

 <p>Nuneaton & Bedworth United to Achieve</p>	<p>Borough Plan Main Modifications Representation Form</p>	<p>Ref:</p> <p>(For official use only)</p>
---	---	---

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Borough Plan Main Modifications

Please return to Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council by 3rd December 2018 via:

Email: planning.policy@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy Consultation, Town Hall, Coton Road, NUNEATON, CV11 5AA

This form has 2 parts:

Part A – Personal details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

	<p>1. Personal details*</p> <p><small>* If an agent is appointed, only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes in section 1. are required. Agent details should be completed in section 2.</small></p>	<p>2. Agent's details (if applicable)</p>
Title		Mr
First name		Michael
Last name		O'Connell
Job title (where applicable)		Technical Director
Organisation (where applicable)		Wood (formerly Amec Foster Wheeler)
House number		(Redacted)
Street		(Redacted)
Town		(Redacted)
Post code		(Redacted)
Telephone number		(Redacted)
Email address		(Redacted)

3. Which of the following age brackets do you fall within?

Up to 15	
16-19	
20-29	
30-39	
40-49	
50-59	
60-69	
70-79	
80+	

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

4. Name or Organisation	Wood (Representor Ref: 3.0028)
--------------------------------	--------------------------------

5. To which main modification does this representation relate?

MMC reference	MMC11
---------------	-------

6. Do you consider the Borough Plan is:

6.(1) Legally compliant

Yes	X
No	

6.(2) Sound

Yes	X
No	X

Please mark with an 'X' as appropriate

7. Please give details of why you consider the main modifications are not legally compliant or are unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the main modifications, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Sound – MM32

Support. The proposed main modification reflects the development potential of site HSG1 and is consistent with the NPPF, which encourages Local Planning Authorities to avoid unnecessarily constraining delivery of new housing with policies that impose, or appear to impose, a limit on dwelling numbers for a given site unless otherwise justified and not in conflict with other policies in the Plan.

Sound – MM36

Support. The proposed change is consistent with the NPPF.

Sound – MM37

Support. The proposed change removes an unnecessary constraint on the delivery of sustainable development on HSG1.

Sound – MM38 and MM42

Support. Land between the boundary of HSG1 and the A5 is not allocated for development and therefore the proposed change removes an unnecessary requirement on applications coming forward on site HSG1.

Sound – MM40

Support. The proposed change is consistent with the NPPF.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

8. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Borough Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at 7 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this modification will make the Borough Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The following MM are considered to be un-sound as they are 'Not positively prepared'

MM33

The 'HSG1 concept plan' is ill-conceived.

The plan does not represent a concept of proposed development under Policy HSG1 but is simply a plan showing the broad location of proposed schools, together with indicative alignment for the proposed 'Spine Road' and pedestrian and cycle routes. Furthermore without inclusion of any qualification as to what is actually presented on the plan i.e. "indicative alignment" for the Spine Road, walking, cycling routes, the plan implies a level of detail that is simply not supported. As a result it is unreasonable to expect development proposals to come forward "...in accordance with the concept plan".

Following the grant of Outline Planning Permission for development of Higham Lane (Appl Ref 035338) the boundary to HSG1 should be suitably amended.

Please refer to separate representation to MM35.

Recommendation:

Delete proposed inserted text: "~~31. Development will be required to come forward in accordance with the concept plan.~~"

MM34

Following the grant of Outline Planning Permission for development of Higham Lane (Appl Ref 035338) the boundary to HSG1 is not correct and should be suitably amended to include this development.

MM35

As per our response to MM33, in its current form the plan is not considered to represent a suitable "concept" against which development proposals should accord.

Recommendation:

The map should either be deleted or, if retained, it should be renamed as the "North Nuneaton - Spine Road, Pedestrian and Cycle Path Network Map", and in the interest of clarity, it is also recommended that the map includes a notation which states that:

"The routes shown are indicative and their precise alignment will be determined through the planning application process and in consultation with NBBC and WCC Highways"

Reference to the routes being indicative would also achieve consistency with proposed MM40, which refers to the Spine Road (as shown on the concept plan) as being an "indicative route".

MM39

The proposed amendment (MM39) is not consistent with MM32.

Recommendation:

The following additional text is added to make the Plan consistent:

"6.32 The site will deliver ~~3331~~ **at least 4,419** new dwellings in a mix of sizes and tenures."

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support and justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

9.

Signature: (If you are filling in an electronic copy, please just type your name)	Michael O'Connell
Date:	30/11/2018