



Title	Local Plan: Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries
For further information about this report please contact	David Barber Development Policy Manager
Wards of the District directly affected	All
Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006?	No
Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number	4th June 2013
Background Papers	Interpreting the Vision – Council 1/12/11 Local Plan Preferred Option – Council 21/5/12 Local Development Scheme (LDS) – Executive 9/1/13 Revised Development Strategy – Council 24/5/13

Contrary to the policy framework:	No
Contrary to the budgetary framework:	No
Key Decision?	Yes
Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number)	Yes (Ref 506)
Equality & Sustainability Impact Assessment Undertaken	No
The Equality & Sustainability Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the Local Plan itself. It is not considered that this report, which sets out the way forward for the next stages of the Plan will have a significant impact in itself.	

Officer/Councillor Approval		
Officer Approval	Date	Name
Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive		Chris Elliott
Head of Service		Tracy Darke
CMT		
Section 151 Officer		Mike Snow
Monitoring Officer		Andy Jones
Finance		
Portfolio Holder(s)		Cllr Les Caborn

Consultation & Community Engagement	
This report has not yet been subject to wider community engagement or consultation. It will form the basis of public consultation to be undertaken during June and July 2013, although it does set out the framework for further consultation in relation to the preparation of the Local Plan.	
Final Decision?	Yes
Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report sets out preferred options for housing development sites in rural settlements along with associated changes to green belt where these are applicable.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the preferred site options for development in and adjacent to rural settlements, as set out in Appendix 1, are approved for public consultation.
- 2.2 That proposals for village boundary and green belt boundary changes, as set out in Appendix 1, are approved for public consultation.

3. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 **Recommendation 2.1:** At its meeting on 24th May 2013, the Executive approved the Revised Development Strategy (RDS) for consultation. This set out proposals to meet a housing requirement of 12,300 homes between 2011 and 2029, along with proposals to make provision for 22.5 hectares of employment land.
- 3.2 The Revised Development Strategy was subject to a period of consultation running from 14th June to 29th July. A full, detailed summary of the outcomes of this report will feed in to the preparation of the New Local Plan for Warwick District. However, to enable preferred village sites to be selected, representations relating to rural housing and village sites have been analysed ahead of other aspects of the Revised Development Strategy. A summary of this is in Appendix 2.
- 3.3 The preferred options set out in Appendix 1 have therefore been prepared taking in to account the following:
- a) **Level of Growth:** For the purposes of the preferred options for villages, it assumed that the District's overall housing requirement for the period 2011 to 2029 will be 12,300 homes in line with the RDS, based on the latest published evidence. It should be noted that this is subject to a potential change as a result of the work currently being carried out on the Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (JSHMA). However, as the work on the JSHMA is still on-going and the report is not published, the requirement identified for the RDS has been used as the basis for village housing provision. It is recognised that through the consultation, this level of growth is being challenged by some residents, parish councils and amenity groups as being too high and by some developers as being too low. However, unless the evidence suggests otherwise, it remains a reasonable level of growth to plan for.

- b) **The proposals in the Revised Development Strategy:** The Revised Development Strategy set out a hierarchy for rural settlements is based on
- an assessment of the ability of settlements to accommodate growth;
 - an assessment of the size, character and demographics of villages;
 - feedback from Parish Councils (where possible).
- The Strategy proposed a total of 1000 houses to be provided in rural settlements with 5 Primary Service Villages (Bishops Tachbrook; Cubbington; Hampton Magna; Kingswood (Lapworth) and Radford Semele) each allocated 100-150 dwellings and 5 Secondary Service Villages (Barford; Baginton; Burton Green; Hatton Park; and Leek Wootton) each allocated 70-90 houses. These proposals were subject to consultation during the summer of 2013.
- c) **2013 Consultation:** the consultation closed on the 29th July. In the region of 1600-1700 letters, emails and forms have been submitted. Work is now well advanced in summarising and analysing these responses. In particular, efforts have been made to ensure that representations relating to the proposals for villages have been examined. Whilst this work is not complete at the time of writing this report, it will be completed before this report is considered by the Executive. An initial report (in as far as representations relate to villages), has therefore been prepared and is presented in Appendix 2. Should further considerations emerge in the completion of this, this will be reported verbally to the Executive. It is important that relevant matters from the 2013 RDS be considered as part of agreeing the preferred options for village developments. It is also important to note that a comprehensive report of the 2013 public consultation (including villages) will be prepared and taken in to account for the Local Plan Submission Draft.
- d) **Detailed site assessment work:** significant work has been undertaken to assess site options for village development. This detailed site assessment work has considered the following elements:
- green belt impacts
 - landscape,
 - ecology/biodiversity,
 - agricultural land quality
 - access and physical constraints
 - historic environment/archaeology
 - flood risk
 - regeneration and village viability
 - sustainability appraisal
 - infrastructure capacity and requirements
 - Site availability and deliverability

3.4 The proposals set out in appendix 1 make provision for housing across the District's rural settlements, along with associated village boundary and green belt changes. This is broadly in line with the Revised Development Strategy, but has been adjusted to take account of the work described in 3.3 above.

Table 1

Settlement	Settle- ment Category (RDS)	Proposed No. of Dwelling	% increase in settle- ment size	No. of sites	Green Belt changes needed?	Notes
Baginton	Secondary (70-90)	35	9.8%	1	Y	Substantial environmental / landscape restrictions

Barford	Secondary (70-90)	80	13.2%	3	N	Small portfolio of lower impact sites
Bishops Tachbrook	Primary (100-150)	150	20.35%	1	N	South of school village extension - regenerative impact
Burton Green	Secondary (70-90)	75	28.5%	1	Y	One major linkage site with new village hall etc, situated near primary school
Cubbington	Primary (100-150)	75	7.7%	2	Y	Substantial environmental / landscape restrictions
Hampton Magna	Primary (100-150)	100	16.6%	1	Y	Existing SHLAA site - some regenerative potential
Hatton Park	Secondary (70-90)	90	11.3%	1	Y	East of settlement with new access road
Kingswood	Primary (100-150)	62	15.8%	7	Y	Substantial environmental / landscape restrictions
Leek Wootton	Secondary (70-90)	80	18.4%	5	Y	Primarily Police HQ site
Radford Semele	Primary (100-150)	100	12.45%	1	N	
Sub Total		847	15.4%	23		
Other Rural Sites						
Baginton (Finham)	N/A	20		1	Y	Edge of urban site
Hatton Station (Shrewley)	Very Small (0)	25		2	Y	Edge of settlement sites - possible viability concerns
Hill Wootton	Very Small (0)	5		1	Y	Small site within 'village envelope'
Hockley Heath	N/A	20		1	Y	Former Aylesbury Ho. Hotel site
Shrewley Common	Feeder Village (0)	20		2	Y	Two small edge of settlement sites
Total for	Approx. 1000	937				

- 3.5 **Recommendation 2.2:** It is proposed to amend the green belt boundaries in and around villages for two main reasons:
- a) at present (with the exception of Cubbington) all the villages that lie within the green belt are "washed over" by the green belt. This restricts organic growth within the current built up area of settlements
 - b) The Local Plan strategy seeks locate a proportion of the District's housing requirement within the most sustainable villages with a view to providing houses to meet the District's need in a way which supports the provision of facilities and services within rural areas.

- 3.6 Full justification for the exceptional circumstances for making changes to the green belt boundaries is provided within Appendix 1.
- 3.7 It should be noted that Radford Semele, Bishops Tachbrook and Barford lie outside the green. Proposals for development in and around these villages do not require any changes to the green belt boundaries, although village boundaries are being proposed to provide the basis for rural policies in the Local Plan. The built up area of Cubbington also lies outside the green, although the green belt current surrounds this village.
- 3.8 **Infrastructure:** The proposals set out in Appendix 1, will require investment in local and district-wide infrastructure. Local requirements are included within the site justifications provided in appendix 1. However, it should be noted that the cumulative impact of these developments on the transport network, hospital services and secondary schools will need to be managed on a District-wide basis through the Local Plan's Infrastructure Development Plan .

4. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

- 4.1 **Policy Framework** – the Local Plan is a key element within the Council's policy framework. The proposals set out in the appendices of this report will help to shape the Submission Draft Local Plan which in turn will have an overarching impact on the future of Warwick District. The proposals are broadly consistent with the Local Plan policy framework agreed by Council on 1st December 2011.
- 4.2 **Fit for the Future** – these proposals have been designed to ensure the Local Plan supports the delivery of the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The delivery of the Local Plan also remains a key element in Fit for the Future.

5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

- 5.1 The costs associated with the villages sites consultation will be met from within the existing Local Plan budget.
- 5.2 The Community Infrastructure Levy will provide the basis for developer contributions towards the costs of infrastructure. It should be noted however that this source of funding, whilst being sufficient to cover a significant part infrastructure costs associated with new development, cannot be used for any other purpose.
- 5.3 The proposals are also likely to have a wider impact on the Council's finances, although these impacts have not been considered during the preparing of the proposals, they are noted for information below:
- 5.4 New Homes Bonus (NHB) – under the current scheme, the Council will be financially rewarded for each additional dwelling built. The income this would generate will be dependent upon the timing of each dwelling's completion and it's council tax banding assessment. However, there is considerable uncertainty as to the long term future of the NHB scheme and whether any continuance would be funded by further reductions in each local authority's Revenue Support Grant allocation.

- 5.5 Council Tax – New properties will generate more additional council tax revenue. Under the current Revenue Support Grant (RSG) calculations, increased council tax revenue has resulted in decreased RSG. Accordingly, it would be imprudent to assume that the Council will directly benefit from increased council tax revenues in the long term.
- 5.6 Service costs and income – with increased growth, there will undoubtedly be increased demand for all of the Council’s services but also increased income from fees and charges. Some of these increased costs will be reflected within future Revenue Support Grant settlements, as population is a key driver.
6. **ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S) CONSIDERED**
- 6.1 **Recommendation 2.1:** The proposals for the Preferred Options sites set out in appendix 1 have been derived from the consideration of a “long list” of almost 200 potential sites and a detailed assessment of over 50 sites. A significant number of alternative options have therefore been considered and the reasoning for the selection or rejection of alternative sites is summarised in Appendix 1 and is set out in full in the evidence base (see site selection methodology).
- 6.2 **Recommendation 2.2:** An alternative to this would be to continue with the approach of the green belt “washing-over” villages. This option has been rejected for the reasons explained in paragraph 3.5 above.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Proposals for Consultation: Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries

Appendix 2: Report on the outcomes of the Public Consultation 2013 in as far as these relate to rural settlements