC, Developer contributions, grant aid
	Fire Station Upgrades	WCC, Developer contributions

	Waste Management	WCC, Developer contributions
	Broadband	Developer contributions
	Health Facilities (including additional clinical rooms)	Developer contributions, CCG, NHS England
	Community Venue(upgrade or new facility)	NWBC/Developer Contributions
	Sewerage Capacity - Hydraulic Modelling will be needed at some sites (to assess the impact of proposed development on the existing infrastructure).	Severn Trent/Developer Contributions
	Walking & Cycling – all developments should consider what improvements can be made to encourage safe and fully accessible walking and cycling	Developer Contributions
Within Warwickshire	Requirement of 1 pitch for travelling showpeople to be allocated within Warwickshire Districts	NWBC / Developer Contributions / WCC / Central Government grant and Private Delivery

Atherstone/Mancetter		
	Improvements to Holly Lane Bridge	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Refurbishment of Leisure Facilities	NWBC, Developer contributions, grant aid
	Holly Lane Island A5 - Widen to extent right turn facilities	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions
	Primary School	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Additional capacity will/may be required to accommodate future expansion	Severn Trent,
	Improved car parking at Atherstone Railway Station	Network Rail/ Rail Operators (London Midland)/Developer Contributions
	Improved facilities at Station – footbridge, ticket office	Network Rail/ Rail Operators /Developer Contributions
	Sewerage capacity - Additional capacity will/may be required to accommodate future expansion	Severn Trent
Dordon/Polesworth		
	Primary School (x2)	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Traffic Modelling will be needed to assess sites	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions
	Improvements to A5 (Dordon roundabout)	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions
	Improvements to A5 (Birch Coppice)	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions
	Sewerage capacity - Additional capacity will/may be required to accommodate future expansion at West Dordon	Severn Trent

	Replacement/refurbishment of Leisure Facilities	NWBC, Developer contributions, grant aid
	Improved services including provision of a footbridge and parking facilities at Polesworth Railway Station	Developer Contributions
	Delivery of a hub containing retail, community and health facilities	Developer Contributions
Coleshill		
	Traffic Modelling will be needed to assess some sites	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
Hartshill		
	Traffic Modelling will be needed to assess some sites	Highways England (not committed), Developer contributions
	Replace Hartshill School	WCC, Developer Contributions, Grant Aid
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
	Distributor road for site – Land between Church Road and Nuneaton Road/Camp Hill Road, Hartshill	Developer contributions
	Sewerage capacity - Additional capacity will/may be required to accommodate future expansion	Severn Trent
Grendon/Baddesley		
	Improvements to Island at Spon Lane/Boot Hill	Highways England, WCC
Old and New Arley		
	Replacement/refurbishment of Leisure Facilities	NWBC, Developer contributions, grant aid
	Arley Station	WCC, Network Rail,
Kingsbury		
	Kingsbury Station	WCC, Network Rail,
	Replacement/refurbishment of Leisure Facilities	NWBC, Developer contributions, grant aid
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
Water Orton		
	New Primary School	HS2, WCC

Ansley		
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
Austrey		
Newton Regis		
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
Shuttington		
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
Warton		
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions
Curdworth		
Fillongley		
Hurley		
Piccadilly		
Shustoke		
	Sewerage capacity - Additional capacity will/may be required to accommodate future expansion	Severn Trent
Whitacre Heath		
Wood End		
	Additional school places	WCC, Developer Contributions

	Site Name	Estimated Pupil Yield *					Possible Income		Initial thoughts as to how Education requirements will be delivered	
		Dwellings	Pre-school	Primary	Secondary	Post 16	Primary	Secondary		
Atherstone & Mancetter	Land to north-west of Atherstone off Whittington Lane	1282	28	194	138	27	£ 2,265,389	£ 2,022,704	Land and financial contributions	Across the area the proposed growth suggests the need for a new primary school on the land off Whittington Lane. We would achieve this by securing land and financial contributions. At secondary there is likely to be need for additional build at Queen Elizabeth School. WCC will request financial contributions to support this.
	Land at Holly Lane Atherstone (ATH20)	531	11	80	57	11	£ 938,317	£ 837,797	Financial contributions	
	Land off Sheepy Road, (football ground)	46	1	7	5	1	£ 81,285	£ 72,578	Financial contributions	
	Britannia Mill redevelopment site, Coleshill Rd	54	1	8	6	1	£ 95,422	£ 85,200	Permission already granted	
	Total	1913	41	289	207	40	£ 3,380,413	£ 3,018,278		
Polesworth & Dordon	Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon	2000	43	302	216	42	£ 3,534,149	£ 3,155,544	Land and financial contributions	Across the area the proposed growth suggests the need for a new primary school on the land East of Polesworth. We would achieve this by securing land and financial contributions. At secondary there will be need for additional build at Polesworth School. WCC will request financial contributions to support this.
	Land west of Woodpack Farm, Polesworth	32	1	5	3	1	£ 56,546	£ 50,489	Financial contributions	
	Land off Fairfields Hill, Polesworth	9	0	1	1	0	£ 15,904	£ 14,200	Financial contributions	
	Former Polesworth Learning Centre, High St, Polesworth	14	0	2	2	0	£ 24,739	£ 22,089	Financial contributions	
	Land at Windridge Dunns Lane, Dordon	9	0	1	1	0	£ 15,904	£ 14,200	Financial contributions	
	Former Chapel House site, Dordon	7	0	1	1	0	£ 12,370	£ 11,044	Financial contributions	
	Total	2071	45	313	224	44	£ 3,659,611	£ 3,267,566		

Coleshill	Grimstock Hill (COL 1)	12	0	2	1	0			To be determined	The relatively small level of growth and the current cross county border movement means that it might not be necessary to increase the current number of school places. This will be kept under review.
	Police station and Leisure Centre site (COL3)	25	1	4	3	1			To be determined	
	Land at Blythways (COL6)	27	1	4	3	1			To be determined	
	Allotments adjacent to Memorial Park, Coleshill	30	1	5	3	1			To be determined	
	Total	94	2	14	10	2	£ -	£ -		
Settlements adjoining Borough	Land west of Robey's Lane, adjacent Tamworth	1191	26	180	129	25	£ 2,104,586	£ 1,879,126	Land and financial contributions	Secondary contributions towards additional provision at The Polesworth School
	Site at Lindridge Road adj. Langley SUE, Wishaw	141	3	21	15	3	£ 249,157	£ 222,466	Financial contributions	
	Total	1332	29	201	144	28	£ 2,353,743	£ 2,101,592		
Grendon & Baddesley Ensor	Land at Church Farm, Baddesley	47	1	7	5	1			To be determined	The relatively small level of growth means that it might not be necessary to increase the current number of school places at primary. Additional places will be required at secondary schools and financial contributions will be requested. This will be kept under review.
	Land north of Grendon Community Hall (former Youth Centre) Boot Hill Grendon	7	0	1	1	0			To be determined	
	Former Sparrowdale School site, Spon Lane Grendon	39	1	6	4	1			To be determined	
	Former Recycling centre site, Spon Lane Grendon	5	0	1	1	0			To be determined	
	Total	98	2	15	11	2	£ -	£ -		
Hartshill & Ansley Common	Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill (HAR 3)	400	9	60	43	8	£ 706,830	£ 631,109	Land and financial contributions	While development in this area does not produce a full form of entry at Primary, given the relation to developments across the
	Land off Coleshill Rd, Ansley Common (ANSCOMM 1)	38	1	6	4	1	£ 67,149	£ 59,955	financial contributions	

	Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common	355	8	54	38	8	£ 627,311	£ 560,109	financial contributions	border in Nuneaton and Bedworth and the lack of available capacity within schools in this area we could consider requesting land for a 1FE Primary School. However, further work needs to take place with Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council to understand the potential impact of their Local Plan.
	Land south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common	230	5	35	25	5	£ 406,427	£ 362,888	financial contributions	
	Total	1023	22	155	110	22	£ 1,807,717	£ 1,614,061		
Kingsbury	Land north of Kingsbury Hall, Kingsbury	41	1	6	4	1			To be determined	The relatively low levels of growth mean that it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on school provision. However, this will be kept under review and financial contributions will be requested as necessary.
Water Orton	Former School redevelopment site (excluding original historic school building)	48	1	7	5	1			To be determined	HS2 mitigation includes the relocation of the existing school into a new building. Funds to support this will be provided by HS2 Ltd. The impact of development on school places will be kept under review and financial contributions requested as necessary.
Ansley	Land at Village Farm, Birmingham Road	12	0	2	1	0			To be determined	The relatively low levels of growth mean that it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on school provision. However, this will be kept under review and financial contributions will be requested as necessary.
	Land rear of Village Hall, Birmingham Road	31	1	5	3	1			To be determined	
	Total	43	1	7	5	1	£ -	£ -	To be determined	

EDUCATION

APPENDIX E

Newton Regis	Manor Farm	21	0	3	2	0			To be determined	The relatively low levels of growth mean that it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on school provision. However, this will be kept under review and financial contributions will be requested as necessary.
Shuttington	Land south of Shuttington Village Hall	24	1	4	3	1			To be determined	The relatively low levels of growth mean that it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on school provision. However, this will be kept under review and financial contributions will be requested as necessary.
Warton	Land north of Orton Rd, Warton (part WAR8)	88	2	13	10	2			to be determined	The relatively low levels of growth mean that it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on school provision. However, this will be kept under review and financial contributions will be requested as necessary.
Wood End	Land south of Islington Farm, r/o 115 Tamworth Rd	28	1	4	3	1			To be determined	The relatively low levels of growth mean that it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on school provision. However, this will be kept under review and financial contributions will be requested as necessary.
Total		6824	147	1032	737	144	£ 11,201,485	£10,001,497		

* The birth rate multiplier used for this exercise is 2.16 children per school year per 100 homes
Pre-school calculation is currently based on 1 year group - this is under review following legislative change for individual free entitlement.
Primary calculation is based on 7 year groups (4-11)
Secondary calculation is based on 5 year groups (11-16)
Post 16 is based on past staying on rates. This is currently under review following the raising of the participation age.

We also request contributions to support adaptations to schools for pupils with special needs, again this is currently under review.

Financial contributions will be based on Department for Education rates and these will be subject to change. The rates in use at January 2017 are

Pre school	£11,687.00	per pupil place
Primary	£11,687.00	per pupil place
Secondary	£14,609.00	per pupil place
Post 16	£15,794.00	per pupil place

In order to ensure CIL compliance we will only be able to request contributions which are fair and reasonable in kind and scale and directly related to the proposed development.

We can pool contributions from different developments but we are restricted to no more than 5 contributions being pooled for any one piece of infrastructure.

For small developments it might not be deemed appropriate to request financial contributions when the amount we could request would be low in terms of capital costs but could have an adverse impact on the viability of the scheme.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan Framework Summary for Health

The CCG and Public Health have developed a framework which identifies both physical and workforce infrastructure requirements for each strategic site. The framework is a tool to support the CCG in assessing the impact of developments on primary medical care to provide an evidence base to inform S106 requests. Below is summary of the framework findings. This framework is subject to change and will be reviewed on an ongoing basis and financial and/or land contributions will be requested as necessary through S106 monies and/or CIL. The exact way that the monies will be spent will be determined at individual planning application.

	Site Name	Dwellings	Residents per H.H	No. of consulting rooms	No. of treatment rooms	Total number of consult/treat	GP Capacity	Nurse Capacity	Financial Contributions	Initial thoughts on primary care requirements
Atherstone & Mancetter	Land to north-west of Atherstone off Whittington Lane	1282	3077	2.25	0.58	2.83	1.71	0.82	£457,187.09	Land and financial contribution already been approved
	Land at Holly Lane Atherstone (ATH20)	531	1274	0.93	0.24	1.17	0.71	0.34	£189,365.48	Financial contribution already been approved therefore no further request to be made
	Land off Sheepy Road, (football ground)	46	110	0.08	0.02	0.10	0.06	0.03	£16,404.42	To be determined
	Britannia Mill redevelopment site, Coleshill Rd	54	130	0.09	0.02	0.12	0.07	0.03	£19,257.18	Financial contribution already been approved therefore no further request to be made
	Total	1913	4591	3.35	0.87	4.22	2.55	1.22	£682,214.18	
Polesworth & Dordon	Land to east of Polesworth & Dordon	2000	4800	3.50	0.91	4.42	2.67	1.28	£713,240.03	Land and financial contributions
	Land west of Woodpack Farm, Polesworth	32	77	0.06	0.01	0.07	0.04	0.02	£11,412.07	Financial contributions
	Land off Fairfields Hill, Polesworth	9	22	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	£3,209.36	Financial contributions
	Former Polesworth Learning Centre, High St, Polesworth	14	34	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	£4,992.34	Financial contributions
	Land at Windridge Dunns Lane, Dordon	9	22	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	£3,209.36	Financial contributions
	Former Chapel House site, Dordon	7	17	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	£2,930.17	Financial contributions
	Total	2071	4970	3.63	0.83	4.57	2.76	1.33	£738,993.35	
Coleshill	Grimstock Hill (COL 1)	12	29	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	£4,279.15	Financial contributions
	Police station and Leisure Centre site (COL3)	25	60	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.02	£8,915.90	Financial contributions
	Land at Blythways (COL6)	27	65	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.04	0.02	£9,195.09	Financial contributions
	Allotments adjacent to Memorial Park, Coleshill	30	72	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.04	0.02	£10,698.88	Financial contributions
	Total	94	226	0.16	0.04	0.21	0.13	0.06	£33,089.03	
Settlements adjoining District	Land west of Robey's Lane, adjacent Tamworth	1191	2858	2.09	0.54	2.63	1.59	0.76	£424,734.85	Land and financial contributions
	Site at Lindridge Road adj. Langley SUE, Wishaw	141	338	0.25	0.06	0.31	0.19	0.09	£50,283.04	Financial contributions
	Total	1332	3197	2.33	0.61	2.94	1.78	0.85	£475,017.89	
Grendon & Baddesley Ensor	Land at Church Farm, Baddesley	47	113	0.08	0.02	0.10	0.06	0.03	£16,761.01	Financial contributions
	Land north of Grendon Community Hall (former Youth Centre) Boot Hill Grendon	7	17	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	£2,496.17	Financial contributions
	Former Sparrowdale School site, Spon Lane Grendon	39	94	0.07	0.02	0.09	0.05	0.02	£13,908.24	Financial contributions
	Former Recycling centre site, Spon Lane Grendon	5	12	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	£1,782.98	Financial contributions
	Total	98	235	0.17	0.04	0.22	0.13	0.06	£34,948.41	
Hartshill & Ansley Common	Land between Church Rd and Nuneaton Rd, Hartshill (HAR)	400	960	0.70	0.18	0.88	0.53	0.26	£142,648.41	Land and financial contributions
	Land off Coleshill Rd, Ansley Common (ANSCOMM 1)	38	91	0.07	0.02	0.08	0.05	0.02	£13,551.65	Financial contributions
	Land north of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common	355	852	0.62	0.16	0.78	0.47	0.23	£126,600.59	Financial contributions
	Land south of Coleshill Road, Ansley Common	230	552	0.40	0.10	0.51	0.31	0.15	£82,023.08	Financial contributions
	Total	1023	2455	1.79	0.47	2.26	1.36	0.66	£364,823.72	
Kingsbury	Land north of Kingsbury Hall, Kingsbury	41	98	0.07	0.02	0.09	0.05	0.03	£14,621.44	Financial contributions
Water Orton	Former School redevelopment site (excluding original historic school building)	48	115	0.08	0.02	0.11	0.06	0.03	£17,117.61	Financial contributions
Ansley	Land at Village Farm, Birmingham Road	12	29	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	£4,279.15	Financial contributions
	Land rear of Village Hall, Birmingham Road	31	74	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.04	0.02	£11,055.48	Financial contributions
	Total	43	103	0.08	0.02	0.09	0.06	0.03	£15,334.63	
Newton Regis	Manor Farm	21	50	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.01	£7,489.52	Financial contributions
Shuttington	Land south of Shuttington Village Hall	24	58	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.02	£8,559.30	Financial contributions
Warton	Land north of Orton Rd, Warton (part WAR8)	88	211	0.15	0.04	0.19	0.12	0.06	£31,382.45	Financial contributions
Wood End	Land south of Islington Farm, r/o 115 Tamworth Rd	28	67	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.04	0.02	£9,985.69	Financial contributions
	Total	6824	16378	11.96	3.11	15.07	9.10	4.37	£2,437,481.21	Land and financial contributions

TO BE INSERTED FROM Strategic Transport Assessment

Agenda Item No 8

**Local Development Framework
Sub-Committee**

11 September 2017

**Report of the Assistant Chief Executive
and Solicitor to the Council**

**North Warwickshire Local
Development Scheme (LDS) update**

1 Summary

1.1 This report brings to Members a revised Local Development Scheme.

Recommendation to Executive Board

That the Local Development Scheme is approved

2 Local Development Scheme

2.1 This report brings to Members an update of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) to reflect the work that has been carried out and to ensure that the legal process for the production of the documents is adhered to.

... 2.2 The revised document is attached as Appendix A. It can be altered / updated at any time.

2.3 As can be seen from the revised LDS the main focus of work will relate to the progression of a Local Plan incorporating the draft site allocations and the draft development management plans.

3 Report Implications

3.1 Finance and Value for Money Implications

3.1.1 The costs of the programme of work have been the subject of other reports and are funded through the Local Development Framework budget.

3.2 Legal and Human Rights Implications

3.2.1 It is a requirement of the 2004 Act that a Local Development Scheme is prepared that outlines the work programme to produce the various Local Development Documents.

3.3 Environment and Sustainability Implications

3.3.1 Sustainability appraisals are required to accompany all Local Development Documents identified by this Local Development Scheme. Consultants are engaged to work alongside the Forward Planning Team. The Local Development Scheme and the associated plans and documents take into account evidence of housing needs, landscaping appraisal, habitat biodiversity audit and other assessments to inform future development frameworks. All the various assessments help inform a sustainability appraisal.

3.4 Equality Implications

3.4.1 An equality impact assessment was carried out on the Core Strategy which sets out the overarching spatial vision for the Borough over the next 20 years. An updated Impact Assessment will be carried out for the emerging Local Plan.

3.5 Links to Council's Priorities

3.5.1 The delivery of the Local Development Framework is linked to all of the Council priorities.

The Contact Officer for this report is Dorothy Barratt (719250).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date

***Local Development
Scheme
for
North Warwickshire***



**North Warwickshire
Borough Council**

September 2017

Introduction

- 1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced the requirement for Councils such as Cambridge City Council to prepare and maintain a Local Development Scheme (LDS). An LDS sets out a timetable for the production of new or revised Development Plan Documents (such as a Local Plan) by the local council.
- 2 It sets out a planning work programme for the Council over a three-year period to 2020. It will be regularly reviewed to keep it up to date. This September 2017 LDS version supersedes previous versions.

What are the current adopted Development Plan Documents for North Warwickshire?

- 3 The current Development Plan Documents for North Warwickshire are:
 - North Warwickshire Core Strategy (adopted October 2014)
 - Warwickshire Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2013)
 - Warwickshire Minerals Local Plan
 - Saved policies from the 2006 North Warwickshire Local Plan
 - Arley Neighbourhood Plan
 - Hartshill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Coleshill Neighbourhood Plan
 - Austrey Neighbourhood Plan
- 4 The Statement of Community Involvement was adopted in April 2007.
- 5 A further **five** Neighbourhood Plan Areas have been formally designated.
- 6 Work is on-going on CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) and it is envisaged that a charging schedule will be in place during 2018/19.

What new Development Plan Documents are to be prepared?

- 7 The Borough Council has been working on the production of two individual documents following the adoption of the Core Strategy in October 2014. Consultation has been carried out on the Draft Site Allocations Plan and the Draft Development Management Plan. It however become clear that there is a need to join these plans together and review, where necessary, any policies from the Core Strategy. The LDS of September 2016 confirmed the production of a single plan. The Draft Local Plan went out for consultation from 3rd August 2016 with a formal period of consultation from 11 November 2016 until 31 March 2017. This allowed for two sets of public consultation events to be carried out.
- 8 This LDS confirms the updated work programme which is attached as Appendix A. The new Local Plan for North Warwickshire will be adopted as early as possible in 2018, following examination by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State.
- 9 The needs of the Gypsy & Traveller community will be incorporated into the emerging Local Plan rather than a separate document as originally envisaged.
- 10 The Minerals and Waste Documents are the responsibility of Warwickshire County Council. The County Council is reviewing the Minerals Plan with further consultations taking place this year. Further information can be found on the County Council's website: www.warwickshire.gov.uk.

- 11 A schedule setting out more detail on the preparation of the new Local Plan is set out below.

Appendix A

Development Plan Document to be produced

Document Title	Subject matter and geographical area	Chain of Conformity	Consultation	Publication of Submission Draft DPD & Public Consultation	Submission and Examination of DPD	Adoption and Publication of DPD	Policies it will replace
North Warwickshire Local Plan	Sets out vision, objectives and strategy for the spatial development of Borough. Lists allocated sites illustrated on an accompanying Policies Map. Sets out policies against which planning applications will be considered. Covers the whole of North Warwickshire Borough Council's administrative area.	Conformity with the NPPF	Growth Options – summer 2016 Draft Local Plan (incorporating previous consultations versions of Site Allocations & Development Management Plan policies) 3 rd August 2016 to 31 March 2017	Submission version – October / November 2017	Submission - January 2018 Examination - March 2018	Summer 2018	It will replace: 1. All remaining saved policies from 2006 Local Plan; and, 2. Core Strategy 2014

Further Information Sources

Below are links to websites which will assist should you require further information on LDSs:

- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/contents>
- Neighbourhood Plan Act
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/20/contents/enacted>
- The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/contents/made>
- Planning Advisory Service:
<http://www.pas.gov.uk>
- Planning Portal:
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>
- Planning Practice Guidance
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/>