

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM 10th March, 2026

Item

1. ADD 2. The Impact on the Green Belt (paragraph 8 of this section)

It also made clear that villages are not regarded as large built-up areas which also must be considered as part of this assessment. Ash Green and Keresley End are considered as villages and so the sprawl and possible connection of these urban areas cannot be considered when assessing if this site is considered grey belt.

AMEND 2. The Impact on the Green Belt (paragraph 9 of this section)

The point of purpose (b) is to maintain a clear physical separation between neighbouring towns to preserve the distinct identity and character of the individual towns. The PPG states this purpose relates to the merging of towns, not villages. Sites that strongly contribute to purpose (b) are likely to form a substantial part of a gap between towns and its development would likely result in the loss of the visual separation of towns. The site forms a section of the green belt between Keresley End, which is a village connected to Coventry and Ash Green/Neils Green which are villages. Neither of these are large built-up areas or 'towns' and so as a result it will not result in forming or reducing the gap between Nuneaton and Bedworth; Nuneaton and Coventry; or Bedworth and Coventry. Therefore, the site makes no contribution to Green Belt Purpose (b) in preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

AMEND final paragraph of 2. Impact on the Green Belt to -

In drawing all of the above together, it is considered that all of the conditions set out in paragraph 155 are met. As all the conditions have been met, the development is to be regarded as not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Add to section "Inappropriate or not inappropriate development" -

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness (footnote 55).

Footnote 55 - Other than in the case of development on previously developed land or grey belt land, where development is not inappropriate.

Paragraph 153 remains applicable to Green Belt land, but this site has been determined as Grey Belt. However, for completeness, the impact on openness has been considered.

Amend final paragraph of 5. Impact on Highway Safety to -

These will be tested against paragraph 57 of the NPPF which states that all planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. It is considered that all of the recommended conditions are reasonable and relevant and the principle of all the conditions is acceptable, however, the wording will be modified to ensure that the conditions are enforceable and precise enough for a decision notice, should this application be approved.

Amend final paragraph of 6. Flooding and Drainage to -

Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2024), states that all planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other aspects. Having assessed the proposed conditions against this paragraph it is determined that the proposed conditions are aligned with this NPPF paragraph and so will be added to the decision notice should this application be approved.

ADD to 10. Affordable Housing

The Borough Plan Review (2025) does not currently contain a specific policy setting affordable housing requirements for development within or released from the Green Belt.

In these circumstances, national policy within the National Planning Policy Framework applies. NPPF paragraph 67 requires major residential development on land within or released from the Green Belt to provide affordable housing at a higher level than would otherwise apply and to deliver at least 50% affordable housing unless this would render the development unviable. The scheme proposes 100% affordable housing, which significantly exceeds the level required by national policy. Government guidance also confirms that the 50% cap does not prevent higher levels of affordable housing provision where this is proposed by the applicant.

Amend 13. Planning obligations (table) to-

WCC Monitoring Costs - A fee for the monitoring and administration of WCC obligations - £350 + (5 hours x £40 officer time x number of triggers)

AMEND Condition 4 to:

4. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans contained in the following schedule:

Plan Description	Plan Reference	Date Received
Access Plan	CH_SK01_GA	25/09/2025
Existing Site Block Plan (Location Plan)	338_PL-03A	18/06/2025

ADD to the Conditions:

25. No dwelling shall be occupied until the advanced highway warning signage scheme, as detailed in Section 3.6 of the approved Designer's Response (ref: 190925 Rev 0, received by email on 3rd February 2026), has been fully implemented in accordance with the details submitted.

26. No development (including site clearance and demolition) shall commence until a Dust Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The approved plan shall set out measures to control and mitigate dust emissions arising from construction activities on the site. The plan shall include details of:

- a) site preparation and demolition methods;
- b) dust suppression measures, including water suppression and covering of stockpiles;
- c) wheel washing and measures to prevent mud and debris being deposited on the public highway;
- d) monitoring and complaint procedures; and
- e) construction traffic management measures to minimise dust generation.

The approved Dust Management Plan shall be implemented in full for the duration of demolition, site preparation and construction works.