

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 19 December 2012 in the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa at 6.00pm.

PRESENT: Councillor Illingworth (Chairman); Councillors Mrs Blacklock, Brookes, Mrs Bromley, De-Lara-Bond, Mrs Falp, Rhead, Weed, Wilkinson and Williams.

163. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Minute Number 165 – W12/1143 – Coventry and Warwickshire Gateway Development

Councillor Mrs Falp declared an interest because the Ward Councillor speaking in objection to the application was the leader of her group.

164. **SITE VISITS**

To assist with decision making, Councillors Mrs Blacklock, Brookes, Mrs Bromley, De-Lara-Bond, Mrs Falp, Illingworth, Rhead, Weed and Wilkinson visited the following application site on Saturday 15 December 2012:

Coventry & Warwickshire Gateway

165. **W12/1143 – COVENTRY AND WARWICKSHIRE GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT**

The Committee considered an application from the Coventry and Warwickshire Development Partnership LLP.

The application was for a comprehensive redevelopment comprising the following:

demolition of existing structures and the erection of new buildings to accommodate offices, research & development facilities and light industrial uses (Use Class B1), general industrial uses (Use Class B2), storage and distribution (Use Class B8), hotel accommodation (Use Class C1), museum accommodation (Use Class D1), model car club facility, small scale retail and catering establishments (Use Classes A1, A3, A4 and/or A5), car showroom accommodation, replacement airport buildings, new countryside park, ground modelling work including the construction of landscaped bunds, construction of new roads/footpaths/cycle routes, remodelling of highways/junctions on the existing highway network, stopping up/diversion of footpaths, associated parking, servicing and landscaping (Hybrid planning application seeking full planning permission in respect of the replacement airport buildings and their associated parking/servicing/landscaping and outline planning permission, with reserved matters details concerning access only to be discharged, in respect of the remainder of the proposed development).

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

The application was presented to the Committee due to the extensive affect that this would have on the District and its residents, and due to the high level of objections received.

The report advised that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) re-affirmed that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

In terms of assessment of the application proposals, it was noted that Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council planning policies applied only to those areas of the site within Warwick District Council's jurisdiction whilst Coventry City Council planning policies applied only to those parts of the application site within Coventry City Council's administrative area. The West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), The RSS Phase II Revision and the NPPF applied to the entire site.

The case officer considered the following policies to be relevant:

Relevant Warwick District Local Plan Policies were:

DP1 - Layout and Design
DP2 - Amenity
DP3 - Natural and Historic Environment and Landscape
DP4 - Archaeology
DP6 - Access
DP7 - Traffic Generation
DP8 - Parking
DP9 - Pollution Control
DP11 - Drainage
DP12 - Energy Efficiency
DP13 - Renewable Energy Developments
DP14 - Crime Prevention
DP15 - Accessibility and Inclusion
SC4 - Supporting Cycle and Pedestrian Facilities
SC8 - Protecting Community Facilities
SC12 - Sustainable Transport Improvements
SC15 - Public Art
RAP6 - Directing New Employment
RAP10 - Safeguarding Rural Roads
RAP11 - Rural Shops and Services
RAP13 - Directing New Outdoor Sport and Recreation Development
RAP16 - Directing New Visitor Accommodation
DAP3 - Protecting Nature Conservation and Geology
DAP4 - Protection of Listed Buildings
DAP8 - Protection of Conservation Areas
UAP3 - Directing New Retail Development

Relevant Warwickshire Structure Plan Policies were as follows:

I.2 - Industrial Land Provision
T.7 - Public Transport
TS10 - Developer Contributions
TC2 - Hierarchy of Town Centres

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

Relevant Coventry Development Plan Policies were as follows:

OS4 – Creating A More Sustainable City
OS5 – Achieving A High Quality City
OS6 – Change Of Land Use
OS9 – Access By Disabled People
OS10 – Planning Obligations
EM2 – Air Quality
EM3 – Water Resources And Quality
EM4 – Flood Risk And Development
EM5 – Pollution Protection Strategy
EM6 – Contaminated Land
EM8 – Light Pollution
E1 – Overall Economy And Employment Strategy
E2 – Consolidating and strengthening the City’s existing economic base
E3 – Diversification of the local economy
E6 – Principal Employment Sites
E8 – Redevelopment Of Existing Employment Sites
AM1 – An Integrated, Accessible And Sustainable Transport Strategy
AM3 – Bus Provision In Major New Developments
AM8 – Improving Pedestrian Routes
AM9 – Pedestrians In New Developments
AM10 – Traffic Calming
AM12 – Cycling In New Developments
AM14 - Roads
AM22 – Road Safety In New Developments
BE1 – Overall Built Environment Strategy
BE2 – The Principles of Urban Design
BE15 – Archaeological Sites
BE19 - Lighting
BE20 – Landscape Design And Development
BE21 – Safety And Security
GE1 – Green Environment Strategy
GE3 – Green Space Corridors
GE6 – Control Over Development In The Green Belt
GE8 – Control Over Development In Urban Green Space
GE11 – Protection of SSSI’s, Local Nature Reserves and CNCS
GE12 – Protection of Other Sites of Nature Conservation Value
GE14 – Protection Of Landscape Features
GE15 – Designing New Development To Accommodate Wildlife

Relevant Regional Spatial Strategy Policies were as follows:

CC1 – Climate Change
UR1 – Implementing urban renaissance – the MUA’s
RR1 – Rural renaissance
RR4 – Rural services
PA1 – Prosperity for all
PA2 – Urban Regeneration Zones
PA3 – High Technology Corridors
PA4 – Development related to higher/further education and research establishments and incubator units
PA5 – Employment areas in need of modernisation and renewal
PA6 – Portfolio of employment land
PA7 – Regional Investment Sites

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

- PA8 – Major Investment Sites
- PA9 – Regional Logistics Sites
- PA13 – Out of Centre retail development
- PA14 – Economic development and the rural economy
- QE1 – Conserving and enhancing the environment
- QE2 – Restoring degraded areas and managing and creating high quality new environments
- QE3 – Creating a high quality built environment for all
- QE4 – Greenery, urban green space and public spaces
- QE5 – Protection and enhancement of the historic environment
- QE6 – The conservation, enhancement and restoration of the Region’s landscape
- QE7 – Protecting, managing and enhancing the Region’s biodiversity and nature conservation resources
- QE8 – Forestry and woodlands
- QE9 – The Water Environment
- EN1 – Energy generation
- EN2 – Energy conservation
- T1 – Developing accessibility and mobility within the Region to support the Spatial Strategy
- T2 – Reducing the need to travel
- T3 – Walking and cycling
- T4 – Promoting travel awareness
- T5 – Public transport
- T7 – Car parking standards and management
- T9 – The management and development of national and regional transport networks
- T11 - Airports

An addendum circulated at the meeting detailed a number of corrections and an update following the recent decision made by Coventry City Council’s Planning Committee. Information was also included about The Lunt Fort, St Martin’s roundabout, further responses from the consultation and the applicant were detailed and additional information regarding the Section 106 agreement.

The case officer felt that the proposed development would have significant economic and employment benefits for the sub-region as a whole and the Coventry & Nuneaton Regeneration Zone in particular and it was not considered that there were other suitable and preferable sites that could accommodate the development.

The officer presenting the report summarised the existing uses of the site and gave Members a detailed description of the area including advising of the District boundaries, green belt areas, contaminated land and the location of the Lunt Roman Fort. He explained that the application was sectioned into two parts, with the original permission being the first part and the second part being the full application, including the airport buildings. He advised Members of the Development Zones and explained the relocation details of the Rugby Club, Railway Museum and the Model Car Club.

Mr Neale, from Warwickshire County Council, introduced the Highways section of the application and advised that the scheme had been modelled and assessed by Warwickshire County Council, the Highways Agency and

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

Coventry City Council. He gave details about a Green Travel Plan and outlined the different phases of works using photomontages of the existing layout and one year and ten year interpretations. Included in this information were details about the 'bunds' which would largely screen the site from rural locations and the S106 contribution of £100k to the Lunt Roman Fort, as detailed in the addendum.

Whilst the proposals constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt, officers considered there to be very special circumstances which were of sufficient weight to override the harm, by way of inappropriateness and the other harm identified. These very special circumstances and the weight that could be attached to them were outlined in the Green Belt section of the report. These related to the economic and employment benefits of the proposals to the sub-region, bearing in mind the absence of suitable and preferable alternative sites for the development, the increased public access to countryside within the application site for outdoor sport and recreation arising as a consequence of the development, the biodiversity enhancement envisaged and the environmental benefits arising from the sustainable decontamination of substantial areas of land within the development.

Subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement, it was considered that the proposals were acceptable in terms of such matters as transportation; landscape impact; public open space, sport and recreation; heritage impacts; noise, air and light pollution; contamination; flood risk/drainage; loss of agricultural land; sequential and other locational issues related to the retail, catering, hotel and car showroom uses proposed; ecology; sustainable building measures; urban design; neighbour amenity impacts and the relationship with Coventry Airport.

Overall it was considered that the proposals complied with Development Plan policies, Government Guidance in the NPPF and other planning policy which was a material consideration. Members were also advised that an independent assessment had been undertaken by G L Hearn, explaining that the development could result in £250m investment and potentially ten thousand job opportunities.

The report therefore recommended that Members be minded to approve those elements of the application within the administrative area of Warwick District Council subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement being entered into by the applicant in respect of those matters, including matters where further clarification was awaited. In addition, the report asked that Members be supportive of the application proposals as a whole for the reasons highlighted in this report.

There were a large number of speakers registered to address the Committee and the first section were representatives from various Parish Councils.

Councillor Hancox spoke first on behalf of Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council. He had concerns about the very high volume of paperwork submitted by the developers, which amounted to over thirty thousand pages. He felt the application was being rushed through despite the unanimous opposition from all the parish councils and advised that none of the traffic issues had been addressed. Councillor Hancox stated that this

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

was only the first part of the development and the second stage would focus on the development of a bigger passenger and freight airport terminal. He reiterated the strength of feeling from residents of Stoneleigh and Ashow and requested that the Committee refuse the application.

Julie Keeton from Baginton Parish Council addressed the Committee and stated that the quality of life for residents of the ancient, rural village would be significantly adversely affected. Residents did not want an access road for a logistics company cutting through their village bringing, light, noise and vibration pollution. Ms Keeton made reference to the loss of Green Belt, the detrimental effect on flora and fauna which could take decades to rectify and did not feel that a man made countryside park was sufficient mitigation. In summary, she asked the Committee to prevent urban sprawl and protect the interests of its residents.

The final parish council representative was Bubbenhall Parish Council's Chair, Joanne Shattock. She stated that the employment figures being proposed by the developer were questionable and could be reduced down to 20% of those quoted. The opinion that this area of Green Belt was not 'high value' was irrelevant because it was open space that acted as a buffer between Coventry and rural Warwickshire villages. She did not feel that the scale and impact was conveyed by the computer simulation and the proposed bunts and tree planting would not shield residents from the 24/7 operations within the industrial warehousing. She made reference to suitable alternative sites at Ansty and Ryton and urged the Committee to listen to the strong local voice which was opposed to the development and refuse the application.

A number of objectors addressed the Committee. They were Dr Ashworth, Peter Foyer, Robert Fryer, Vicky Fletcher, Peter Everett Langley, David Ellwood, David Wintle, Alan Roe and Mark Symes.

Dr Ashworth addressed the Committee on behalf of the Leamington and Warwick Friends of the Earth. Her main concerns were the loss of a large area of Green Belt which was needed for the District's growing population and the impact this would have on the wildlife and bird population. She felt the developers should be looking at developing derelict sites, not countryside and urged the Council to take a firm stance and refuse the application.

Mr David Ellwood spoke on behalf of Mr Andrew Goldie, who was unable to attend. The main concern centred on the Beatty family and the location of their family home and business at Rock Farm. If the development were to go ahead, the farm would be demolished and the tenants given notice by the landlord, Coventry City Council. Mr Goldie's comments highlighted that the family had had no communication from the Council, had no funds to buy another property and would lose their livelihood. Potentially, three generations of one family would be made homeless and Members were asked to bear this in mind when reaching their decision.

Mr Peter Foyer addressed Members and explained that he had worked in the logistics industry for some time. Based on this, he felt that the employment prospects being quoted were fatuous and more suited to a manufacturing concept. He stated that the logistics industry was moving towards basing sites nearer to town centres and did not think that this site,

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

being in the Green Belt, could be justified. He asked Members to re-think and recommended further independent investigation on the employment numbers, traffic levels and the value of a logistics park in this location.

Mr Robert Fryer outlined his concerns with regards to the polluted state of the land on site and advised Members of the history of the sewage sludge and waste tipping in the area. He explained how this had been stored in lagoons at Rock Farm and he had concerns that the bunds would increase the risk of contamination. Mr Fryer advised that there could be a shortfall in the drinking water supply and was concerned that the bore hole extract was at a lower level to the Gateway site, which could lead to contaminated water.

Ms Victoria Fletcher addressed Members on behalf of residents in Bubbenhall village who were angry and suspicious of the application. She outlined their concerns as being the speed at which the application had been processed and residents felt that thirteen weeks was insufficient time to consider such a large proposal. Residents were unconvinced that this proposal was very different to the Enterprise Zone scheme which had recently been refused and did not feel that the independent report from G L Hearn was acceptable. Secondly, Ms Fletcher did not feel that Sir Peter Rigby's involvement could be impartial because he was owner of Coventry Airport and the Chairman of the Local Enterprise Partnership(LEP). Finally, residents had grave concerns regarding the loss of such a large area of Green Belt and did not feel that officers had successfully identified 'very special circumstances'.

Mr Peter Everett Langley spoke next as a representative of the Campaign to Protect Rural England who had submitted a number of objections to the application. He advised Members that there was no numerical need for more employment land and felt that numerous suitable alternative sites had been dismissed for insufficient reasons. He outlined the lack of transport and accessibility issues to the development and warned Members that this site would suffer from a lack of demand, similar to current, empty sites.

Mr David Ellwood addressed Members and focused on discrepancies in the report and his dissatisfaction that officers had interpreted the NPPF to validate their 'very special circumstances' whilst ignoring the Local Plan policies. He made reference to the appeal decision detailed in the report and recent guidance notes published by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors. Finally, he reminded Members of eighteen alternative sites and signposted them to the relevant pages of the report concerning the Green Belt.

Mr David Wintle spoke and made reference to the hundreds of constituents who were fearful and frustrated by the proposed development. He quoted a number of paragraphs from the NPPF and how he felt the application conflicted with them. He also made reference to the objection from the RSPB and reminded Members that the three affected Warwickshire villages, had conservation area status which should be protected. He finished by stating that to approve the application, would be a pre-determination of the draft Local Plan consultation process and would be unreasonable and irrational.

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

Mr Alan Roe addressed the Committee and used the report from G L Hearn to enhance his objection. He felt that the employment forecast was seriously overstated and although the proposal contained potential capacity, the employment numbers were not commercially achievable. He quoted the original 14,000 jobs figure from the Savills report, which the G L Hearn report had failed to mention. He felt this was because they had realised it was an 'indefensible number' which had an 'inherent uncertainty'. Mr Roe had concerns that he had seen no evidence to suggest that the financial viability of the scheme had been investigated and made reference to the weight applied to this in the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors guidelines. He stated that there were 'gaping chasms in the knowledge base and technical analysis' and urged Members to reject the application.

Mr Mark Symes, a resident of Bubbenhall, was the last objector to address the Committee. As a businessman involved in the Logistics industry he explained why he believed the employment figures to be unjustified and how the current market was oversupplied for similar sites. Based on the formula for calculating potential job numbers, he had calculated that the region had space available for 32,000 jobs, using only the existing industrial sites. He made reference to the G L Hearn report, which he believed was not independent and purely a critique of the Savills report, especially because they had not been commissioned to establish their own independent report. Mr Symes concluded that this development was not worth the sacrifice of Green Belt and asked Members to refuse permission.

James Avery addressed the Committee in support of the application as a local resident and a keen cycling enthusiast. He commended the developers for the inclusion of cycle routes but felt that these needed further development to ensure the site was 'green'. He made reference to an email which he had previously circulated and questioned the lack of cycle routes into Warwick, Leamington and Bubbenhall. In summary, he was supportive of the potential employment opportunities that could be on offer but felt there was still room for improvement on the positive cycle provisions in the application.

Mr John Holmes, the applicant, addressed Members and explained that the Gateway proposal had been made in response to prevailing economic circumstances. He reminded Members that the national picture was a depressing one and the Government was encouraging local authorities to support economic growth. He advised that the Coventry and Warwickshire sub-region had higher than average unemployment figures and lower than average disposable income. It was hoped that the Gateway site would provide a mix of building types to ensure it attracted a broad range of occupiers.

Mr Holmes defended the job number quoted in the report and explained that the developers had extensive experience in developing similar sites. He gave examples of successfully delivered projects for well known companies such as Amazon, Tesco, Sainsbury and Ocado along with their corresponding created job numbers. He suggested that there were signs of positive change in the construction market and a number of companies had expressed an interest in developing sites in this site region. These included GeoPost, Tesco, H&M, Greggs, Jaguar Land Rover, Aston Martin and Rolls Royce. Reference was also made to a confidential letter, distributed to

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

Members, which named four well known companies who had enquired about locating to the Gateway site.

In response to the comments about suitable alternative sites, Mr Holmes explained that these were not large enough and, as an example, stated that the site at Ryton would only be able to accommodate two of the previously mentioned companies.

He appreciated the difficulties that the local authority faced especially with regard to the location of Coventry and Warwickshire within a tightly drawn Green Belt. However, he felt that if the need and demand for high quality employment land continued to grow, then Members would have to consider expanding.

Mr Holmes then addressed some of the issues raised regarding the park and assured Members that there would be wide public access, with enhanced habitat and biodiversity measures in place. He stated that the open space park took up almost 45% of the total area of the site and would ensure extensive and appropriate tree planting and screening.

Finally, Mr Holmes argued that the project was financially viable and assured the Committee that extensive amounts of money were being held by supporters and backers of the scheme. He also reminded Members that the scheme had the support of the Environment Agency, Highways Agency and Natural England and he urged the Committee to support growth in the area.

Mr Steve Johnstone addressed a number of the queries raised regarding the infrastructure involved in the development. He denied that Parcelforce had an objection to the proposals and was encouraged that the conflict with Whitley Business Park had been thoroughly covered during the Coventry City Council planning meeting last week.

Mr Johnstone made reference to the funds being made available for the infrastructure improvements which would not be possible if permission was refused for the Gateway project. He described the ongoing traffic issues at Festival Island and St Martin's roundabout and reiterated the support from the Highways Agency.

He made reference to the access road and compared the existing layout with the proposed plans. This, combined with the CCTV and Automatic Number Plate Recognition processes, allowed the developers to be confident that they could control the traffic effectively and alleviate residents' concerns.

Councillor Norman Pratt addressed the Committee in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Cubbington and endorsed all the objections made by previous speakers. He supported the grave concerns that residents had over the future of their village, which housed a thirteenth century church and ancient spring. He felt that to construct a large logistics building above the church was unacceptable and raised concerns that little time had been given to consider the proposals in depth.

Councillor Pratt made reference to the job numbers quoted in the application and highlighted the differences between the Savills report and

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

the G L Hearn report, which implied that not only were the numbers over exaggerated, there were likely to be more relocated jobs than new jobs. He also stated that the 'quality' of the Green Belt was irrelevant because it served a purpose by preventing coalescence and separated Bubbenhall from the fringes of Coventry and the airport.

In summary, he urged Members to separate the facts from the promises and preserve the benefits of these rural villages for future generations.

Councillor Bertie MacKay addressed Members in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council, which was objecting to the application. Residents had concerns that their lives would be affected detrimentally due to increased traffic and noise pollution and Councillor MacKay made reference to the long journey time experienced by bus users trying to access Coventry and Stoneleigh.

He also made reference to the previously mentioned urban sprawl and showed Members a map which he felt identified the built up areas extending Coventry into Baginton and Bubbenhall villages. Councillor MacKay then made reference to the 1988 minutes of Baginton Parish Council which outlined objections to the erection of industrial units and a loss of Green Belt. He stated that twenty four years on, the problem was unravelling once more.

Reference was also made to the connection with Sir Peter Rigby and the suggestion that the development was tied in with improvements to the airport. Councillor MacKay raised concerns about the levels of money involved and the price of agricultural land. He detailed the variance in the estimated job numbers and suggested that the development was 'industrial elitism'.

Finally, Councillor MacKay explained that the 'very special circumstances' were only mitigation and compensation matters and reiterated that neither Warwick District nor Coventry needed any more employment land.

At this point, the Chairman agreed that a short comfort break could be taken and the meeting would reconvene with the Committee debate.

Councillor Brookes requested clarification as to why the area had been unsuccessful as an 'Enterprise Zone'. The Head of Development Services explained that the Government had selected ten schemes which it felt were in a stronger position.

In addition, she answered queries regarding the listed status of the Rock Farm dwelling, which was thought to be Victorian and not old enough to be listed. With regard to the current tenant's right to remain in the property, Member were advised that no planning policies existed which sought to protect farms or individual residences. Ultimately, Coventry City Council would have a duty of care to the residents and would have to adhere to the law if the site was to be redeveloped.

Discussions ensued regarding various high profile names in the automotive industry, including Jaguar Land Rover and Aston Martin, and whether our District needed to look at capitalising on this growing area of industry. Councillor Brookes intimated that if large companies were looking to base

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

themselves in our area, the Council would need to investigate developing sites to attract employers of this size.

Members discussed the potential of employment opportunities but had concerns that the majority of the proposed plans for transport provision focused on journeys to and from Coventry. Queries were also raised regarding the accuracy of some of the details in the S106 agreement because distances appeared to have been calculated incorrectly. Councillor Rhead suggested that a Travel Plan Co-ordinator should be employed by the Council and not by the developer, who seemed to have focused on ensuring skilled workers could access the site from Coventry and was disappointed that there had been little mention of Warwick District.

Mr Geoff Horsman from Coventry City Council answered a number of queries regarding the proposed employment figures and advised that the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) guidelines had been used for these calculations. Mr Horsman addressed the Committee with regard to the square footage of space needed for companies with high job densities.

Concerns were raised regarding the protection of the Lunt Roman Fort but Members were pleased to see that discussions appeared to be moving in a more positive direction. However, some Members still felt that the harm could still be substantial given the distance from the site and clarification was given regarding flood risk.

Mike Jenkins, WDC Environmental Health officer, outlined the current situation regarding contaminated land on site and explained that the Environment Agency would take the lead on this aspect of work. Ultimately, any disturbed waste could result in a rise in pollution levels but Members were assured this would be heavily regulated. He reminded Members that this was an existing problem, with or without any new development and an outline remediation plan was in place.

Councillor Brookes felt that the economic benefits, and potential for employment growth, outweighed the location in the Green Belt and therefore proposed that outline permission be granted as per the recommendations.

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Rhead, who agreed that the region was worth investing as long as sufficient safeguards were in place.

The Chairman, Councillor Illingworth addressed Members and felt that the decision should be made on planning policy and not on economic drivers. He felt strongly that the Green Belt should be defended and, although he was supportive of sustainable development, he did not feel there was a demand for employment land in terms of the Local Plan.

The proposal was put to the vote and tied five votes to five. The Chairman was given the casting vote and the proposal was lost.

Further discussions ensued and Members agreed that further information was needed with regard to the proposed employment figures, the situation regarding the existing tenants at Rock Farm and the developer's proposals for encouraging more employment from Warwick District, not just Coventry.

PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

Members felt they would like to see further evidence of potential occupiers of the proposed units, the travel benefits for Warwick District and the progression made with discussions regarding the Lunt Roman Fort.

It was therefore proposed and duly seconded that the application be deferred for further information to be collated.

RESOLVED that item W12/1143 be DEFERRED so that further information could be provided including the issues set out below and other matters relevant to the decision. Members also requested that a full independent report be undertaken into potential sites, with forecasts of job numbers to be based on the best information available.

- an assessment of the likely number of jobs created at the Gateway for residents of Warwick District;
- further details of the potential future occupiers of the units, and the corresponding employment numbers if possible;
- the travel benefits for Warwick District including cycle and bus routes;
- an update on the progress made with English Heritage with regard to the Lunt Roman Fort;
- provision in the Section 106 agreement to link education providers with future employers;
- further information on the propositions being made to the Beatty family with regard to their future at the farm or elsewhere;
- generally more indication on the benefits for Warwick District, rather than the main focus being on the gains that Coventry City Council are likely to reap; and
- feedback from the Landscape Consultant employed by the Council on the latest scheme proposed.

(The meeting ended at 11:10 pm)