Nuneaton & Bedworth

United to Achieve

AGENDA
for
EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

to be held on

Monday, 10th June 2019

Nuneaton & Bedworth
United to Achieve

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
Town Hall, Coton Road, Nuneaton
Warwickshire CV11 5AA

www.nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk
024 7637 6376

Enquiries to:
Vickie Bentley
Direct Dial: 024 7637 6204

Direct Email: victoria.bentley@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk

Date: 30th May 2019

Our Ref: VB

To: All Members of the Borough Council

An EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL will be held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Nuneaton, on **Monday 10th June, 2019**, commencing at **6.00pm**.

In accordance with Procedure Rule Part 4A, Paragraph 4.3.1(v) of the Council's Constitution, the Head of Paid Service is calling an Extraordinary Meeting in order to allow the Council to consider adoption of the Borough Plan at as early an opportunity as possible.

All members of the Council are summoned to attend to determine the business as set out below.

Please note that meetings will be recorded for future broadcast. Please use the microphones provided so that the camera will focus upon members when they are speaking.

A G E N D A

1. EVACUATION PROCEDURE

A fire drill is not expected, so if the alarm sounds please evacuate the building quickly and calmly. Please use the stairs and do not use the lifts. Once out of the building, please gather outside the Yorkshire Bank on the opposite side of the road.

Please exit by the door by which you entered the room or by the fire exits which are clearly indicated by the standard green fire exit signs.

If you need any assistance in evacuating the building, please make yourself known to a member of staff.

Please also make sure all your mobile phones are turned off or set to silent.

2. APOLOGIES - to receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests and other interests in matters under consideration pursuant to Council procedure Rule 4A.2(iii)

Declaring interests at meetings

If there is any item of business to be discussed at the meeting in which you have a disclosable pecuniary interest or non- pecuniary interest (Other Interests), you must declare the interest appropriately at the start of the meeting or as soon as you become aware that you have an interest.

Arrangements have been made for interests that are declared regularly by members to be appended to the agenda **(Page 7)**. Any interest noted in the Schedule at the back of the agenda papers will be deemed to have been declared and will be minuted as such by the Democratic Services Officer. As a general rule, there will, therefore, be no need for those Members to declare those interests as set out in the schedule.

There are, however, TWO EXCEPTIONS to the general rule:

1. When the interest amounts to a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest that is engaged in connection with any item on the agenda and the member feels that the interest is such that they must leave the room. Prior to leaving the room, the member must inform the meeting that they are doing so, to ensure that it is recorded in the minutes.

2. Where a dispensation has been granted to vote and/or speak on an item where there is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, but it is not referred to in the Schedule (where for example, the dispensation was granted by the Monitoring Officer immediately prior to the meeting). The existence and nature of the dispensation needs to be recorded in the minutes and will, therefore, have to be disclosed at an appropriate time to the meeting.

Note: Following the adoption of the new Code of Conduct, Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the relevant item (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary or a Deemed Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, the Member must withdraw from the room.

Where a Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest but has received a dispensation from Audit & Standards Committee, that Member may vote and/or speak on the matter (as the case may be) and must disclose the existence of the dispensation and any restrictions placed on it at the time the interest is declared.

Where a Member has a Deemed Disclosable Interest as defined in the Code of Conduct, the Member may address the meeting as a member of the public as set out in the Code.

Note: Council Procedure Rules require Members with Disclosable Pecuniary Interests to withdraw from the meeting unless a dispensation allows them to remain to vote and/or speak on the business giving rise to the interest.

Where a Member has a Deemed Disclosable Interest, the Council's Code of Conduct permits public speaking on the item, after which the Member is required by Council Procedure Rules to withdraw from the meeting.

4. PUBLIC SPEAKING – pursuant to paragraph 4.3.3 of the Council's Constitution, 20 minutes is to be set aside for members of the public to speak and ask questions in connection with the items on the agenda.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET – 22nd MAY 2019

On 22nd May 2019, Cabinet considered a report and appendices in connection with the Examination in Public into the draft Borough Plan.

The Cabinet report and appendices are attached as Appendix 1 **(Page 11).** A copy of the Borough Plan can be accessed from the Council's website. Any Member can request a hard copy of the Plan (incorporating the Inspector's main modifications and the minor modifications), by contacting Katherine Moreton, Head of Planning, by telephone on 024 7637 6130 or email at katherine.moreton@nuneaotnandbedworth.gov.uk.

Cabinet resolved that it be recommended to Council that:

1. the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan published in January 2017 as amended by:

   (i) the Inspectors final report (Appendix B);
   (ii) the schedule of Main Modifications recommended by the Inspector (Appendix C); and
   (iii) the schedule of minor modifications (Appendix D)

   be adopted;

2. subject to 1. above, as soon as reasonably practicable, the Council:

   (a) make available in accordance with regulation 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) —

   (i) the Borough Plan;
   (ii) an adoption statement;
   (iii) the sustainability appraisal report; and
   (iv) details of where the Borough Plan is available for inspection and the places and times at which the document can be inspected;

   (b) send a copy of the adoption statement to any person who has asked to be notified of the adoption of the local plan; and

(c) send a copy of the adoption statement to the Secretary of State; and

3. delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Development and Health to make further minor modifications to the Plan prior to final publication, where these modifications correct typographical errors, amendments to numbering or cross referencing.

Brent Davis
Executive Director - Operations

NOTE: Points of Order and Personal Explanation can only be raised in accordance with Council Procedure Rules which are set out below: -

13.12 **Point of order**

A Member may raise a point of order at any time. The Mayor will hear them at the end of the speech of the Member speaking at the time the point is raised. A point of order may only relate to an alleged breach of these Council Rules of Procedure or the law. The Member must indicate the rule of law and the way in which he/she considers it has been broken. The Mayor shall consider the Point of Order and, if necessary, take advice on the matter from the Monitoring Officer and, shall then rule on the Point of Order raised. There shall be no discussion or challenge to the advice given or the Mayors decision in the meeting. If a Member persistently seeks to raise a Point of Order but is unable to identify the procedure rule or legal principle infringed then, after having being warned by the Mayor, any further abuse of this procedure rule shall not be tolerated and the Mayor shall move that the Member not be heard further pursuant to Procedure Rule 4.19.13. The ruling of the Mayor on the matter will be final.

13.13 **Personal explanation**

A Member may make a point of personal explanation at any time. The Mayor will hear them at the end of the speech of the Member speaking at the time the point is raised. A personal explanation may only relate to some material part of an earlier speech by the Member which may appear to have been misunderstood in the present debate. The ruling of the Mayor on the admissibility of a personal explanation will be final.

Council - Schedule of Declarations of Interests

	Name of Councillor	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest	Other Personal Interest	Dispensation
	General dispensations granted to all members under s.33 of the Localism Act 2011			Granted to all members of the Council in the areas of: - Housing matters - Statutory sick pay under Part XI of the Social Security Contributions and Benefits Act 1992 - An allowance, payment given to members - An indemnity given to members - Any ceremonial honour given to members - Setting council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992 - Planning and Licensing matters - Allotments - Local Enterprise Partnership
	J. Beaumont		Board member of Bulkington Community Library CIC in addition to an unpaid Manager of the library. Board member of Bulkington Village Centre Member of the Police and Crime Panel	
	K. Brindley-Edwards	Teacher and Head of 6th Form at Beauchamp College		
	D. Brown	Employed by H.M Land Registry		
	S. Croft	Employed at Holland & Barrett Retail Ltd	Deputy Chairman Nuneaton Conservative Association	
	G. Daffern	Cover Supervisor and teacher at Sidney Stringer Academy, Coventry; Teacher at Stoke Park School Coventry	Co-opted Governor at Newdigate Primary School	
	S. Doughty	People in Action Cherville Limited	Unite the Union	
	P. Elliott	Employee of CW Mind ASD Support	Governor at Stockingford Nursery	

		Service Mentor		
	K. Evans	Student at De Montford University; Officer Cadet at Birmingham University Royal Navy Unit.	Officer at the North Warwickshire Conservative Association	
	D. Gissane		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	C. Golby		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	S. Gran		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	J. Gutteridge	Startin Tractors		To speak and vote on any matters involving the Borough Plan related to land at Leyland Road Bulkington
	W.J Hancox	None	Hammersley and Orton	
	L. Hocking	Employed by Openreach	Unite the Union	
	J.A Jackson	Any matter relating to the employment policies and procedures of Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council or any matter relating to the contractual arrangements with Sport & Leisure Management Ltd.		Dispensation to speak and vote on matters that do not relate specifically to her husband's contract of employment.
			Non Executive Director with Nuneaton and Bedworth Community Enterprises Limited	Dispensation to speak and vote
	K.A. Kondakor		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	A. Llewellyn-Nash	Employee of BMI Healthcare		
	I. Lloyd	Employee of Jaguar Land Rover	Non Executive Director with Nuneaton and Bedworth Community Enterprises Limited.	Dispensation to speak and vote
	B.J. Longden		Daughter and son-in-law work in the NHS	
			Member of the Stockingford Community Centre	
			Ex-Officiate of the Veterans Contact Point Board	
	B. Pandher	Manager of the Indian Community	Member of Warwickshire County Council	

		Centre Association, Coventry	Treasurer & Trustee of Nanaksar Gurdwara Gursikh Temple; Coordinator of Council of Sikh Temples in Coventry; Secretary of Coventry Indian Community; Trustee of Sikh Monument Trust Vice Chair Exhall Multicultural Group	
	G.D Pomfrett	None	None	
	N. Phillips	Employee of DWP	Member of: - A5 Sterling Group (Council Representative) - Nuneaton Labour CLP - The Fabian Society - The George Eliot Society - The PCS Union - Nuneaton Credit Union	
	M. Rudkin	Employee of People in Action	Unite the Union	
	A. Sargeant		Member of Warwickshire County Council	
	J. Sargeant	SATCOL Charity Project Manager		To speak and vote on any matters related to the Salvation Army Charity (SATCOL) or related bodies, unless the matter directly affects the contract of employment of the Councillor
	J. Sheppard		Partnership member of the Hill Top and Caldwell Big Local.	
			Director of Wembrook Community Centre.	Dispensation to speak and vote on any matters of Borough Plan that relate to the Directorship of Wembrook Community Centre
			Member of the Management Committee at the Mental Health Drop in.	
	T. Sheppard	Employee of Dairy Crest		

	R. Smith		Director of Volunteer Friends, Bulkington; Board of Directors at Bulkington Village Community and Conference Centre	
	J.A. Tandy		Partnership member of the Hill Top and Caldwell Big Local. Member of Warwickshire Police & Crime Panel.	
	R. Tromans	Director of RTC Ltd		
	H. Walmsley	Chief of Staff to Julian Knight MP Self-employed Public Relations Consultant.	Chartered Institute of Public Relations	
	C.M Watkins	Employee of Hermes	Member of Labour Group	
	K.D Wilson	Employee of the courts service	Non Executive Director with Nuneaton and Bedworth Community Enterprises Limited	Dispensation to speak and vote

APPENDIX 1

Agenda item:

Cabinet

Report Summary Sheet

Date: 22nd May 2019
Subject: Consideration of The Planning Inspector's report on the examination of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan and the adoption of the Local Plan.
Portfolio: Planning and Development (Councillor Neil Phillips)
From: Director of Planning and Public Protection – Ian Powell

Summary: To consider the Report of the Local Plan Inspector
Recommendations: IT BE RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL THAT: 2.1 The Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan published in January 2017 as amended by: The Inspectors final report (Appendix B); The schedule of Main Modifications recommended by the Inspector (Appendix C); and The schedule of minor modifications (Appendix D) be adopted; 2.2 Subject to 2.1 above, as soon as reasonably practicable, Council: (a) make available in accordance with regulation 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) — (i) the local plan;

(ii) an adoption statement;

(iii) the sustainability appraisal report; and

(iv) details of where the local plan is available for inspection and the places and times at which the document can be inspected;

(b) send a copy of the adoption statement to any person who has asked to be notified of the adoption of the local plan; and

(c) send a copy of the adoption statement to the Secretary of State; and

And

2.3 Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development to make further minor modifications to the Plan prior to final publication, where these modifications correct typographical errors, amendments to numbering or cross referencing.

Options: To recommend the Plan to be adopted

Not to recommend the Plan to be adopted

Reasons: To ensure the proper planning of the Borough

Consultation undertaken with Members/Officers/Stakeholders

Report to OSP; Portfolio-holder for Planning & Development; The Director – Planning & Public Protection; The Director – Arts Leisure & Democracy.

Subject to call-in: No

Ward relevance: Whole Borough

Forward plan: Adoption of the Borough Plan is a Key Decision and has been referred to in the Forward Plan for some time. Unfortunately, for the requisite period, the Forward Plan was amended and reference removed until June, in the belief that the Inspector's report would be received later than April. Because of this and the need to have the Plan adopted at the earliest opportunity, the Urgency Procedure, as set out in the Council's Constitution has been utilised. The Chair of the Internal OSP has been consulted and a notice placed on the Council's website and public notice boards.

Corporate Priorities: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 3.1 and 3.2
Relevant statutes or policy: Town and Country Planning Legislation

Equalities Implications: No Direct Implications
Human resources implications: No Direct Implications
Financial implications: No Direct Implications
Health Inequalities Implications: No Direct Implications
Section 17 Crime & Disorder Implications: No Direct Implications
Risk management implications: No Direct Implications
SME (Small/Medium Enterprises) & Local Economy Implications: Set out in detail within the Borough Plan

Environmental implications:	Set out in detail within the Borough Plan

Legal implications:

The adoption of the Borough Plan is a formal requirement of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Contact details:

Katherine Moreton: Tel 024 76376130

E-mail katherine.moreton@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to: **Cabinet - 22nd May 2019**

From: **Director – Planning and Public Protection**

Subject: **Consideration of The Planning Inspector's report on the examination of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan and the adoption of the Local Plan.**

From **Director of Planning and Public Protection – Ian Powell**

Portfolio: **Planning and Development (Councillor Neil Phillips)**

Corporate Aim: 1 and 3

Corporate Priority: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.1 and 3.2

---

1. Purpose of Report

To consider the Inspector's report on the examination of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan and to recommend adoption of the Plan to Council.

2. Recommendations

IT BE RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL THAT:

2.1 The Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan published in January 2017 as amended by:

- The Inspectors final report (Appendix B);
- The schedule of Main Modifications recommended by the Inspector (Appendix C); and
- The schedule of minor modifications (Appendix D)

be adopted.

2.2 Subject to 2.1 above, as soon as reasonably practicable, Council:

(a) make available in accordance with regulation 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) —
(i) the local plan;
(ii) an adoption statement;
(iii) the sustainability appraisal report; and

(iv) details of where the local plan is available for inspection and the places and times at which the document can be inspected;

(b) send a copy of the adoption statement to any person who has asked to be notified of the adoption of the local plan; and

(c) send a copy of the adoption statement to the Secretary of State; and

2.3 Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development to make further minor modifications to the Plan prior to final publication, where these modifications correct typographical errors, amendments to numbering or cross referencing.

3. Background

3.1 This is the final stage of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan. In order to save on printing costs, hard copies of the Plan including modifications have been placed in the members Rooms and are available on request.

3.2 The Published version of the Plan was approved for consultation purposes in January 2017 and responses to this consultation were considered by Cabinet and Council in May 2017 before the Plan and all responses were formally submitted for examination at the beginning of June 2017. Following a series of hearings in August/September 2017, February/March 2018 and February 2019 the Council has now received the Report on the examination of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan from the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

3.3 Once adopted this will supersede the saved polices of previous adopted Local plan 2006.

3.4 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is the legislation which sets out the process for Local plans and states:

"Section 23 Adoption of local development documents …

(2) If the person appointed to carry out the independent examination of a development plan document recommends that it is adopted, the authority may adopt the document—
(a) as it is, or
(b) with modifications that (taken together) do not materially affect the policies set out in it.

(2A) Subsection (3) applies if the person appointed to carry out the independent examination of a development plan document—
(a) recommends non-adoption, and
(b) under section 20(7C) recommends modifications ("the main modifications").

(3) The authority may adopt the document—

(a) with the main modifications, or
(b) with the main modifications and additional modifications if the additional modifications (taken together) do not materially affect the policies that would be set out in the document if it was adopted with the main modifications but no other modifications.

(4) The authority must not adopt a development plan document unless they do so in accordance with subsection (2) or (3).

(5) A document is adopted for the purposes of this section if it is adopted by resolution of the authority."

3.5 The inspector in this case has recommended that the plan is unsound unless adopted with the main modifications as set out in Appendix C. No other changes can be made to the plan which alter its contents (beyond minor changes). Any changes which are significant would prevent the Council being able to adopt the plan by virtue of Section 23(4) above.

3.6 The only alternative option available to the Council would be to recommend withdrawal of the plan pursuant to section 22 of the Act. This is outlined below:

"22 Withdrawal of local development documents

(1) A local planning authority may at any time before a local development document is adopted under section 23 withdraw the document."

4. <u>The Inspector's Report</u>

4.1 The Inspector finds that the Plan is an appropriate basis for the Planning of the Borough subject to Main Modifications being made to it.

4.2 These are the Main modifications which were approved by Cabinet last year and consulted on between September and early December 2018. The only changes made by the Inspector to these are minor word changes for clarity or consistency. (The schedule of Main Modifications is attached as Appendix C).

4.3 The Inspector divides his report into areas, a brief summary of each section is set out below.

4.3.1 **Consultation** – The Inspector is satisfied that the Council undertook a proportionate consultation effort which went beyond the legal requirement.

4.3.2 **Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations** – The Inspector is satisfied that the Sustainability Assessment has been adequate and that a Habitats Assessment was rightly not required.

4.3.3 **Duty to Cooperate** – where necessary the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in the preparation of the Plan and that the legal Duty to Cooperate has been met.

4.3.4 **Soundness** – The Inspector suggests there are 11 main issues to his assessment of soundness.

1. Strategic Objectives - where the main change to this section is the introduction of a new policy for an early Plan review

.

2. Spatial Strategy including the approach to Green Belt: Changes have been made to the description of areas to include “Northern Fringe of Coventry” as part of the Spatial Strategy; and the inspector confirms that the need for houses and jobs outweighs the retention of the Green Belt in the areas where allocations have been made;

3. Housing Need – The Inspector says this is based on the reasoned judgement of the evidence and is sound.

4. Compliance with National Policy: The Inspector confirms that the Spatial Strategy and the Green Belt alterations are justified by exceptional circumstances and comply with National Government Policy. There are main modifications identified but, subject to these being accepted, the housing allocations are soundly based;

5. Whether the Plan will support and maintain a deliverable supply of housing: The Inspector concludes that there is a reasonable prospect of five years’ worth of deliverable housing land upon adoption of the Plan which will also provide robust provision of developable housing land for the medium to long term;

6. Does the Plan support a strong competitive economy; and are the Green Belt alterations for employment justified by exceptional circumstances: The Inspector identifies a number of main modifications, but subject to adoption of these, the Plan supports the Local Economy and the proposed sites will deliver the desired outcomes and is justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with National Government Policy and is sound

7. Natural Environment including Air Quality and Flood Risk: The Inspector has recommended some main modifications and, subject to these, the Plan is consistent with National Government Policy and the local evidence base in the approach to preserving and enhancing the natural environment, including air quality and flood risk;

8. Appropriate Provision of Retail, leisure, tourism and related uses including hierarchy of retail centres – There are some Main Modifications identified but subject to these the Plan is consistent with national policies on ensuring the vitality of town centres.

9. Policies for housing, communities and the built environment – There are some Main Modifications and subject to these the development management policies for housing, communities and the built environment would be sound.

10. Whether adequate provision for infrastructure supporting growth is given and is the plan viable and deliverable: The Inspector has recommended some main modifications but, subject to these, the individual policies for the

strategic sites taken together with the generic policies relating to infrastructure and transport make the Plan viable and deliverable; and

11. Whether there is an adequate framework for monitoring and implementation: The Inspector notes that some of the targets need to be updated factually to be in line with other main modifications. Subject to this, there would be appropriate monitoring arrangements in place to monitor Plan effectiveness and delivery.

4.3.5 **Legal Compliance** – The Borough Plan complies with all relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations.

4.3.6 **Conclusion and Recommendation** – With the Main Modifications suggested the Plan would satisfy the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Planning Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Early Review of the Local Plan

5.1 Members may be aware that the Government has recently issued the Standard Methodology for assessing housing need which together with the Housing Delivery test may mean a change to the objectively assessed need for the Borough.

5.2 The Council has agreed with the Inspector through the Main Modifications process that a review policy was required to be included in the Plan.

5.3 At the time that the Government published its standard method, transitional arrangements were also put in place to address those plans already at the examination stage. As the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Local Plan had been published in January 2017 and subject to a Public Consultation before examination in June 2017, the transitional arrangements set out in paragraph 214 of the National Planning and Policy Framework (2018) applied. This states: "The policies in the previous framework will apply for the purposes of examining plans, where those plans are submitted on or before 24th January 2019."

5.4 This is reiterated by the Inspector in paragraph 2 of his report.

5.5 After adoption of the Plan the first stage of any review would be to set out the timetable of the review within the Local Development Scheme. This is required under section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). The Local Development Scheme must be made available publicly and kept up-to-date as it is important that local communities and interested parties can keep track of progress. The Local Development Scheme would need to be reported to and agreed by Cabinet once the legal challenge period to the Plan (6 weeks after the decision to adopt) is over. A revised Local Development Scheme could be reported to Cabinet as early as September .

6. Appendices

- A - Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan as amended by the Main Modifications and other modifications (available as hard copies in members' room and by request. Copies will also be available at the meeting
- B - The Inspectors final report
- C - Schedule of Main Modifications
- D - Schedule of Minor Modifications

7. Background Papers (if none, state none) Evidence Base and Local Plan papers

https://www.nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk/info/21014/borough_plan_information/389/borough_plan_examination/3

The Planning Inspectorate

Report to Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 09 April 2019

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

(as amended)

Section 20

Report on the Examination of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan

The Plan was submitted for examination on 6 June 2017

The examination hearings were held 30 August 2017 - 1 September 2017, 20 February 2018 - 22 March 2018 and 19 February 2019.

File Ref: PINS/W3710/429/2

Abbreviations used in this report

AQAP	Air Quality Action Plan
AQC	Air Quality Consultants
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
CWSEP	Coventry & Warwickshire Strategic Economic Plan
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DPD	Development Plan Document
DtC	Duty to Co-operate
EDS	Economic Development Strategy
EGA	Ecology and Geodiversity Assessment 2016
ELMOU	Employment Land Memorandum of Understanding
GTAA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment
GTSAP	Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan
HMA	Housing Market Area
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LEP	Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
MM	Main Modification
NBBC	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
NBBP	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
OAN	Objectively Assessed Need
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SNPP	Sub-National Population Projections
SOCG	Statement of Common Ground
TCAAP	Town Centres Area Action Plan
UAoHN	Updated Assessment of Housing Need
WCC	Warwickshire County Council
WCML	West Coast Main Line
WMS	Written Ministerial Statement

In addition to the abbreviations presented above, this report includes examination library document references, for example [D7] or [NBBC/72].

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Borough, provided main modifications (MMs) are made to it. The Borough Council has specifically requested me to recommend any MMs necessary to enable the Plan to be adopted.

All the MMs were proposed by the Council and were subject to public consultation over a twelve-week period in late 2018. In some cases, I have amended the detailed wording where necessary. I have recommended their inclusion in the Plan after considering all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The Main Modifications can be summarised as follows:

- To increase the overall levels of development to at least 14,060 homes and some 107 hectares (ha) of employment land to meet the Borough's needs as well as identified unmet needs from neighbouring Coventry.
- To amend the housing trajectory so that it meets the Borough's objectively assessed need for the period 2011-2018 and then steps up from that point to meet Coventry's established unmet need. In addition to the stepped trajectory to clarify that the shortfall accrued prior to 2018 will be recovered over the plan period (the Liverpool method) to secure realistic and sustainable rates of delivery.
- To allocate an additional housing site at the former Hawkesbury Golf Course (Proposed Site HSG12) via an alteration to the Green Belt boundary.
- To allocate an additional employment site as an extension to Prologis Park at Keresley (Proposed Site EMP3) via an alteration to the Green Belt boundary.
- To include additional policies on ensuring housing delivery and Plan Review.
- The inclusion of concept plans and the requirement for masterplans for some larger strategic allocations including revised access arrangements for Arbury (HSG2) and Bedworth Woodlands (HSG4).
- Various modifications to individual development management and site-specific policies.
- A new policy on healthy food environments, focusing on hot food takeaways.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan (NBBP) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate. It then considers whether the Plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (paragraph 182) makes it clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in July 2018 and updated in February 2019. It includes a transitional arrangement in paragraph 214 which indicates that plans submitted on or before 24 January 2019, such as the NBBP, are to be examined against the provisions of the 2012 NPPF. Similarly, where the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) has been updated to reflect the revised NPPF, the previous versions of the PPG apply for the purposes of this examination under the transitional arrangement. Therefore, unless stated otherwise, references in this report are to the 2012 NPPF and the versions of the PPG which were extant prior to July 2018.

3. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local planning authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The publication version of the NBBP submitted in June 2017 is the basis for my examination. It is the same document as was published for consultation in January 2017.

Main Modifications

4. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should recommend any main modifications (MMs) necessary to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound and thus incapable of being adopted. My report explains why the recommended MMs, all of which relate to matters that were discussed at the examination hearings, are necessary. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report in the form **MM1, MM2, MM3** etc, and are set out in full in the Appendix.

5. Following the main examination hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and updated the sustainability appraisal. The MM schedule was subject to public consultation for twelve weeks in late 2018 and further hearings were held in February 2019 on various MMs. I have taken account of the consultation responses as well as submissions at the hearings in coming to my conclusions in this report. I have made some amendments to the detailed wording of MMs where these are necessary for consistency or clarity. None of my minor amendments to the wording of MMs significantly alters the content of the modifications as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and sustainability appraisal that has been undertaken. Where necessary I have highlighted these amendments in the report.

6. A small number of proposed main modifications, on further reflection, would not materially affect the interpretation or implementation of policies in the Plan and therefore it would not be necessary for me to recommend for soundness. These proposed modifications are: MM5, MM31, MM39, MM94, MM105, MM106, MM118, MM121 and MM169. In my view, these proposed

changes can be reasonably categorized as additional modifications to the Plan and therefore it would be a matter for the Council as to whether it wishes to make these changes to the Plan.

7. In light of the updated highways evidence and associated land take at Bedworth Woodlands (HSG4) submitted after consultation on the proposed main modifications I am not able to recommend MM60 and the capacity of the site should remain as submitted at circa 689 dwellings. Additionally, having regard to the comments made on the capacity of Golf Drive (HSG9) in the main modifications consultation I cannot recommend MM84 and as such the capacity of the site should remain at circa 621 dwellings as submitted.

Policies Map

8. The Council must maintain an adopted policies map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a local plan for examination, the Council is required to provide a submission policies map showing the changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted local plan. In this case, the submission policies map comprises the Publication – Proposals Map 2017 [D2.1].

9. The policies map is not defined in statute as a development plan document and so I do not have the power to recommend main modifications to it. However, some of the published MMs to the Plan's policies, including the addition of allocated sites, require further corresponding changes to be made to the policies map. These further changes were published for consultation alongside the MMs as an appendix document and clearly cross-referenced in the main schedule of MMs. In this report I identify any amendments that are needed to those further changes in the light of the consultation responses.

10. When the Plan is adopted, to comply with the legislation and give effect to the Plan's policies, the Council will need to update the adopted policies map to include all the changes proposed in Publication Proposals Map 2017 and the further changes published alongside the MMs.

Consultation

11. The pre-submission consultation was held over a 6-week period between 31 January and 13 March 2017. Notwithstanding that community representatives organised their own consultation events in early 2017, I nonetheless consider that the Council's consultations have met the legal requirements as set out in the Regulations[1] and the local standards set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement 2015 (SCI). Various means of commenting on the 2017 publication version of the Plan were provided as required (as summarised in the Table on pages 8-10 of the Council's Regulation 22c Consultation Statement [D8.1]). Whilst not every affected community received a specific public event or meeting in early 2017, I am satisfied that the Council undertook a proportionate consultation effort which went beyond the minimum legal requirement.

[1] Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

12. In terms of the effectiveness of the consultation, there is no substantive evidence that notable numbers of people have been prevented from commenting on the published Plan in early 2017. Nearly 4,000 duly-made representations were received on the published Plan, which is a significant number. The vast majority of these representations (3,200) used template forms prepared and circulated by community representatives which the Council processed as individually made representations. Those with an interest in the Plan were given appropriate opportunity to submit representations and participate in the hearings.

13. With regards to the proposed apportionment of Coventry's unmet housing need through the Coventry and Warwickshire Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 2015 there is nothing in this approach which indicates that the need for public participation in decision-making on matters of environmental governance has been disregarded. The citizens of Coventry and Warwickshire, including within Nuneaton and Bedworth, have had the opportunity to participate through relevant Local Plan consultations and examinations[2] on the household projections and associated evidence including the sub-regional MOUs on housing and employment. Coventry's housing need and unmet requirement was found sound in October 2017 having regard to the MOU. The proposed MMs to meet the full apportionment of unmet housing and employment needs from Coventry have been subject to sustainability appraisal (SA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) which accompanied the consultation on the proposed MMs.

Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations

14. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been carried out at each stage of plan preparation. Issues of coverage and consistency have been addressed during examination and considerable updates to the SA report produced in January 2018 and in September 2018. In terms of the timing of the outputs, SA is an iterative process that has informed the contents of the Plan. Some representors have argued that not all reasonable alternatives have been subject to SA. However, the Council can exercise its discretion in deciding what the reasonable alternatives may be. I am satisfied that the Council has exercised this discretion in a reasonable way. Overall, I find the SA has been adequate in terms of its purpose and generally accords with Paragraph 152 of the NPPF and the content in Section 11 of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

15. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report – November 2016 [D3] sets out why an Appropriate Assessment is not necessary and Natural England supports this. An update of the HRA to accompany the MM consultation has taken account of the judgement by the Court of Justice of the European Union in the case of *People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v. Coillte Teoranta* and reaffirmed that the conclusions of the 2016 HRA remain valid.

16. A number of proposed housing and employment allocations in Nuneaton would be close to the Ensor's Pool Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a small body of water designated as a 'refuge' site for a population of Annex II species white-clawed crayfish (the qualifying feature). Recent trapping and dive

[2] Stratford (September 2014-June 2016), Warwick (January 2015-July 2017), Coventry (April 2016 – October 2017), Nuneaton (June 2017 onwards) and Rugby (July 2017 onwards)

surveys undertaken on behalf of Natural England have revealed that the population of crayfish no longer exists, likely to be the result of biosecurity issues (crayfish plague). Natural England have therefore confirmed (February 2016) that a conclusion of no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC can be made at the NBBP level. That does not remove the future scope for project level HRA and Policy NE3 would apply in that scenario.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

17. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the Plan's preparation.

18. In dealing with the Duty to Co-operate (DtC) there is a careful distinction to be made between the legal aspect of the Duty and separate, but often inter-related, aspects of plan soundness. Other cases of failures to meet the DtC were submitted to the examination including the high court judgment in St Albans[3] which helpfully sets out the legal framework. It is important to have in mind that it is a duty to co-operate, not necessarily a duty to agree.

19. The Council has provided a record of its engagement with neighbouring Councils and relevant statutory authorities through a DtC Statement [OTH/1]. Extensive supplementary evidence[4] has been provided during the examination demonstrating the Council has been an active participant of various strategic groups and bodies relevant to plan preparation. This evidence shows clear engagement and cooperation during the preparation of the Plan including on strategic cross-boundary matters such as infrastructure, the local economy, a jointly commissioned Green Belt Review Study and a jointly prepared Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) methodology. Accordingly, on most strategic issues there is confirmation of coherent cross-boundary activity and outcomes, including with neighbouring authorities in Leicestershire.

20. The principal duty to co-operate issues relate to unmet housing and employment needs arising from Coventry, an adjacent authority within the same wider Housing Market Area (HMA) and functional economic area. Importantly, the Council is a signatory of the Coventry and Warwickshire employment land MOU (ELMOU) agreeing to meet an apportionment of Coventry's unmet need. This demonstrates that there has not been an in-principle resistance by the Council to the re-distribution of unmet needs.

21. On the disputed ability to accommodate unmet housing need, the Council has accepted that the Borough is part of a wider Coventry and Warwickshire HMA. To this end, the Council has been a cooperative partner in commissioning and accepting joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) outputs since 2013 (as evidenced through NBBC/12). Importantly, the Council has consistently sought, as a minimum, to meet its own full housing need as identified through this joint working.

22. To sustainably distribute Coventry's un-met need the HMA authorities conceived a MOU which was finalised in Autumn 2015. Plan examinations elsewhere in the HMA have found the MOU an effective mechanism for this

[3] R. (OAO St Albans City and District Council) v. SSCLG and others ([2017] EWHC 1751)
[4] Documents NBBC/04, 08. 09, 11 and 12

strategic cross-boundary matter and so do I. Whilst at the time of submitting the NBBP, all HMA authorities had signed the MOU, except Nuneaton & Bedworth, the Council has not disputed the mechanism of the MOU, which provides further distinction from other cases where the legal DtC has failed.

23. In not signing the MOU prior to submission the Council cited supply capacity issues in its ability to meet 4,020 homes from Coventry. This represents a very significant 40% uplift on the Borough's own objectively assessed need and given the small area of the Borough and extent of Green Belt, the Council's cautiousness has not been unreasonable.

24. I recognise that the other HMA authorities were, prior to submission, stern in their criticism of the Council's approach in not meeting the full share of Coventry's unmet needs, including legal DtC objections. This is not determinative given the evidence that the Council has been a cooperative partner, at no point disputing the HMA wide need and accepting the principle that it should accommodate a share of Coventry's unmet need (as evidenced in statements to Warwick and Coventry Plan examinations). The scale of Coventry's unmet need was only found sound after NBBP submission with the publication of the Coventry Inspector's Report in October 2017. More broadly the MOU underplays Nuneaton's cooperative outlook in that declining demographic need in the Borough between the 2012 and 2014 projections has, in effect, been offset by accommodating more of Coventry's unmet need to keep individual Borough apportionments the same[5]. The Council has been co-operative in the redistribution of unmet needs across the wider HMA.

25. Between the intended submission version of the Plan in 2015 and the final publication version of the Plan in early 2017 the Council identified it had capacity to accommodate 2,330 homes of the 4,020 unmet need. This is an appreciable proportion. Additionally, the Council's unambiguous position[6] has been that if it could evidence additional housing land capacity it would seek to meet the full unmet need. The Council has not been an uncooperative authority.

26. Since submission of the NBBP the other HMA authorities have withdrawn their legal DtC objection. Again, this is not determinative, but it is a material consideration. In arriving at this position, the other HMA authorities consider the Council has made efforts to engage on finding a constructive outcome on housing supply capacity. Timing is critical, and I am mindful that such engagement must have occurred prior to submission. The evidence is that the Council has proactively held dialogue with its neighbours before this Plan was submitted, expressing an optimistic attitude that matters of supply capacity could be resolved based on updated monitoring outputs for the 2016/17 period. There is no dispute that the various key meetings took place in Spring 2017, prior to submission, as presented in the records provided [summarised in OTH/01 and NBBC/12].

27. To some extent, with more time, it may well be that the supply capacity position would have been clarified and settled prior to submission. Whilst it is clearly the case that some of the outcomes which one would expect of the DtC

[5] NBBC's need decreased from 10,040 to 9,400 on the 2014 projections, whereas Coventry's increased from 42,400 to 47,230.
[6] NBBC/06, NBBC/07, NBBC/24 and OTH/01

have only become formalised once the Plan was in examination I am under no doubt, however, that this scenario stems from engagement that occurred pre-submission. In January 2018 the Council signed the housing distribution MOU [NBBC/37]. The timing of this does not represent a belated compliance with the DtC, it is the outcome of ongoing dialogue and work stretching back over the past couple of years.

28. I was invited to draw parallels to the recent St Albans case but for the reasons set out above I find the circumstances in Nuneaton and Bedworth to be materially different. Accordingly, I arrive at a positive conclusion that where necessary the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of the Plan and that the legal DtC has been met.

Assessment of Soundness

Background

29. The Examination hearing sessions were held in two stages. The first stage in August 2017 looked at the legal DtC, other procedural matters, housing need and, in broad terms, housing supply capacity. A report summarising my findings was provided to the Council on the 19 September 2017. At that stage I identified some notable shortcomings in the submitted NBBP on housing provision, the site selection process and the housing trajectory. Accordingly, additional work was required to ensure a robust supply of deliverable and developable sites could be identified to meet the full objectively assessed need. A second stage of hearings in February and March 2018 considered all proposed sites and policies and the updated evidence. A third stage of hearings was held in February 2019 to consider the responses to the proposed main modifications, particularly in relation to the proposed additional housing allocation at the former Hawkesbury golf course and the proposed access arrangements for the Bedworth Woodlands housing allocation.

Main Issues

30. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings I have identified 11 main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends. Under these headings my report deals with the main issues of soundness rather than responding to every point raised by representors.

Issue 1 – Are the Strategic Objectives for the Borough effective and justified and is the proposed Plan period justified and consistent with national policy in terms of an appropriate time scale?

Strategic Objectives

31. The strategic objectives of the Plan are comprehensive and reflect the key issues for the Borough as evidenced through the comprehensive sustainability appraisal reports and the core evidence base. There are some Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in the Borough which are designated for their geological or geomorphological features as well as other local sites of geological interest. The relevant strategic objectives should be amended to include a reference to geodiversity and I recommend **MM2** and **MM4** for effectiveness and consistency with national policy.

Plan Period

32. The submitted plan period of 2011-2031 is consistent with other Local Plans in the Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Market Area and key elements of the joint evidence base. There are still some 12 years of the plan period left. The NPPF at paragraph 157 advises that Plans should be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon. Paragraph 157 does not stipulate the time horizon is to be regarded as post adoption only. The remaining plan period still represents a considerable period against which to deliver various requirements which have been objectively assessed against forecast needs to 2031. There is no need to extend the plan period.

33. In any event, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are now required by law to review whether there is a need to update strategic policies in the Plan on a five-yearly basis. Bearing in mind the 2019 NPPF, the latest methodology to establish local housing need and the requirement to ensure a deliverable supply of housing land, these factors come together to justify the Council committing to a "comprehensive review" of the Plan before 31 March 2023. This is a shorter period than the legislated 5 years, but I consider it necessary for soundness so that a review can be aligned quickly to updated assessments of needs across the wider housing market area, any further Green Belt assessment and the ongoing monitoring of housing delivery. I therefore recommend a new policy for an earlier Plan Review through **MM30** as being necessary for effectiveness.

Conclusion on Issue 1

34. Subject to the modifications identified the strategic objectives and plan period are justified and consistent with national policy.

Issue 2 – Is the spatial strategy, including the over-arching approach to Green Belt, sound?

35. The Plan at Policy DS2 sets out the settlement hierarchy and the roles of the Borough's settlements in contributing to the overall strategy for managing development in the Borough over the plan period. As submitted the strategy for housing, employment and service provision assigns a primary role to Nuneaton as the focus for most development, a supporting role to Bedworth and Bulkington and a local role to Keresley and Ash Green/Neal's Green.

The role of Nuneaton and whether the extent of non-Green Belt land to the north of the town supports an alternative spatial strategy

36. Given the scale of Nuneaton including its town centre, key services such as the George Eliot Hospital and higher education and its role as a transport hub for bus and rail services, the approach to Nuneaton in Policy DS2 is justified. This is explained in detail in the submitted Accessibility and Settlement Hierarchy Study 2011 [L1] and 2013 Locality Hierarchy Study [L3]. Nuneaton provides good opportunities for improved containment between homes and jobs and where residents have considerable scope to travel other than the private car.

37. In terms of accommodating growth, the town already hosts most of the consented supply of housing and employment land. There is nothing in the submitted Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) or from key stakeholders that

there are insurmountable infrastructure constraints to support additional sustainable growth.

38. In terms of environmental capacity, there are flood risk issues arising from the River Anker and Wem Brook but sequentially there are significant areas of land at the lowest level of risk. The town and its immediate hinterland contain very few designated sites. The Grade I Listed Arbury Hall and its separately listed registered parkland grounds to the west of Nuneaton do not present a significant bearing on the town's ability, in principle, to accommodate appreciable levels of growth. This is soundly evidenced through the comprehensive Borough Plan Heritage Assessment 2016 [J7.1-7.4].

39. The significant issue for future growth in Nuneaton is the fact that land north of Nuneaton comprises the principal undeveloped area of the Borough that is not Green Belt. Unsurprisingly it has been a consistent area of focus and to some extent provides a logical direction of growth during the plan period. Whilst it can accommodate an appreciable proportion of the Borough's growth to 2031, there are sound reasons why the Plan should not allocate further development in this direction.

40. On submission, the Plan allocated 3,331 homes on land north of Nuneaton. Through subsequent consents to 1 April 2018 this number has increased to 4,419 homes. Broadly, this one location already accounts for nearly a third of the housing requirement. The land identified in the Plan is well-related to existing housing and forms the next logical extension to the town at this location as evidenced through the SHLAA and SA. Accordingly, additional peripheral areas of land would be further removed from existing jobs and services in Nuneaton and planned facilities yet to be built north of Nuneaton including the link road and additional schools. Additional peripheral development at this location would result in a disjointed and unsustainable pattern of development.

41. There also needs to be realism about what can be delivered in one sizeable direction of growth. Whilst past build out rates are to be treated with caution, expanding north of Nuneaton yet even further would result in a scale of development well beyond what the market has previously sustained, even in buoyant years. As submitted the allocation north of Nuneaton is already dependent on a significant number of outlets sustaining near maximum delivery rates. Additionally, there would be infrastructure trigger points and a need for a sustainable sequencing of development. Releasing additional non-Green Belt land to the north of the town, beyond that already identified, would not be a reasonable alternative to significantly boost delivery than what is proposed in the submitted plan.

42. Moreover, extending further into the area of non-Green Belt land to the north of Nuneaton would result in peripheral growth some distance from the town centre, the larger employment sites to the south of the town, the hospital and from good transport links to Coventry. The latter is significant given a key element of the housing requirement is meeting the City's unmet needs. The result would be a 'top-heavy' spatial strategy well beyond reasonable cycling distances and direct public transport linkages to Coventry. It would not be a sustainable pattern of development or the most appropriate strategy.

43. Additionally, further growth north and east of Nuneaton would create potential for Nuneaton and Hinckley to coalesce with the risk of a loss of identity and erosion of some of the remaining openness and landscape setting between the two towns. Whilst I accept development already extends along the A47 Hinckley Road/the Long Shoot there is in places a lack of consolidation which provides a reasonable degree of separation.

44. I have taken account of the evidence on the development potential on sites within the built-up area, regeneration initiatives and the amount of undeveloped and vacant employment land. The Council has undertaken solid assessments of land supply, applying reasonable judgements, including through the employment land review and SHLAA. Realistic estimates of urban capacity have been accounted for and employment land with no reasonable prospect of delivery reassigned for alternative uses (including housing). The forthcoming Town Centres Area Action Plan (TCAAP) is better placed to determine town centre potential including for residential.

45. Accordingly, none of these factors avoid the need to consider altering the Green Belt boundary at the southern edge of Nuneaton if the town is to sustainably fulfil its role in the settlement hierarchy.

46. In particular, for Nuneaton to fully perform as the main location to support growth of the local economy and to tackle job quality and pay, then land options to the south of the town would be required. This would reflect that most of the sustainably located non-Green Belt land to the north is already committed for housing together with the evidence in the Local Enterprise Partnership's Strategic Economic Plan and the Council's Economic Development Strategy of strongest demand for additional land being well-related to the M6. In Nuneaton's case this would need to involve land on the southern side of the town close to the A444, consolidating recent employment growth at Bermuda Park. This area is accessible by the new rail station and programmed for further connectivity enhancements through improvements to the A444 and the Bermuda Connection project [OTH/59].

47. The Green Belt to the south of Nuneaton largely comprises open countryside albeit with elements of quarrying and strands of linear development. The Green Belt separates Nuneaton from Bedworth and Bulkington, it also serves as a break between the Attleborough and Whitestone parts of Nuneaton and Hinckley and Bramcote. The Joint Green Belt Study 2015 generally presents a mixed assessment of the performance of Green Belt to the south of Nuneaton against the five purposes in the NPPF.

48. From the evidence before me, including my observations, the principal purposes of Green Belt here are to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another (mainly Nuneaton and Bedworth), check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. That said, the urban edge of Nuneaton already has a marked influence on many fringe parcels of Green Belt, including the immediately adjoining countryside character. Carefully located development would not result in neighbouring towns merging and only have a moderate effect on the two other principal purposes of Green Belt. Overall, Green Belt does not preclude the consideration of alterations to boundaries, particularly for well-contained parcels of land at the existing urban edge south of Nuneaton.

49. Consequently, in strategic terms, exceptional circumstances do exist to alter the Green Belt at Nuneaton as part of the most appropriate strategy for the Plan to secure the most sustainable pattern of development.

50. In bringing this altogether, Policy DS2 is justified in identifying Nuneaton at the top tier in the settlement hierarchy and assigning it a primary role in meeting development needs. Reasonable choices have been made in considering the capacity of non-Green Belt options in and around Nuneaton, but this does not remove the need to consider Green Belt locations to the south of Nuneaton if development needs are to be met sustainably.

Role and Scale of development in Bedworth

51. The second largest settlement in the Borough is the town of Bedworth. The town benefits from direct rail links to both Coventry and Nuneaton, is within reasonable cycling distance from large parts of north Coventry, provides significant employment and in addition to the town centre, accommodates a good level of service provision including, amongst other things, education, health and leisure. It is a sustainable location for additional housing and employment growth.

52. On submission the Plan at Policy DS2 described Bedworth as having a supporting role within the settlement hierarchy. Similar phrasing applied to the nearby large village of Bulkington. Given Bedworth's evidenced capacity to support growth, including additional employment development close to the M6, and the scale of housing allocation proposed in the Plan for the town, it is necessary for a distinction to be made between Bedworth and Bulkington for the Plan to be effective and justified. **MM6** and **MM7** would clarify that Bedworth is the second-tier settlement in the hierarchy with a commensurate level of employment, housing and service provision and I recommend them accordingly.

53. In terms of fulfilling its spatial role, particularly as an employment base close to the M6, it is important to note that the town is virtually encircled by Green Belt including by very narrow margins between its southern edge at Exhall and the M6 and northern fringe of Coventry at Longford. The only edge of Bedworth which is not Green Belt is at Bedworth Woodlands to the north-west of the town. Part of this area forms a proposal in the submitted Plan. Consequently, at a strategic level there would be insufficient non-Green Belt capacity for Bedworth to accommodate a scale of development that appropriately reflected its ability to sustainably accommodate identified development needs.

54. The Green Belt around Bedworth largely comprises open countryside with scattered peripheral development and former industrial activities (such as mining). The M6 and proximate edge of Coventry are significant urbanising influences on Green Belt parcels to the south of the town. The Joint Green Belt Study 2015 generally presents a mixed assessment of the performance of Green Belt around Bedworth against the five purposes in the NPPF.

55. From the evidence before me, including my observations, the principal purposes of Green Belt here are to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. As with Nuneaton above, many parcels of Green Belt at the

edge of Bedworth are strongly related to existing urban development and have a limited relationship to a wider countryside character. Carefully located development would not result in Bedworth merging with Nuneaton, Bulkington and parts of Ash Green and Keresley. Overall, Green Belt does not preclude the consideration of alterations to boundaries, particularly for well-contained parcels of land at the existing urban edge south of Nuneaton.

56. Therefore, in principle, at a strategic level there are exceptional circumstances for considering altering the Green Belt around Bedworth. Given the proximity of Coventry and the City's unmet needs being a key component of the scale of development planned for, it is appropriate that options to the south of Bedworth should be the focus. The Joint Green Belt Study presents mixed findings in relation to the function and character of Green Belt parcels around Bedworth such that at a strategic level the performance of the Green Belt is not a moratorium on additional growth.

Role and Scale of Development in Bulkington

57. Bulkington is a large village with a population of just over 6,000 (2011 Census) and like the rest of the Borough it is within the Coventry Travel to Work Area. It has a reasonable range of facilities, including primary education, doctors, shops for day-to-day needs, pubs and hot food outlets and a well-used community centre. Whilst it does not have significant employment opportunities and does not have a rail station, jobs and rail services in Bedworth are within a reasonable cycling distance and the village has regular and direct daily buses to Coventry, Bedworth and Nuneaton. At a strategic level Bulkington is a sustainable location in the Borough.

58. The village is surrounded by Green Belt, the principal purposes of which are to prevent merging with the neighbouring towns of Bedworth and Nuneaton, check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. To some extent the West Coast Main Line (WCML) to the west of the village would serve as a strong existing feature that would contain additional development close to the existing settlement without sprawling into the countryside or resulting in coalescence with Bedworth. Elsewhere, more careful site selection is required but given the relatively modest scale of development for Bulkington it would only have a moderate effect on the three principal purposes of Green Belt applicable. Again, the Joint Green Belt Study's assessment of the performance of Green Belt does not preclude consideration of Bulkington as a location for some additional development.

59. The Green Belt around Bulkington largely comprises open countryside with scattered peripheral development and former industrial activities (such as mining). The M6 and proximate edge of Coventry are significant urbanising influences on Green Belt parcels to the south of the town. The Joint Green Belt Study 2015 generally presents a mixed assessment of the performance of Green Belt around Bedworth against the five purposes in the NPPF.

60. As set out above, it would not be justified to present Bulkington as being on a par with Bedworth. It would be justified to assign Bulkington a tertiary role in the hierarchy for a scale of development that would support its role as a sustainable, larger village. This would be encompassed within **MM6** and **MM7** and I recommend them accordingly.

Role and Scale of Development on the 'Northern Fringe' of Coventry

61. Ash Green, Neal's Green and parts of Keresley are situated very close to the urban edge of the northern fringe of Coventry. I recognise that the narrow green wedges of open countryside to the south of the M6 which separate these communities from Bedworth, the M6 and parts of Coventry are important to local communities. Nonetheless, the proximity of urban Coventry and the M6 are palpable. These are not detached, isolated settlements. The submitted plan appropriately responds to this and allocates an appreciable area of land at Pickards Way (EMP2) for primarily employment purposes. Other non-strategic sites are proposed for additional housing. During the examination, the Council also proposed to reinstate the employment land extension at Prologis Park in this part of the Borough.

62. As submitted, I do not consider that the submitted Plan adequately reflects the proposals for appreciable land releases in this part of the Borough. Consequently, **MM6** and **MM7** would be needed to make the Plan justified and effective in setting out that the 'Northern Fringe' of Coventry is clearly part of the submitted spatial strategy.

63. This is a part of the Borough where the Green Belt applies to any open land between settlement and M6. There is no scope to consider non-Green Belt options here such that I am satisfied that exceptional circumstances do exist in considering a modest role in meeting some housing and employment needs close to the edge of Coventry whilst striking the right balance in retaining those parcels of Green Belt that in the Joint Green Belt Study perform stronger against the five purposes.

General Approach to Green Belt

64. As set out elsewhere, the Council has been party to the preparation of a Joint Green Belt Study 2015 [P2.1] prepared for the Coventry and the Warwickshire authorities. The study has thoroughly and systematically appraised individual parcels of Green Belt land. Table 3.2 of the Study presents a clear audit line of how the review criteria stem from the five Green Belt purposes in the NPPF and how those criteria translate into a transparent scoring system. The methodology has been found sound elsewhere in the HMA and overall, I too find the Study to be a robust and proportionate piece of evidence that informs the demonstration of exceptional circumstances.

65. In considering the study and the Council's position as summarised at paragraph 2.97 of the Housing Topic Paper [NBBC/33] it is reasonable given the scale of need for housing and employment, that all deliverable "low" performing Green Belt sites should be considered for their development potential. Clearly the individual qualities of a particular Green Belt parcel is only one consideration and alignment to the most appropriate strategy to secure a sustainable pattern of development is also critical in determining whether exceptional circumstances exist as per paragraph 84 of the NPPF.

66. The scale of need is such in the Borough (factoring in Coventry's unmet need) that there are not enough low performing parcels. Accordingly, the Council has been justified in considering low-to-medium performing parcels and within those areas where the purpose and function of the wider Green Belt parcel was not unduly compromised, particularly in relation to preventing

neighbouring towns merging into one another and checking unrestricted sprawl. I consider this an appropriate approach in establishing exceptional circumstances. Furthermore, it is important not to lose sight that high performing parcels of Green Belt are not being contemplated as part of this Plan. As a consequence of the Plan's proposals 41% of the Borough (3,275 ha) would remain Green Belt.

67. The permanence of Green Belt must be given great importance. However, similar substantial weight applies to meeting the needs for homes and jobs in a way which addresses climate change through sustainable patterns of development. It is a balance which can be tested as part of preparing Local Plans. It is not the case that Green Belt boundaries are immutable. As demonstrated through the Joint Green Belt Study, SHLAA, ELR, SA and Housing Topic Paper, the Council has examined all reasonable non-Green Belt options and demonstrated these would be insufficient to meet the need identified. Other recent Local Plans in the same HMA have found exceptional circumstances to alter the boundaries of the West Midlands Green Belt. The submitted NBBP is not out of step with neighbouring authorities.

68. Policy DS7 sets out the approach to Green Belt including the identification of those areas of land where the Plan would result in alterations to the Green Belt. This needs to be updated as a consequence of other proposed modifications and I recommend **MM27** and **MM28** accordingly for effectiveness.

Conclusion on Issue 2

69. Subject to the modifications identified, the spatial strategy and general approach to the Green Belt would be sound.

Issue 3 – Whether the plan identifies a sound assessment of the overall level of housing need and the need for affordable housing and sets an appropriate housing requirement.

Introduction to the OAN

70. The 2015 SHMA reflects the 2012-based Office for National Statistics (ONS) subnational population projections (SNPP) and 2012-based CLG household projections as is also described as the 'Updated Assessment of Housing Need' (the UAoHN). The SHMA was supplemented by a further HMA wide report in 2016 (the JGC Report [document S13]) which analysed key data from the 2014-based population and household projections. It does not review or revise key assumptions on the OAN applied in the 2015 SHMA. The outputs of the JGC report identify that whilst there has been a slight change at the individual authority level, the overall objectively assessed need for the HMA has remained consistent between the 2012 and 2014 projections. Accordingly, the current round of Local Plans in the HMA have progressed on the 2015 SHMA outputs. It is reasonable that the NBBP is similarly prepared.

71. The PPG advises at Paragraph 2a-016-20150227 that it is not always necessary to review matters each time household projections are published. There is cogency to the submission that because the 2012 and 2014 based projections result in similar HMA outputs, there is, in practice, little rationality

to revisiting the distribution. Whilst Nuneaton's OAN goes down slightly from 10,040 to 9,400, Coventry's unmet need goes up such that, under the functional relationship methodology used, the overall housing requirement for the Borough would remain similar.

72. The updated 2016-based population and household projections were published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in 2018. As raised through the MM consultation process, these show a reduction in projected housing need for the Borough such that the exceptional circumstances for Green Belt alterations are further disputed. The 2016-based projections have generated reflection on the appropriateness of the ONS' methodology for household projections and particularly the use of two historical points (2001 and 2011) rather than longer trends to project household formation rates. This feeds into wider considerations on how the 2016-based projections align with stated national objectives to deliver at least 300,000 homes a year to address housing affordability such that the Government has advised against the use of the 2016-based projections. On this basis, the 2014-based projections (and earlier) remain a valid starting point for assessing housing need. Additionally, given that the Borough is part of a wider housing market area, it would be premature to consider adjustments in one authority area.

The Housing Market Area

73. The Borough is evidently part of a wider housing market area (HMA). The key dynamic is the relationship with Coventry as evidenced by household migration and contextual data (for example travel to work area boundaries). It is therefore consistent with paragraph 159 of the NPPF to derive an understanding of the housing needs for the area from a SHMA which has assessed the full housing needs within the wider Coventry-Warwickshire HMA[7]. Whilst I acknowledge that socio-economic factors such as house prices and incomes suggest Nuneaton and Bedworth is at variance with other parts of the wider HMA, there is insufficient evidence, when looking at the guidance on defining HMAs[8], to conclude that the Borough is a stand-alone HMA.

Demographic starting point

74. The demographic based need for Nuneaton is 423 dwellings per annum applying the 2012-based household projections. As paragraphs 47 and 159 of the NPPF make clear, the housing needs are those of the HMA. At an aggregate level the housing needs of the HMA have changed very little between the 2012 and 2014 based projections such that the latest jointly prepared SHMA retains individual authority apportionment based on the 2012-household projections. As such I find the 423 dwellings figure to be positively prepared and sound but any further upwards adjustments to this starting point will require careful consideration.

Adjustments to the demographic starting point

75. The rate at which new households form is an important consideration but the evidence, principally in UAoHN [S12], has appropriately considered the extent to which household formation appears to have been suppressed. Additional

[7] As advised at PPG paragraph 2a-008-20140306
[8] PPG Paragraph 2a-011-20140306

analysis in the JGC Report on the 2014 based households [S13] finds similar. The evidence indicates that suppression is relatively modest in Nuneaton. There are inter-relationships with affordability and household formation rates and the 2015 SHMA identifies a logical and reasonable link between affordability/the supply of affordable housing and household formation rates for the 25-34 age group. In basic terms an improvement in affordability and the supply of affordable housing is likely to result in some recovery in household formation rates.

76. The UAoHN has looked at longer term trends by way of a sensitivity analysis to the official projections and this is presented at Table 47. The analysis has also considered the issue of unattributable population change. The sensitivity analysis is robust and that there are margins of error around the official projections which could be from -13% to +20% either side of the SNPP. These are extremes, and in my view unlikely to materialise such that I find the approach of applying the 2012-household projections provides a justified starting point for considering housing need.

77. In respect of migration, there are sensitivities around the 10-year migration trends as summarised at Figure 10.3 of the JGC Report. The difference between the official projections and the application of 10-year migration trends is slight such that the official projections remain reasonable to use in the analysis. The 2015 SHMA is to be considered robust in this regard and accordingly there is no need to make a further adjustment.

Market signals

78. The 2015 SHMA has assessed the range of market signals set out in the PPG. To improve affordability in the Borough, the 2015 SHMA presents a modest adjustment of 6 dwellings per annum. Whilst marginal, the output is consistent with the SHMA methodology to meet HMA wide need, as found sound in other parts of the HMA, and would be reasonable.

79. Given the higher 2012 demographic starting point, further uplifts for affordability would be difficult to justify. It is also important to bear in mind other uplifts to the household projections for future jobs. Clearly a positive adjustment for one factor can have simultaneously positive benefits for other factors. As such consolidating individual adjustments could lead to significant and unjustified uplifts. In respect of Nuneaton, the combined adjustments in the 2015 SHMA would represent a 19% uplift on the demographic starting point of 423 dwellings per annum (dpa). Furthermore, the resultant combined OAN of 502 dwellings per annum is 44% above the 2014-based household projections presented in the JGC report. On these measures the Plan will improve affordability and the modest adjustment of 6dpa for market signals would be justified.

Future jobs

80. It is clear from the issues facing the Borough that there does need to be an increase in knowledge-based employment opportunities, a re-balancing of the extent of out-commuting to work in Coventry, other parts of Warwickshire and Leicestershire and a need to address issues of deprivation and low wages in the Borough. The 2015 SHMA considers the level of housing needed to support

workforce growth indicated by employment forecasts would be 496 dwellings per annum equating a 73dpa uplift on the demographic starting point.

81. In terms of the reasonableness of the approach of translating jobs growth data into growth in the labour force the commuting ratio of the 2011 Census has been realistically held constant to 2031 at 1.33. The economic-led housing need figure has also been derived from a more accurate blending of actual demographic data from 2011-2014 and then projecting employment forecasts from 2014 onwards. The 2015 SHMA confirms that the various forecasts for Nuneaton and Bedworth (Experian's 2013-based forecast, Cambridge Econometric's 2013 and 2015 based forecasts and Oxford Economics 2013-based forecast for the Nuneaton and Bedworth Employment Land Review 2014) are relatively similar to one another and that the economy and labour market of the Borough is closely affiliated to that of Coventry. The forecasts generally cluster around 0.6% per annum growth rate equating to a job growth of 4,800 jobs between 2014 and 2031. This equates to the need for 496 homes and is the highest of all the scenarios considered.

82. Whilst the WMCA SEP [OTH/04] presents higher employment growth across wider LEP areas it does not present detailed consideration to individual local authority performance. SEPs are intrinsically optimistic and aspirational documents in terms of their outlook on future growth prospects. Additionally, forecasting employment growth is complex. For the 2015 SHMA, a number of estimates from established forecasting houses have been considered and these have generated a range of growth estimates. This demonstrates that there is no single straightforward or absolute forecast. When taking account of all available evidence, the 2015 SHMA is optimistically realistic when considering the number of new homes needed to support strong employment growth in the Borough. Accordingly, the 73 dpa adjustment is soundly based.

83. The upshot of this is that the Borough is in effect, through the adjustment of 73 homes per year to support further economic growth in the Borough, meeting unmet need from Coventry given the strong functional alignment of the local economy north of the city. This further illustrates the degree to which the NBBP is cooperating in supporting the wider housing needs of the HMA.

Other local circumstances

84. Reference has been made to Brexit and the general effects on future levels of net in-migration from European Union countries and wider implications on economic performance. The 2014-based household projections already factor in an adjustment that net in-migration trends are likely to fall such that I consider the HMA wide OAN to appropriately reflect this. At this stage the effects of Brexit on population and the economy remain uncertain and complex. Non-EU migration, which has been rising, is also part of the equation. Accordingly, it would be untimely to make further adjustments to the OAN for Brexit.

85. The Borough is not immune from general trends of an ageing population, with the 2015 SHMA forecasting that the population aged 60-74 is expected to increase by 23.7% over the plan period and population over 75 to increase by nearly 88% in the same period. National and local strategies seek to maintain

independence and to support residents to continue living in their own homes. There is insufficient understanding as to what the effects of down-sizing and need for specialist and support accommodation mean for churn in the housing market. The 2013 SHMA indicates a need for 2,231 extra care housing units in the Borough. NBBP Policies H1 and TC3 support the provision of additional housing for elderly within the general range and mix of housing to be provided and specifically on suitable sites close to town centres where there are services and public transport. Accordingly, there is no need for the OAN to be specifically adjusted for older persons housing.

Conclusions on OAN

86. From the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the adjusted OAN of 4,277 dpa for the wider HMA and the 502dpa for the Borough are justified. Overall, the OAN of 10,040 dwellings for the Borough over the plan period is soundly based. This figure is the minimum to meet local demographic needs, ensure growth in future jobs can be supported and help balance the housing market, including improving affordability. There are not the specific local circumstances which would support a higher housing need figure.

Accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers

87. The submitted Plan is supported by a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show People Accommodation Assessment 2016 (the GTAA) [document Q3]. This has been prepared in accordance with the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 (PPTS). Applying the latest planning definition, the GTAA identifies a need for 39 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches over the plan period. In order that the Plan is positively prepared it would be necessary that Policies DS4 and H3 express the requirement as a minimum and **MM9** and **MM132** would do that respectively and I recommend them accordingly.

88. Since the GTAA was prepared the 2016 Housing and Planning Act introduced the need to conduct a wider assessment of all caravan and houseboat accommodation needs, not just those from Gypsy and Traveller ethnicities. Such an assessment would take considerable time. This would be a matter for Plan review.

89. The identified need for Gypsies and Travellers factors in the potential for 20 permanent pitches through a combination of authorising provision at Parrotts Grove and reasonable assumptions of the turnover of pitch provision at the authorised site in Nuneaton[9]. In the short term there is no identified need for net additional permanent pitches by 2021/22, nonetheless the Council has provided evidence that permissions for 7 permanent pitches have recently been granted in the Borough (application refs 032595 and 035177). The Council's proposal to find new sites for at least 19 permanent pitches and 5 transit pitches through a separate Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan document (GTSAP) is reasonable. The Council is making progress on the GTSAP in accordance with the LDS and has carried out initial consultations together with a further call for sites in 2018. The NPPF and PPG (paragraph 12-012-20140306) allow for multiple plan documents. **MM133** would clarify that Policy H3 would also be used to determine windfall proposals and I recommend it for effectiveness. Consequently, I consider the submitted Plan

[9] GTAA 2016 (Document Q3, paragraph 10.6)

is sound in its overall approach in establishing and planning for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

Translating the OAN into a Housing Requirement

The validity of, and appropriate response to, Coventry's Unmet Needs

90. The overall OAN for the Coventry and Warwickshire HMA is 4,277 dwellings per annum. Through the various iterations of the SHMA, Coventry on its own accounts for almost half of the housing need in the HMA. The forecast population growth in Coventry over the period 2011-2031 is high at 32% (comparing with Birmingham 16% and Nuneaton & Bedworth at 8%). The OAN for Coventry has recently been found sound, nonetheless, because of its ramifications for surrounding areas and in light of updated evidence, I have looked at matters relating to: (1) actual birth rates 2014-2016; (2) significant variations between 2001 and 2011 estimates; and (3) net international in-migration and international student retention.

91. On the first two issues relating to birth rates and variations in trends, national policy advises that the starting point in forecasting housing need is to apply the latest household projections. The PPG advises that these are to be considered statistically robust. Based on everything that is before me there are no compelling reasons to deviate from the officially produced projections on these points.

92. In relation to net in-migration I note that it is a significant issue for Coventry, generally running at about 4500 per annum[10]. It is one element of Coventry's population growth change, with the statistics showing that increases from natural change are also a significant factor in Coventry's forecast population growth. As set out elsewhere household projections already assume a fall in levels of international migration.

93. I have been directed to various documentation including latest statistics being collected under the exit checks programme which show that 96% of non-European Economic Area visas (for study, work or family visits) departed on time and there was no extension to stay. The Home Office report [OTH/19] describes these as "experimental statistics" (page 3). I also note the ONS is looking at the reliability of estimates of international emigration from the International Passenger Survey as well as grappling with the issue of "graduate" destinations, recognising that the existing methodology around health registration may have weaknesses resulting in over-estimating populations. Nonetheless, the various evidence including submissions from academics and the ONS about potential anomalous attributes in Coventry's population and household projections, it is not sufficiently advanced or conclusive to justify selectively unpicking Coventry's established and tested OAN, which has recently been examined in detail and found sound. In coming to this view, I have also had regard to the contrary submissions of others that net international migration may be conservatively estimated[11]. Again, the balance lies with the officially based ONS household projections being considered statistically robust.

[10] Document OTH/20 ONS Projections by District – 2016 (Submitted by CPRE)
[11] Barton Willmore – Coventry & Warwickshire HMA OAN Evidence Review [OTH/05]

94. Notwithstanding the recent approvals of student flats in Coventry, the SHMA has appropriately considered student accommodation, and the overall housing need remains. Accordingly, the resultant shortfall of 17,800 homes in Coventry which the Joint Committee of Coventry, Warwickshire and South-West Leicestershire in 2015 sought the MOU to address is soundly based.

95. In distributing Coventry's unmet need, the methodology applied through the MOU is a functional relationship based on gross migration flows and two-way commuting relationships. In applying these factors with equal weighting, the average percentage of migrating and commuting flows was 32.3% for Nuneaton and Bedworth, the second highest after Warwick at 39.37%. This functional relationship methodology is appropriate if a wider sustainable pattern of development based on aligning homes, jobs and established travel patterns in the HMA is to be secured. Overall, the apportionment of 4,020 homes of Coventry's unmet need to Nuneaton & Bedworth is soundly based.

96. The housing requirement on submission was 13,374 homes which included a 10% allowance for flexibility to deliver the NBBC OAN, amounting to 1,004 dwellings. The benefits of such a buffer would be desirable, however it is essential that identified unmet HMA needs are met in the first instance. Consequently, the 10% flexibility allowance within the submitted housing requirement would not be a justified starting point.

97. Additionally, during the examination the Council has revisited its supply and since late August 2017 it has been able to demonstrate a supply over the plan period in excess of 15,000 homes. Accordingly, I find the submitted housing requirement of 13,374, which was considered to reflect capacity constraints, would not be justified, positively prepared or consistent with national policy and therefore would not be sound.

98. Therefore, I recommend for the Plan to be sound, that the housing requirement is modified to reflect the 4,020 homes of unmet need arising from Coventry, increasing the overall target to at least 14,060 homes over the plan period. **MM9, MM10** and **MM18** would reflect this in Policy DS4 (Overall Development Needs) and its associated monitoring target and I recommend them accordingly.

Affordable Housing

99. The 2015 SHMA identifies a need for additional affordable housing across the HMA. The Council has considered the need for affordable housing further in a background paper [document S2] which identifies a need for affordable housing of between 195 and 320 per annum. Looking at past delivery and viability considerations the identified Borough OAN is unlikely to meet this need.

100. In meeting a proportion of Coventry's unmet needs the resultant average annual requirement increases to some 700 dwellings per annum. Annual delivery will need to be higher than this, because of the shortfall in delivery that has accrued since 2011, against the Borough's own OAN. Delivering in excess of 700 homes per annum represents a significant boost in housing delivery compared to recent past completion rates. It will improve general affordability and increase the delivery of affordable homes. The housing requirement is to be expressed as a minimum such that additional 'windfall'

sources of supply are also likely to assist the delivery of affordable housing. Increasing the annual average requirement above 700 dwellings per annum to improve affordable housing delivery would be difficult to justify against past delivery rates. Moreover, increasing the housing requirement further would result in rates of development that are unlikely to be delivered or that would secure a wider sustainable pattern of development having regard to the available SHLAA and SA evidence.

More recent evidence on housing need and housing requirement figures.

101. The revised NPPF, states that, other than in exceptional circumstances, a new standard method (detailed in revised PPG) should be used to determine local housing needs. For Nuneaton and Bedworth, the standard method currently indicates a need for 385 dpa for the period 2016-2026. This is materially lower than the 502dpa OAN on which the plan is based. However, the revised NPPF makes clear that a plan already submitted for examination should be examined against the 2012 NPPF.

102. The lower local housing need is a reflection that the most recent 2016-based ONS population projections indicate lower population growth in the Borough than that on which the 2015 SHMA was based. However, such projections would still need to be considered against potential uplifts for household formation, economic growth and affordable housing. There would still be a matter of potential unmet needs from neighbouring authorities. Considering these matters would inevitably take a considerable amount of time. If the completion of plan examinations were to be delayed each time new evidence is published few plans would ever be adopted. Whilst future reviews of the plan will be likely to need to take account of it, it is not necessary for the plan to be modified at this stage to reflect the new standard method for soundness.

Conclusion on Issue 3

103. The full OAN of 10,040 homes over the period 2011-2031 for the Borough is based on reasoned judgement of the evidence and is sound. In order for the Plan to be sound, the proposed distribution of 4,020 homes of the unmet need within the wider HMA to 2031 resulting in adjusted housing requirement to 14,060 would be necessary. This revised figure of 14,060 has been subject to an assessment of capacity and supply, including updates to SA. In any event it is only moderately higher than the submitted Plan's target to deliver 13,374 homes.

Issue 4 – Does the plan comply with national policy, the spatial strategy, and the evidence base in identifying the proposed housing sites? Are the submitted allocations requiring Green Belt alterations justified by exceptional circumstances?

General Approach to Site Selection

104. On submission, the sustainability appraisal (SA) [D6] set out various options to meet the housing requirement including 12 shortlisted sites presented as either preferred sites or reasonable alternatives with associated detailed assessment, including non-strategic sites, at appendices D and E of the SA. On submission the SA was informed by the 2016 SHLAA [S8], which at

Appendix 3 presents a matrix of available sites which were assessed by the SA. This includes those strategic sites that have been carried forward into allocations as well as omitted sites.

105. During the examination the Council prepared a Housing Topic Paper [NBBC/33] on which comments were invited in late 2017 and was tested through the Stage 2 Hearings in February 2018. The paper appropriately justifies the site selection process when read in conjunction with the SA, SHLAA and Joint Green Belt Study. I am satisfied that the Council's SHLAA and SA processes have been thorough and that the planning judgements applied in determining which sites to take forward have been generally sound. The Council's approach also follows the joint SHLAA methodology [S7], which has been found sound elsewhere in the HMA. Overall, the Council has adhered to the relevant guidance in Section 3 of the PPG on housing land assessment, including the methodology outlined at paragraph 3-006-20140306.

106. The inclusion of Green Belt alterations for five strategic housing sites at a relatively late stage of plan preparation and the inclusion of 23 non-strategic sites (including two Green Belt alterations) between the submission version of the Plan in October 2015 and the publication version of the plan in January 2017 has created concern about the audit trail and site selection process. There is nothing unsound, however, about the relatively late inclusion of additional supply capacity which has involved some difficult choices to ensure housing needs are met through a sustainable pattern of development.

107. To assist the examination, the Council produced an additional SHLAA follow-up-schedule in 2017 [NBBC/10] which amplifies why certain sites were not taken forward. The Housing Topic Paper further elaborates on site selection and an updated SHLAA in 2018 [NBBC/70] updates the land availability picture. The judgements applied will not always be agreed particularly where sites are not proposed for allocation, but I am satisfied that the Council has taken a proportionate and realistic view of suitable and appropriate housing land options in the Borough.

108. The capacity of the proposed strategic allocations has been calculated applying reasonable density multipliers. This results in specific figures and only in a handful of cases should these be regarded as the number to plan for, for reasons set out below. In all other cases the plan should be positively prepared by expressing that the numbers are to be regarded as minima and I deal with the necessary MMs below on a site by site basis. In respect of HSG10 in Nuneaton and HSG5 in Bedworth these are the only modifications necessary for soundness and so I recommend **MM68** and **MM90** accordingly.

Housing Sites in Nuneaton

HSG1 North of Nuneaton

109. The site comprises an amalgam of completions, sites with planning permission and a remaining balance to be allocated. Through this process the capacity of the site, originally presented at 3,331 dwellings, has appreciably increased and as such the submitted Plan is no longer sound. To make the Plan effective and recognise its full potential during the Plan period I recommend **MM20** and

MM32 which would clarify that the revised capacity of this strategic location over the plan period would be a minimum of 4,419 dwellings.

110. It is the largest development site in the plan with key initial phases already consented and well under construction. The Plan, however, is to some extent unclear on how future phases of development will come forward in a coordinated manner. I recognise that the general principles in Policy SA1 as well as the detailed content in Policy HSG1 will combine to secure sustainable development but requiring a concept plan and policy content requiring remaining development to come forward in accordance with that plan would be necessary to make the Plan effective and avoid potentially haphazard outcomes on such a strategically important site. I therefore recommend **MM33-35**.

111. The delivery of a connecting link road through the site is critical as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the STA. It is necessary to ensure the highway impacts on the wider surrounding road network, including the nearby A5, would not be severe. It would bind together distinct phases of the development east and west of Higham Lane, ensuring good connectivity especially for public transport and for integrated pedestrian and cycle linkages. The connectivity of the site and the wider highway network would also benefit from a new junction onto the A5 at the Callendar Farm part of the site. To reflect this and secure more effective outcomes at HSG1 I recommend **MM36** and **MM40-41.**

112. As submitted the Plan contains a landscape buffer between the northern edge of HSG1 and the A5 beyond which, by a narrow margin, is the Borough boundary with extensive countryside beyond. The landscape buffer is largely informed by the Landscape Capacity Study [T13] which places an emphasis on the openness of land above the 90metre AOD contour and views across the Anker valley, particularly towards 'Mount Judd', a conical man-made spoil heap. The area to be protected by the buffer is no different in landscape character from the wider countryside east of the A5. The submissions that the buffer would protect the remaining countryside in this part of the Borough ignores the fact that countryside and landscape washes over artificial administrative boundaries. There are no special landscape qualities that support particular protection for this area which is already influenced by inter-visibility with the existing urban edge of Nuneaton and sporadic development along the A5. The policy for HSG1 as submitted requires public open space and appropriate landscape treatment along its northern edge, I consider this a justified approach.

113. In terms of views over to Mount Judd and the Anker valley, these are generally intermittent and very likely to be affected by the extent of HSG1, including development on other parts of the site at Top Farm on land which would exceed the 90m AOD contour. Overall, the sizeable landscape buffer at HSG1 is not justified or consistent with national policy and I recommend **MM37-38** and **MM42** which would remove the proposed landscape buffer and requirement to retain land above 90m AOD for open space.

HSG2 Arbury (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

114. The site is currently Green Belt comprising a mainly open and large-scale patchwork of arable farmland bounded by existing development to the north and east, Harefield Lane (and Bermuda Park commercial area beyond) to the south and Spring Kidden Wood to the west. It is a contained site and its development in line with the allocation would not represent unrestricted sprawl or result in coalescence with neighbouring settlements. The proposal would result in the loss of open countryside but given existing urban features adjoining the site any harm arising from this loss would be only moderate and demonstrably outweighed by the wider public benefit of providing needed housing at the principal settlement in the spatial strategy.

115. The site would be of a scale to generate its own social infrastructure and would also be within walking and cycling distances of local services and facilities including Nuneaton town centre, the George Eliot hospital and substantial employment areas to the south of the town. It would be accessible by existing bus routes along Croft and Heath End Roads and is of a scale to support and sustain future internal bus services around the development. The site would be within reasonable and safe walking and cycling distance of Bermuda Park station. This connection should be reinforced in the Policy through **MM46** for effectiveness. It is a sustainably located site and would contribute to a sustainable pattern of development. Overall, when all these factors are taken into consideration and balanced, alongside the strategic factors discussed under Issue 2 above, there are the necessary exceptional circumstances to justify altering the Green Belt boundary at this location.

116. The site adjoins Arbury Park registered parkland and grounds containing the Grade I listed Arbury house and the separately listed grade II* tea-house within the grounds as well as non-designated heritage assets at Coton Lawn within HSG2. The Heritage Assessment [J7.1] accompanying the plan appropriately sets out the assets, their significance, the contribution of HSG2 and the potential impacts. From the heritage assessment and from my observations the site HSG2 would harm the setting of the II* registered parkland and gardens and result in the loss of non-designated heritage assets of low significance.

117. The Heritage Assessment at Section 5.5 identifies how proposals at HSG2 could maximise enhancement and minimise harm and these have generally been embedded into policy. **MM49** and **MM52** would clarify the scope to secure appropriate measures and commitments for an asset management plan for the Estate as identified in the SOCG with Historic England [OTH/42] and I recommend them for Plan effectiveness.

118. There would be no inter-visibility from either the immediate setting of Arbury Hall or the separately listed tea-House. The development would not be conspicuous from the main approach to Arbury through Spring Kidden Wood. Modern arable farming and the existing hard urban edge of Nuneaton has affected the contribution of HSG2 as part of the wider historic setting of Arbury Park. Together with the measures set out in Policy HSG2 on the form of development the harm on the setting of the parkland would be minimised such that any residual harm would be less than substantial. Whilst this harm

has significant weight, it would be substantially outweighed by the wider public benefits of providing needed housing on a sustainably located site.

119. The potential total loss of non-designated heritage assets (Coton Lawn Garden and Coton Lawn Farmhouse) needs to be considered against their low heritage significance. Again, the harm of total loss would be outweighed by the wider public benefit of providing otherwise sustainably located new housing to meet an identified need.

120. The site adjoins Ensor's Pool, a SAC site and Local Nature Reserve and contains other features (veteran trees, ponds and hedgerows) of biodiversity value. None of these environmental attributes indicate the site should not be allocated subject to appropriate layouts and mitigation. **MM50** would clarify the need to protect adjoining LWSs at Spring Kidden Wood and North Woods and I recommend it so that the Plan is justified.

121. The site will require a comprehensive approach including clarification, albeit in indicative terms, of how the site can be connected to the A444 to the south. I accept that there are various peripheral points to the site which could facilitate some early delivery connecting into the existing road network within Nuneaton, but this needs to be coordinated within a wider concept plan. As such I find the lack of a long-term framework including strategic road access, for such a strategic site for the Plan to be ineffective, not positively prepared and therefore not sound.

122. The capacity of the site is indicatively shown as 1,525 dwellings, to be positively prepared this should be expressed as a minimum as per **MM43**. **MM44**, **MM47, MM48** and **MM51** would introduce a broad concept plan for the site, showing an indicative route for the strategic access road and require development to come forward through a masterplan in accordance with the concept plan. All are necessary for Plan effectiveness and I recommend them accordingly.

123. The need for the road is explained in the assumptions underpinning the STA ([Z5] paragraphs 4.9-4.10, page 32). The road would require traversing Green Belt land, primarily in close proximity to existing commercial uses and land restored from former mining activity. It is balanced as to whether the road would be local transport infrastructure under paragraph 90 of the NPPF given its potential to function as an alternative local distributor road connecting to Heath End Road but alternatively for similar reasons as set out above, exceptional circumstances to alter the boundary of HSG2 to include the road corridor exist. **MM45** would necessarily confirm the distributor link road function including necessary connectivity to the A444 and relate it to the concept plan.

HSG3 Gipsy Lane (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

124. The site is bounded by housing to the north and east, the Coventry Canal and proposed Faultlands employment site (EMP1) and Bermuda Park employment area beyond to the west and Gipsy Lane to the south. It is a well-contained site such that development here would not result in unrestricted sprawl, result in merging with Bedworth or encroach into the wider countryside. It is a sustainably located site within walking and cycling distance of local services

and facilities including major employment areas. It would contribute to a sustainable pattern of development. Gipsy Lane would form a clear, defensible boundary to the south. Accordingly, taken together with the strategic factors discussed under Issue 2 above, exceptional circumstances exist to alter Green Belt boundary at this location.

125. To be positively prepared the capacity of the site should be expressed as a minimum and **MM53** would do that. To secure appropriate connectivity and sustainable outcomes the policy should specify through **MM55** that the layout of the site will secure effective cycle network connections to the adjoining EMP1 allocation given the volume and speed of traffic on Gipsy Lane. Gipsy Lane will need improvements and it is justified that these works are implemented at an early stage and take account of mature highway trees at this location. **MM54** would do this and I recommend it, so that the Plan is justified and effective.

126. The HSG3 development should make the most of the attractive feature of the adjoining Coventry Canal and ensure the structural integrity of the canal is preserved and valued habitats along its route are successfully incorporated and enhanced. **MM58** would secure this within policy and I recommend it for effectiveness. The existing Turnover bridge provides a point of connection over the canal to the EMP1 site. As set out under main issue 6 below, the suitability of using and adapting the heritage bridge remains to be determined and as such a fall-back position of securing an alternative bridge crossing needs to be embedded within policy. Consequently, I recommend **MM56** which mirrors a similar MM for EMP1. I have amended the wording of **MM56** to include navigational safety as a consideration should an alternative bridge be required.

127. Given Policy BE4 references archaeology there is no justification for a particular policy requirement within HSG3 and **MM59** would remove it accordingly. There is also no need for the policy to specifically exclude adjoining land at the Red Deeps/Wem Meadows wildspace which would not form part of the allocation. **MM57** would provide the necessary clarification.

HSG9 Land at Golf Drive (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

128. The site is bounded by housing to the south and west and a golf course to the east. Open countryside to the north extends into the plain of the River Anker valley but an established hedgerow along most of the northern boundary which would provide a defensible limit. The site contains buildings at Hill Farm and pylon infrastructure which further reduce any intrinsic landscape value. Although a section of open footpath from Golf Drive across the site would be subsumed within development, the rural character of the extensive network of footpaths beyond to the north would not be affected. The contained nature of the site means that its development in line with the allocation would not result in unrestricted sprawl or wider encroachment into the countryside, with the northern edge of development aligning with housing around Grassington Drive to the west. There would be no coalescence with neighbouring settlements or planned development in Rugby Borough.

129. The site would be within walking and cycling distance of day-to-day services and facilities including a good level of bus services into Nuneaton. It would be

reasonably related to strategic employment on the south side of the town. Overall, it would form a part of a sustainable pattern of development. Accordingly, together with the strategic factors discussed above, exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt boundary at Golf Drive as submitted.

130. In terms of enhancing the connectivity of the site and securing proportionate and justified infrastructure the policy for the site needs to be modified to include contributions to evening and weekend bus services, specify that off-site highway measures will also include the B4114 corridor and that the principal destinations for cycle path connections are the town centre and Bermuda Park. **MM85-87** would address this and I recommend them so that the Plan is justified and effective.

131. Hill Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building perched on a slight promontory looking over the plain of the Anker valley. Development of HSG9 would adversely affect the setting of this building although existing urbanising features, such as the pylons, already compromise its original rural setting and thus limit the harm. In this case, subject to appropriate mitigation, the harm would be less than substantial and would be outweighed by the considerable wider public benefit of providing needed housing at a sustainable location. Having regard to the Heritage Assessment accompanying the Plan the policy should be clearer in requiring a buffer to protect the setting of the farmhouse and **MM88** would be necessary for the Plan to be justified. Accordingly, the capacity of the site is unlikely to exceed the 621 homes identified by the Council.

132. HSG9 is one of the larger housing sites in the Plan. In terms of ensuring coordinated development including further detail on access arrangements, it would be justified for the policy to require a concept plan to be submitted to demonstrate how the site can come forward and to be used as a basis for assessing future proposals. This would not be onerous or unduly delay development and accordingly I recommend **MM89** for Plan effectiveness.

HSG11 Tuttle Hill

133. The extent of the allocated site in the Plan is justified, taking account of highways arrangements and neighbouring uses. That said, with further work, there may well be additional potential at this previously-developed location and accordingly, it is necessary that HSG11 is modified to be expressed as "at least 200 dwellings" as per **MM91** so that the Plan is positively prepared.

134. In terms of delivery of the site it would not be justified to require the site to deliver a new bridge over the WCML. **MM93** and **MM95** would clarify that the site can contribute towards delivery of a good quality cycle connection via Stoney Road using the existing underbridge to link to Sustrans route 52 and public open space in Weddington. This would be a justified and proportionate approach. There is repetition in the submitted policy on contributions to bus services and infrastructure and **MM92** would address this so that the Plan would be effective.

135. The site is positioned to the east of Coventry Canal and represents a significant opportunity to enhance the setting of the Canal and the gateway into Nuneaton for users of this waterway. It would be justified to require

through the policy that development addresses the canal, making the most of a waterfront context, and as such secure enhancements to the towpath along the site boundary. **MM96** and **MM97** would do this and I recommend them accordingly.

Housing Sites in Bedworth

Bedworth Woodlands (HSG4)

136. The extent of the proposed allocation has been appropriately scaled back from earlier versions of the Plan. This approach is justified by the landscape quality, including the cohesive condition of the remnant features of the Arden Forest landscape, and various heritage assets immediately to the north and north-west of the proposed HSG4.

137. The submitted site is not subject to any designations where the NPPF states that development should be restricted[12]. The submitted policy for HSG4 sets out an extensive list of site-specific criteria which appropriately reflects the comprehensive landscape, ecological and heritage evidence underpinning the Plan as it relates to Bedworth Woodlands. In respect of the ecological value of the site, there is no need for development to encroach into the Flash Meadow LWS and **MM63** is necessary in setting out the retention of this site. Additionally, the policy needs to remove specificity in terms of how ecological impacts can be mitigated. **MM64** would do this and I recommend it for effectiveness and consistency with national policy.

138. There is no justification to require development at this location to secure an asset management plan for the Arbury Estate including any heritage assets at risk. **MM67** would remove the reference and I recommend it so that the Plan is justified and effective. The site contains areas of medieval ridge and furrow including two areas which are reasonably well-preserved. These are non-designated heritage assets which the Heritage Assessment [J7] ascribes 'medium' value. A balance needs to be struck and given the wider public benefit of the housing need it would be justified and consistent with national policy to retain this ridge and furrow "where possible", including incorporating it into green infrastructure. **MM62** would introduce the qualification (consistent with Policy SA1) and I recommend it accordingly.

139. Highways access to the site is a significant issue. On Plan submission, the principal means of highway access, as evidenced through the STA, was to be taken from a new junction on the A444 opposite Sutherland Drive. This involved land outside of the allocation and the control of the landowners and would not be deliverable. Subsequently, WCC has adequately demonstrated through further assessment work [NBBC/62] that the existing local highway network can only accommodate the trip generation from some 170 dwellings before further interventions are required. This is disputed but further assessment work [NBBC/77] clearly shows that without a northbound connection onto the A444 traffic levels through Bedworth Town Centre and northbound on the B4113 to Nuneaton would be severe. The potential effects on air quality in Bedworth, given the evidence [NBBC/55] also support the need for a northbound connection onto the A444.

[12] NPPF paragraph 14, footnote 9

140. A revised access arrangement has been prepared [plan ref VD18716-SK01 A, NBBC/62]. This would be within the allocation and whilst highways orders would be required the proposed scheme is necessary to avoid a severe impact on the highway and ensure the site is deliverable. The route would pass near to the rear of properties on Woodlands Road but there would remain a reasonable degree of separation and scope to consider noise mitigation as part of detailed proposals.

141. The proposed access would involve the loss of some well-preserved ridge and furrow in the south-east corner of the site. The area lost would be significant, but some areas would be capable of retention as part of the green infrastructure for the site. Whilst the Heritage Assessment recommends that this area should be retained, I note there is no public access or visibility from a public vantage point and the setting of this small area is somewhat compromised by the proximity of existing housing and the A444. Whilst I attach significant weight to the loss of some of the ridge and furrow as a non-designated heritage asset this harm would be less than substantial and outweighed by the significant public benefit of meeting an identified housing need and creating a form of access which is necessary to access the site and remove appreciable traffic from the town centre.

142. WCC have estimated initial costs for the indicative route at no less than £2.62million and likely to be more, others suggest the scheme is likely to be in the region of £4million. The Council's plan-wide viability work has assessed the site and bearing in mind the other infrastructure costs associated with the site, the revised highways arrangement is likely to push the scheme to the margins of viability in the absence of any public contribution towards the northbound connection to the A444[13]. It is a balanced situation, but I note from the wider viability work that even only small increases in sales values would have a noticeable positive impact on viability such that over time development would be viably able to support the revised access arrangements. To ensure there is a reasonable prospect that the highways infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion Policy HSG4 should be accompanied by a concept plan to illustrate the proposed highway access and a requirement that development should come forward in accordance with the concept plan. **MM61, MM65** and **MM66** would do this and I recommend them all accordingly so that the Plan is justified and effective. I have amended the wording of **MM66** slightly to reflect the updated wording from NBBC following the February 2019 hearing which provides necessary clarification.

Hospital Lane (HSG5) (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

143. The site is currently Green Belt on the western edge of Bedworth, bounded by housing to the north, east and in large part to the south. Hospital Lane to the west forms a readily recognisable and permanent physical feature. Pylons across part of the site provide a further urbanising influence. Accordingly, whilst there would be a loss of openness, development would not represent unrestricted sprawl, there would be no merging with nearby settlements and Hospital Lane would prevent encroachment into the wider countryside to the

[13] NBBC/85

west. The site therefore performs only moderately against the purposes of Green Belt.

144. Day-to-day facilities are within reasonable walking and cycling distances. The site is well-connected to employment and Bedworth Town Centre by existing bus routes and the surrounding road network and layout of the site would support further bus provision. At a more local level, the site would be well-related to the employment allocation at Bowling Green Lane EMP7. It would therefore form part of a sustainable pattern for development. Consequently, together with the strategic factors discussed above, exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt boundary at Hospital Lane as submitted to provide for at least 398 needed new dwellings.

School Lane (HSG6) (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

145. The site is highly contained by development and part crossed by pylons. Visually and perceptibly, in large part due to the presence of the adjoining M6, it does not form part of a wider, evident openness separating Bedworth from the northern fringe of Coventry. Heading north from Coventry on the B4113 there is a continuous frontage of development on the east side of the road such that to a noticeable extent Coventry and Bedworth (Exhall) already merge at this location. The HSG6 site would consolidate development but, in the context of the existing degree of enclosure by the M6 and existing commercial development at School Lane and Coventry Road, there would not be unrestricted sprawl and the wider countryside would be not encroached upon. As such, the site performs only very partially against the purposes of Green Belt.

146. In terms of securing a sustainable pattern of development, the site would be well-related to day-to-day services facilities by walking and cycling, frequent bus services along the B4113 corridor and significant employment at Bayton Road and through proposed sites EMP2, EMP6 and EMP7. There are no statutory environmental designations and no reason why habitats and any protected species cannot be addressed through other policies of the plan. Similarly, the proximity of the M6 does not preclude the principle of residential development subject to design, layout and other forms of mitigation. Overall, the site is well placed to contribute to a sustainable pattern of development and together with the strategic factors discussed above, exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt boundary on this part of School Lane.

147. The STA identifies potential mitigation measures and the multifaceted highway modelling behind the STA has not underestimated network capacity of the locality and performance in the peak periods. The precise timing of mitigation will depend on when development comes forward and updates in modelling to reflect latest travel behaviours. The impact of HSG6 alone, or in combination, can be reasonably mitigated and the residual impact would not be severe.

148. On submission the site was intended to provide 388 dwellings across a wider site. The western portion of the site is under the control of a landowner who does not wish this part of the site to be developed and for it to be retained as Green Belt. As such a wider allocation as submitted would not be justified,

even when taking account of the potential for the Council to use compulsory purchase powers.

149. Consequently, the Plan should be modified to reflect a reduced site comprising the eastern half of the site. The remainder of the site should be left as Green Belt. Given the sustainable location of the site and the scale of nearby commercial buildings, the site could reasonably support a higher density scheme at around 50 dwellings per hectare to offset the reduction in capacity such that the site could still yield at least 220 dwellings. Accordingly, **MM69** is necessary to amend the boundary of the site and **MM20, MM70** and **MM71** would reflect the revised capacity and I recommend these MMs so that the Plan is justified and effective. **MM72** would also be necessary to effectively safeguard established trees on the site within the proposed development.

Housing Sites in Bulkington

Bulkington East (HSG7) (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

150. The site comprises two parcels of land, a field north of Arundel Road and a field east of Lancing Road on land which rises up to Bramcote Close and Long Street. Both are within wider Parcel BU1 in the Green Belt Study which scores moderately well against Green Belt purposes. On closer inspection, both parts of HSG7 would not result in restricted sprawl, merging with neighbouring settlements and the southern part of the site is largely experienced as a field adjoined by housing, such that it has a limited relationship to the wider countryside. The northern field on the other hand is perceptibly part of the wider countryside stretching over the shallow valley towards Bramcote. However, it is particularly contained by established hedgerows and trees such that any intrusion into the wider landscape would be limited. The site is within walking and cycling distance of services and facilities and accessible to regular bus services through the settlement. It is sustainably located and would form part of a pattern of sustainable development. Overall, the necessary exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundary exist.

151. The transport implications of the proposed allocations at Bulkington have been subject to further analysis through updates to the Paramics modelling in January 2018 (NBBC/41) which reasonably demonstrate that, subject to mitigation, there would be no severe impact on the safety or performance of the highway network. **MM74** would be necessary to confirm that HSG7 should make a proportionate contribution to off-site highway mitigation identified in the updated January 2018 testing and I recommend it so that the Plan would be justified and effective. **MM77** would reflect the evidence from the highways authority that it supports the main access points from Nuneaton Road and Lancing Road. This would not negate the consideration of Bramcote Close as an alternative point of access to the southern part of the site.

152. The site would accommodate nearly 200 dwellings and I recommend **MM73** to clarify that the capacity of the site in the Plan is to be treated as a minimum in order to be positively prepared. The site should make proportionate contributions to community facilities and healthcare provision in line with the evidence in the IDP. **MM75** and **MM76** would introduce the requirements into Policy HSG7 and I recommend them both.

Bulkington West (HSG8) (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

153. The site is bounded to the south by housing along the B4109 Coventry Road and to the west by the WCML. To the east is the existing settlement edge of Bulkington which is generally on rising land above the proposed allocation such that the settlement edge is already relatively exposed and pronounced in the wider landscape. There is already some development in the area including a short length of established two storey housing development on the old Bedworth Road and a recent residential scheme at Weavers Close where the B4029 crosses the WCML, including some prominent three storey buildings. Consequently, HSG8 would not result in unrestricted sprawl, the merging of Bulkington and Bedworth or encroachment into the wider countryside.

154. I note that the northern boundary of the site is at present a post and wire fence within a wider fabric of open fields. To ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 85 the boundary needs to be strengthened at this point so that it correlates with the adjoining boundary at Mill Lane. To do this, the policy should require boundary strengthening through a new green edge and given the topography of the site this location would be appropriate for open space provision. I therefore recommend **MM83** for Plan effectiveness and ensure consistency with national policy.

155. Development on this side of Bulkington would be close to services and facilities in the village and within reasonable walking and cycling distance of Bedworth including the rail station and a secondary school. Overall, HSG8 would form part of a sustainable pattern of development and taken together with the strategic factors discussed above, exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt boundary at this location.

156. As with HSG7, to be justified and effective, the policy content of HSG8 needs to reflect updates to the IDP and the January 2018 updated highway modelling for Bulkington in terms of proportionate contributions to infrastructure and, therefore, I recommend **MM79-81**. The site is in various ownerships, particularly to the south of the B4029. Accordingly, the policy should require a concept framework to be agreed so that subsequent proposals, including access arrangements, come forward in a co-ordinated manner to secure the efficient and effective development of the allocation. **MM82** would strengthen the policy in this regard, although I note the northern parcel of the site (north of the B4029) may well be capable of coming forward in isolation given it is slightly detached from the wider allocation. **MM78** would clarify that the site capacity at 495 dwellings is to be regarded as a minimum. I recommend both MMs so that the plan is positively prepared and effective.

Non-Strategic Housing Sites

157. The Plan allocates a number of smaller non-strategic housing sites through Policy DS5 and presents them in detailed plan form at Appendix A of the Plan as well as on the Policies Map. The SA has been subsequently updated to individually appraise these sites [document NBBC/36]. Whilst this is retrospective, it nonetheless demonstrates that the proposed non-strategic housing sites would contribute to the most appropriate strategy. A number of the sites will have local biodiversity and heritage considerations, including the setting of the Coventry Canal, and as such mitigation would be required in

accordance with other policies of the Plan. **MM21** would introduce additional text to this effect within Policy DS5 and I recommend it for effectiveness.

158. Two of the proposed non-strategic sites would involve alterations to Green Belt boundaries and they are appropriately identified in Policy DS7. Site NUN181 at Stockley Road, Bedworth is situated between established housing on Blackhorse Road and recent housing development off Sephton Drive. Existing employment uses and the railway line contain the site to the west and the former Hawkesbury Golf Course is to the north. Existing highway infrastructure at Stockley Road and Sephton Drive already crosses part of the site. In terms of the purposes of Green Belt, the site relates more to the built-up character of this part of Hawkesbury. The site does not function to check unrestricted sprawl, prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another or preserve the setting of Bedworth. Development of the site would not contravene the five purposes of Green Belt. It would make a modest contribution to boosting housing delivery in a sustainable location consistent with the Plan's spatial strategy. As such, and when taken together with the strategic factors discussed above, there are exceptional circumstances for altering the Green Belt here.

159. The second proposed alteration of Green Belt for a non-strategic housing site is Site NUN286/NUN317 at Burbages Lane in Neal's Green. With an estimated capacity of 127 homes it is one of the largest non-strategic sites. The southern part of the site is not in the Green Belt and I note the Council has resolved to grant planning permission for 47 homes on this land subject to a legal agreement. Accordingly, there are considerations as to whether a larger site would enable a more comprehensive and coherent form of development.

160. At present the site is largely to the rear of existing housing on Burbages Lane, however, it would form a relatively compact and logical extension to Neal's Green such that an appreciable finger of Green Belt along the shallow valley containing the A444 would remain. Neal's Green and Longford would not merge and the development of the site, contained by existing boundaries, would not result in unrestricted sprawl.

161. Any loss of openness would be principally experienced from Wheelwright Lane. However, views across the site are limited due to the extent of surrounding development. It is a modest gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage. Development of the site would also affect user's experience of the public footpath (Route B18) from Burbages Lane to St Giles Road, however the majority of the route of the footpath beyond the proposed allocation would remain in countryside.

162. The proposed site would accord with the development strategy and enable housing to come forward to meet needs in this part of the Borough. The edge of Coventry is within reasonable walking and cycling distance of the site and employment opportunities are nearby. Good public transport connections by bus link into Coventry. Overall, and when taken together with the strategic factors discussed above, site specific exceptional circumstances exist to justify altering Green Belt boundary here.

Conclusion on Issue 4

163. Subject to the main modifications identified, I find the proposed housing allocations in the NBBP would be soundly based.

Issue 5 – Whether the Plan will support and maintain a deliverable supply of housing.

The evidence on housing land supply on submission

164. On submission the Plan was predicated on not being able to meet in full the identified apportionment of Coventry's unmet needs such that the submitted housing requirement was 13,374 over the plan period. The submitted Plan's trajectory was also based on the situation as of 1 April 2016 and indistinct in terms of the profile of delivery (annualised or stepped) and the inputs to determining whether or not a five-year deliverable supply of housing would exist on plan adoption. It was evident in the very early stages of examination that the housing land supply position was challenging recognising that the April 2016 housing land statement[14] (document S3) revealed that a five-year supply, on an annualised basis, could not be achieved including dealing with the shortfall over the plan period (Liverpool method), rather than in the first five years. This only improved slightly by the time of the April 2017 statement (document S4)[15].

165. Overall, the submitted Plan is ambiguous on deliverable supply, and the extent to which the situation would improve from past performance. Additionally, in light of the need to slightly increase the housing requirement (see Issue 3 above), the evidence on submission points to a necessity to strengthen and clarify the Plan's approach to housing delivery and potentially identify additional deliverable supply. As submitted the Plan, on this main issue, would not be positively prepared, consistent with national policy or effective and therefore not sound.

Updated evidence on deliverable supply during examination

166. Post submission the Council presented outputs of monitoring for 2016/17 [NBBC/14 and then NBBC/20]. The consequence of the updated annual monitoring material is that the Council as of 1 April 2017 asserted a total supply of 15,223 dwellings[16] (an increase of 1,849 on the submitted Plan requirement of 13,374). Detailed aspects of the housing land supply evidence were assessed further by the Council in its Housing Topic Paper of November 2017 [NBBC/33] and refinements made in terms of expired sites, windfall analysis and potential duplications. Further revisions were prepared in response to the main modification consultation in March 2019 [NBBC/86-88]. Notwithstanding the scrutiny to which the land supply has been subjected to, I find the Council's updated monitoring outputs and assessment of capacity and supply to be reasonable. They reflect a reality that in the recent absence of a

[14] On an annualised approach: 2.67years under Sedgefield, 3.31years under Liverpool
[15] On an annualised approach: 3.6 years under Sedgefield, 5.04years under Liverpool
[16] A figure which has thereafter remained reasonably constant – including 15,217 in NBBC/86

demonstrable five-year supply, appreciable amounts of additional non-Green Belt supply have been consented.

167. That scenario could be interpreted as indicating the Council's site selection process for the Plan has omitted reasonable alternatives. Overall, however, I find the Council's SHLAA, as the principal evidence on site selection, has applied reasonable judgements and generally followed the jointly agreed HMA authorities' methodology. There is nothing unreasonable with the approach that sites which are discounted through the SHLAA have not migrated into the SA as reasonable alternatives. The Council's Housing Topic Paper addresses these matters and sets out the reasonableness of the Council's approach. The one exception is Hawkesbury (HSG12) and that is dealt with separately below.

Components of Supply

168. Since 1 April 2011 some 2,382 dwellings have been completed in the Borough as of 31 March 2018 and this figure should be updated through **MM10**.

169. The capacity of the proposed strategic allocations needs to be amended to reflect changing circumstances. Given the complex situation with HSG1 (a blend of completions, numerous applications, including schemes under construction, and remaining allocated land), this should be presented separately. Accordingly, the capacity of all other strategic allocations should be modified through **MM10** to 5,582 dwellings. With regards to North of Nuneaton at HSG1, the plan period should be modified through **MM10** to make clear that remaining permissions as of 1 April 2018 total 939 dwellings, and that the remaining capacity of the site in terms of the strategic allocation is 2,823 dwellings. The capacity of non-strategic allocations is reasonable and only requires slight adjustment in **MM10** from 940 dwellings to 926 dwellings to reflect factual matters.

170. Sites with planning permission excluding sites on HSG1 should be amended to 1 April 2018 which results in a negligible change from 2,144 dwellings to 2,148 dwellings which **MM10** would address. The submitted plan made a modest allowance for windfall sites at 121 dwellings. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 48 the Council has revisited the windfall evidence such that a reasonable allowance should only be made from 1 April 2021 onwards to avoid double counting. The forecast contribution of 247 dwellings from windfall sources over the last ten years of the plan period is soundly based and **MM10** would reflect this and ensure the Plan is positively prepared and consistent with national policy.

Non-implementation and a supply buffer for flexibility

171. There is little before me that permissions for major housing sites (10 or more dwellings) regularly lapse and are not renewed. Accordingly, the focus is on smaller sites and in the absence of extensive local monitoring a 10% non-implementation rate on sites of less than 10 dwellings should be applied. This needs to be made clearer and **MM10** would confirm it, which I recommend for effectiveness.

172. On submission the Plan included a 10% flexibility allowance within the housing requirement at Policy DS4. As set out above this approach would not be

sound given the need to focus on increasing the submitted housing requirement to address unmet need within the HMA. Consequentially, supply does need to be increased to meet the higher requirement but significant further buffers in supply for flexibility (for example at 10%) would not be justified or a basis for exceptional circumstances for further Green Belt alterations.

Shortfall since 2011 and trajectory going forward

173. There is little to explain the basis of the trajectory in the submitted plan. On this basis, I find it would be unsound in terms of how it is to be monitored, the basis on which future decision makers would be expected to assess supply and delivery and how the unmet need from Coventry feeds into a realistic trajectory.

174. The modified housing requirement of 14,060 would equate to a steady 703 dwellings per annum (dpa) over the plan period. The extent of Coventry's unmet need, however, was only established in 2015 and was largely confirmed in late 2017. On this basis it would not be justified or sound to measure delivery on a constant 703dpa. The most effective and justified approach would be to apply the Borough's OAN of 502 dwellings for the period from 2011 and for the step change in terms of Coventry unmet need to align with plan adoption and start from 2018/19. This is 4020 dwellings over 13 years which would result in an annual target of 812 dwellings per annum from 2018/19 onwards.

175. Since the start of the plan period there has been a 1,132 shortfall against this stepped trajectory amounting to persistent under-delivery. Consequently, a buffer of 20% should be applied (brought forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition. Recovering the shortfall within the next five years (the Sedgefield approach) would equate to 226 dpa which once a 20% buffer is applied would result in a need to deliver 1,245 dpa in years 1-5 post adoption. This would be an undeliverable and unsustainable step-change that would set up the plan to immediately fail, contrary to the Government's primary objective of a plan-led system.

176. The plan's strategy maintains a fine balance between meeting an unprecedented scale of need, making the most of sustainably located non-Green Belt land and altering the Green Belt to secure a sustainable pattern of development. To maximise sustainable outcomes, it is a strategy which relies on two strategic urban extensions to Nuneaton and a variety of sizeable Green Belt alterations. Most strategic allocations are not due to deliver until after plan adoption. Accordingly, the shortfall since 2011 should be spread over the remainder of the plan period (the Liverpool approach) so that it can be sustainably, and realistically, delivered.

177. I therefore conclude that for the Plan to be sound, it needs to apply a stepped trajectory and that the shortfall from 2011 is recovered over the remaining plan period. The revised trajectory at **MM11** and the updated explanatory text at **MM13** and **MM14** would do this and thus make the plan justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Would there be a deliverable 5-year supply on the updated evidence?

178. The total supply over the plan period (2011-2031) would be 14,608 equating to approximately 600 dwellings over the requirement. Within the remaining period 2018-2031 the supply equates to 12,226 and is profiled to deliver sooner rather than later. This results in a significant incremental increase over the next 3 years resulting in a peak period of supply in 2021/22-2023/24.

179. This requires a broad split of 60% from strategic sites, 15% from non-strategic sites and 25% from existing commitments and other sources. It is undoubtedly a challenge, but given the pent-up housing need, the Plan provides an opportunity for the market to concertedly respond to significantly boost supply to meet both the Borough's and a share of Coventry's needs.

180. The assessment of supply realistically recognises that some sites will require a lead-in time from plan adoption and as such are phased to deliver from 2020/21 onwards. The biggest challenge is the scale of combined delivery required from the two strategic sites at Nuneaton (HSG1 and HSG2). Reasonable individual trajectories for these sites were prepared (Appendices N & O of NBBC/33). The Council has provided cogent evidence that a realistic and reasonable approach has been taken to the trajectories for these strategic sites.

181. Given the length of the examination it has been necessary to update the housing land supply as of 1 April 2018 so that the Plan would be justified and effective. This was done in May 2018 [NBBC/63] and reveals that when making the various modifications, including applying a stepped trajectory and the Liverpool approach, the supply would be, at best, circa 5.4 years on plan adoption, without identifying any additional supply.

182. In examining this figure, I consider some caution needs to be applied to the fact that the plan is based on significant alterations to Green Belt that cannot come forward until plan adoption. Whilst I accept the Council's submission that preparatory parallel progress is being made on a number of Green Belt sites, it is nonetheless a risk. Additionally, as further discussion on Bedworth Woodlands as part of the February 2019 hearing has revealed the trajectory for this site will need to be readjusted back slightly [NBBC/86]. In bringing this all together, I find the May 2018 figure of 5.4 years is very likely to decrease, such that exceptional circumstances exist to consider additional supply to provide robustness to the plan and de-risk it from being out-of-date soon after adoption.

183. The application of the new NPPF is not a reason to revisit the profile of the land supply and delay adoption, for a Plan being examined under the transitional arrangements of the 2012 NPPF. In any event, the delivery of each of the proposed allocations has been scrutinised and adjusted accordingly in the 1 April 2018 supply update [NBBC/63v2], which was further updated in March 2019 [NBBC/86]. Overall, I find the Council's approach to forecasting delivery accords with recognised practices and applies reasonable assumptions.

Additional deliverable supply

Former Hawkesbury Golf Course (HSG12) (Proposed alteration to Green Belt)

184. This site did not form part of the proposed submission Plan but was presented in the accompanying SA as a reasonable alternative based on access and deliverability concerns. Those were addressed relatively early in the examination such that the Council was able to conclude in the Housing Topic Paper [NBBC/33] that there were no reasons why the site should not be allocated. This was formalised through SOCGs including with the highway authority [OTH/33&34].

185. The evidence in the Joint Green Belt Study 2015 and the Landscape Assessment provide a demonstration that the site makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt (Parcel BE4) by virtue of its man-made qualities as a restored mining site and subsequent golf course. The site is contained by existing development and to the east the Coventry Canal. Development here would not result in unrestricted sprawl, neighbouring settlements merging into one another or encroachment into the countryside. At a site-specific level, taken together with the strategic factors discussed above, there are exceptional circumstances to justify altering the Green Belt boundary.

186. In spatial terms it is sustainably located within the settlement hierarchy in Policy DS2 and is within reasonable walking and cycling distance of most day to day services and facilities and is directly adjacent to significant employment opportunities. Whilst schools within the Borough are some distance from the site they are not so far as to be considered remote from the site. There is a regular bus service that passes the site and more frequent bus services a short distance away on the B4113 Coventry Road. Importantly, the site offers an opportunity to provide a missing part of the Sustrans 52 cycle route linking Nuneaton, Bedworth and Coventry, including connections into Bedworth town centre and to the railway station. The site would contribute to a sustainable pattern of development.

187. The site has a capacity of at least 380 dwellings and would be capable of some delivery (c.125 dwellings) within the first five years [as per NBBC/72 and NBBC/86] providing further resilience. Consequently, the allocation of the site is necessary to make the plan sound in being positively prepared and would ensure the Plan is based on the most appropriate strategy.

188. I therefore recommend **MM20** to include the site in Policy DS5 as a strategic housing site for at least 380 dwellings and **MM28** to identify the site in Policy DS7 as a Green Belt alteration. **MM175** would be necessary to provide a site-specific policy for the allocation and supporting text to guide the implementation of policy. Following the February 2019 hearing session, I have amended the detailed wording of **MM175** for additional clarity, broadly in line with NBBC/82 on matters relating to infrastructure and mitigation. It does not alter the substance of the policy wording and supporting text consulted upon.

189. Having regard to the additional highway modelling of the Longford Road corridor, the assessment of the Blackhorse Road level crossing [OTH/33] and the assessment by the Exhall Residents Association [OTH/62] (and associated scrutiny by WCC in NBBC/74) the impact on the local highway network would

not be severe. There is a reasonable prospect that the forecast level crossing down times as a result of increased frequency of trains could be improved and that alternative means of the crossing the line could positively align with Network Rail's stated objective to reduce the number of level crossings. Even taking a worst-case scenario the barriers would remain open for a significant proportion of the day and the location would not be harmfully cut off.

190. The modifications to include HSG12 have brought criticisms of consistency in approach with the nearby former Hawkesbury tip site, given the Council signed a SOCG in May 2018 [OTH/57&58] which concluded with an agreement that the site is suitable for allocation. I must give appreciable weight to the signed SOCG and the updated SA analysis.

191. Militating against the allocation of the former tip site is the fact that the site is separated from settlement in the Borough and from proposals in the Coventry Local Plan by existing canals. The proposed primary access solution is to the east resulting in an unsustainably detached development. Additionally, given the condition of the former tip site and past activities on the site I have strong reservations it can make any meaningful contribution to five-year supply. As such I cannot share the agreed assessment in the SOCG and find greater weight should be given to the assessment (for site NUN123) in the 2011-2013 SHLAAs which reasonably discounted the site.

192. In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, there is a very real risk that without additional deliverable supply capacity, the May 2018 trajectory at 5.4 years of supply would be uncertain and very likely to be less. This provides the exceptional circumstances for the proposed inclusion of the former Hawkesbury Golf Course HSG12. This is illustrated by the latest March 2019 trajectory [NBBC/86] and commentary [NBBC/87] revealing a deliverable supply including HSG12 at approximately 5.3 years once a number of adjustments are made.

Contingencies

193. There is no requirement in national policy (or a prescribed figure) for a plan to contain a land supply buffer above and beyond the housing target although it is widely recognised that a reasonable supply contingency can assist in ensuring a plan-led approach. The revised trajectory at NBBC/86 would include a very modest buffer (a total supply of 14,608 over plan period against a requirement of 14,060). There are no reasonable options or exceptional circumstances, at this moment in time, to increase the buffer.

194. Should monitoring reveal that housing delivery has fallen below the trajectory then a number of interim measures are available prior to Plan review in line with the flexibility sought by paragraph 14 of the NPPF. These include proactive measures by the LPA to assist with delivery including, amongst other things, working with developers on funding bids, re-phasing larger schemes where this would assist with viability and helping to overcome site assembly and land acquisition issues. Where there is a need to deliver in the short term and there is not a deliverable supply, then the basic contingency may well be the release of additional sites. Where this is demonstrably necessary, the priority should be the redevelopment opportunities emerging in Nuneaton town centre and elsewhere at the edge of settlements in accordance with the

modified settlement hierarchy in Policy DS2. To formalise a positively prepared approach to monitoring housing delivery and stimulating action where necessary I recommend the measures outlined above are presented in a new Policy DS8 as set out in **MM29**. This modification would be necessary for effectiveness, positive preparation and consistency with national policy.

Conclusion on Issue 5

195. Subject to the MMs identified, including a stepped trajectory, meeting the shortfall over the plan period and the allocation of HSG12, I conclude that there would be a reasonable prospect of five years' worth of deliverable housing land on plan adoption. It would also set out the robust provision of developable housing land for the medium to long term.

Issue 6 – Whether the Plan provides appropriate measures to support a strong, competitive economy? Are the allocations of Green Belt land for employment justified by exceptional circumstances? Should other Green Belt allocations be made?

The wider economic strategy

196. The SHMAs employment growth calculations use forecasts from Cambridge Econometrics Local Economy Forecasting Model (LEFM). The Council's Employment Land Study [M7] is aligned to the LEFM figures of March 2015. Prior to this an alternative Oxford Economics model – the Nuneaton and Bedworth Forecasting Model (NBFM) had provided a forecast as of April 2014. Over the respective periods, the LEFM forecasts a growth of 2,360 full time equivalent (FTE) jobs and the NBFM forecasts 4,710 FTE jobs – equivalent to annual average growth rates of 0.35% and 0.7% respectively.

197. The forecasts are a starting point and are trend based. It needs to be recognised that development constraints and other economic trends may well have affected these projections. The ELS has applied the LEFM which is sound given it aligns with the SHMA and provides a tempered outlook for economic performance. On this basis it considers provision of around 70 ha of employment land (55-60ha for B8 and 10-15ha for B1/B2) would meet the forecast needs and strike the right balance between being aspirational and realistic.

198. In addition to the 70ha, the employment land study has found approximately 18ha of poorer employment land and building stock which should be replaced which would bring the overall requirement up to around 87ha to meet the Borough's needs. I find this figure robust and therefore sound. In terms of meeting this 87ha Borough requirement, there is already a supply of 23ha of retained commercial land including 14ha with planning permission for employment uses. The net balance to find through plan allocations would be 64ha which is a sound basis for meeting the Borough's own economic needs.

199. Regard also needs to be given to the Employment Land Memorandum of Understanding – July 2016 (ELMOU) prepared by the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Committee and signed by NBBC. The ELMOU seeks to ensure that the 714ha of employment land needed across the HMA is met including the shortfall of some 241 hectares of employment land to meet

Coventry's needs. The ELMOU redistributes this shortfall along the same lines as the housing need distribution recognising the degree of functional relationship. This results in a headline re-distribution to Nuneaton and Bedworth of 91 hectares as presented at Table C, paragraph 4.6.2 of the ELMOU.

200. Further analysis has been undertaken recognising the need to address the unemployment rate in the Borough (the highest in the HMA) and regeneration of parts of the employment base. This analysis also looked at evidence from the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) regarding the need for B8 warehousing particularly related to the motorway network and the demand for B2 general industry. Consequently, the ELMOU (Table E, paragraph 4.7.5) recalculates the proportion of Coventry's unmet need to Nuneaton and Bedworth at 26ha. Given the careful analysis undertaken and the factors influencing the sub-regional economy this distribution is justified.

201. The submitted Plan seeks to meet the Borough's own employment land requirement (87ha) but was only able to accommodate 16.6 ha of the Coventry shortfall, leaving it 9.4ha adrift of the agreed apportionment. This situation has not drawn significant duty to cooperate concerns, in part because other locations within the wider HMA are forecast to meet the shortfall through further over-provision of employment land. Additionally, forecasting employment land is subject to numerous variables which require a degree of caution. Consequently, the submitted shortfall of 9.4ha at approximately 8% of the Borough's overall requirement is unlikely to impede local or sub-regional economic growth in the short term.

202. Notwithstanding the Plan's general conformity with the ELMOU there remains some concern, including from the LEP and others, that the Plan lacks the required ambition and alignment with the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan (CWSEP) and the wider SEP for the West Midlands Combined Authority. I note the aim of the CWSEP is to improve the economy by employing 94,500 additional people over the period 2014-2030. This equates to about 5,900 net annual jobs every year. This is significantly above the Cambridge Econometrics forecasts applied in the SHMA, which in turn have informed the Council's Employment Land Study. Intrinsically, LEPs want to be ambitious and encouraging of their local economy, however, I am unaware that other Plans in the HMA have departed from the evidence base and review of employment growth assumptions used to derive future jobs in the SHMA. Given the variabilities that inform employment projections the prudent outlook used to inform the SHMA would allow for relatively steady employment growth in the Borough.

203. The Plan constructively proposes strategic employment land allocations around Bermuda Park to the south of Nuneaton that would be well-connected to the M6 and the LEP's investment in the Coventry to Nuneaton rail service (NUCKLE 1). I have also taken account of the proposed employment land releases around Junction 3 of the M6 to the south of the Borough. All of these sites require Green Belt alterations and are of sufficient scale to meet the LEP's objective. The scope to do more is very limited. Overall, the employment land requirement in the Plan would proactively support economic development in a way which is aspirational but realistic.

204. The NPPF at paragraph 21 requires Local Plans to have a clear economic strategy. The submitted Plan aligns with the Council's Economic Development Strategy (EDS) and recognises that issues facing the local economy include poor accessibility to some employment locations by non-car modes, significant levels of out-commuting, a declining manufacturing base and limited knowledge-based jobs, lowest household earnings in Warwickshire, and a need to improve skills. Additional text is needed to explain how the spatial strategy and strategic employment allocations appropriately respond to the EDS and CWSEP and so deliver the economic vision for the Borough. Consequently, I recommend **MM8**, **MM12** and **MM25** for plan effectiveness.

205. As submitted the Plan is ambiguous in respect of the requirement at NPPF paragraph 21 to identify particular strategic sites for local and inward investment as sought by the LEP. On this basis I find the submitted Plan would be inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound. The Bermuda Park area at the south of Nuneaton is already a key centre for employment, connected by the new Bermuda Park rail station and by the A444 to the M6. Policy DS6 should identify that the wider Bermuda Park area including proposed allocations at EMP1 and EMP4 is an employment location of regional significance. **MM24** would do this and I recommend it accordingly.

General approach to Employment land

206. The employment land studies from 2014 onwards and SA at Section 4 (from paragraph 4.1.66 onwards) have examined reasonable options to meet the need for additional employment land. The proposed sites are, in general terms, deliverable and have been assessed for potential market attractiveness. The latest ELS complies with NPPF paragraph 22 in that the plan does not seek to protect employment sites that no longer have a reasonable prospect of providing employment. On submission, this work has identified through existing supply and potential sites an overall employment land supply of 103ha.

207. With exception of EMP5, the submitted employment sites would require alteration to the Green Belt. At a strategic level it is evident that there is insufficient sustainably located non-Green Belt land to accommodate the overall requirement for homes, jobs and services. In relation to the local economy, this is brought into focus given that Green Belt correlates to the location of land around existing strategic employment hubs south of Nuneaton and north of Coventry, including along the M6 corridor. In terms of the objectives for economic regeneration, addressing unemployment and improving accessibility to jobs by public transport these can only be served by looking at land options close to Nuneaton and Bedworth. Therefore, these strategic factors, when taken together with the shortfall in employment land provision identified above, demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to alter Green Belt boundaries to ensure the local economy is supported.

208. As set out above, meeting future employment needs will require land on existing employment sites and already consented land as examined through the ELS and the summary of outputs at Table 11 of the plan. Policy E1 would support employment proposals on these sites but as submitted the wording would be likely to unintentionally restrict development including potentially onerous SPD requirements on inward investment and density standards.

Various restructuring and wording changes to the policy would make it effective and I recommend these as set out in **MM134** and **MM136**. It also needs to be clear that these sites to be protected and supported for employment uses through Policy E1 are shown on the Policies Map and I recommend **MM137** accordingly.

209. There is a recognition that more could be done to encourage tourism as part of the local economy. The submitted plan focuses on tourism in town centres only but should be more positively prepared to support appropriately located tourism proposals elsewhere in the Borough. **MM135** would do this in Policy E1 and I recommend it for effectiveness.

210. In terms of flexibility, Policy E2 recognises that through the ELS process there are some existing employment sites where alternative uses would be suitable in-principle. However, the Policy as submitted would not be effective in terms of managing non-employment uses at these locations and ensuring the local economy would not be unduly harmed. **MM138** and **MM140** would provide additional clarity in the policy in terms of ensuring this employment land resource is not unnecessarily lost including details on marketing requirements, the potential for mixed-use schemes and that any affected or displaced businesses are appropriately taken into consideration. **MM139** would recognise that an area at School Lane, Bedworth should also be considered against Policy E2. These MMs would make the policy justified and effective and I recommend them accordingly.

Nuneaton Employment Sites

211. As the principal settlement in the hierarchy at Policy DS2 it is crucial that additional employment is directed to Nuneaton. This is necessary to improve rates of economic activity and skills but also to redress the disparity with economic performance and average earnings compared to southern parts of the HMA. The submitted Plan responds accordingly through the employment land allocations proposed.

212. The strategy for delivering additional employment land in Nuneaton involves further land releases to the south of the town. There are sound reasons for doing this including good proximity to established and planned residential areas in terms of accessing work by modes of transport other than the car (including via Bermuda Park station), good access afforded by the A444 including its direct link to the M6 Junction 3 and Coventry; the ability to create critical mass with neighbouring employment sites; and the potential to limit commercial traffic volumes through the town centre.

EMP1 - Faultlands (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

213. The principal site to the south of Nuneaton is the Faultlands site (EMP1) to the east of the A444 Griff roundabout which would provide for 26ha of land for B1, B2 and B8 uses. The scale of the site means it is a strategic employment site, capable of coming forward as a high-quality site, and meeting the needs of the growing logistics sector, amongst others.

214. In terms of its current Green Belt status, the site comprises farmland and restored former quarry land and the existing farm buildings at Faultands. Power lines bisect the site and the busy B4113 Coventry Road and Gipsy Lane

roads form the western and southern boundaries respectively. Immediately to the south of the site is the Griff Quarry (granite). The Coventry Canal is to the east and to the north the Griff Hollows LWS with housing beyond. Gipsy Lane provides a very clear and readily recognisable boundary that would provide a new permanent southern edge to Nuneaton. A meaningful degree of Green Belt separation between Nuneaton and Bedworth would be preserved. In terms of its assessment against the purposes of Green Belt, the site is part of wider parcel N5 which scores moderately in the Joint Green Belt Study. However, at a site-specific level there would not be unrestricted sprawl or significant encroachment into the wider countryside as described above. Consequently, site-specific exceptional circumstances would exist, together with strategic considerations identified under Issue 2 above, to alter the Green Belt boundary here.

215. There would be no adverse impact on the geological Griff Hill Quarry SSSI in the south-west corner of the site as confirmed in correspondence from Natural England[17] given the intention to de-notify that part of the SSSI within the proposed allocation. **MM115** would reflect this and remove the need for associated mitigation. There are local environmental designations in proximity to the site including the Griff Hollows LWS, the Coventry Canal and the Wem Brook. Generally, the policy follows the evidence contained in the 2016 Ecology and Geodiversity Assessment [F8.3] however further clarity and specificity is required. **MM107-109** would introduce necessary clarifications on landscape buffer and ecological mitigation and I recommend them so that the plan would be justified and effective.

216. The STA demonstrates that the site can be safely accessed from a new signalised junction on the B4113 Coventry Road and this has been modelled to operate well within capacity by 2031. **MM104, MM103** and **MM98** would clarify that the site would also make proportionate contributions to the A444 corridor and Gipsy Lane improvements respectively. A significant factor that supports the inclusion of this site is its connectivity by means other than the car including regular buses along the B4113, the nearby Bermuda Park station and foot and cycle access to adjacent residential areas. It would be a sustainably located site. **MM99** would clarify the need for proportionate contributions to a cycle link to Bermuda Park Station. Given the proximity of bus stops at the edge of the site a requirement to fund bus services into the site would not be justified and so **MM101** and **MM102** are necessary.

217. The site has been appraised as part of the heritage assessment of the Plan [J7.1]. Faultlands Farm on the site is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset. Notwithstanding the area's links to the author George Eliot, there is little evidence of an associated heritage significance such that the harm from total loss of the farm buildings would be no more than moderate. This harm would be substantially outweighed by the significant wider public benefit arising from high quality employment in an area where skilled jobs are keenly needed. The requirement in the submitted policy for the scale of development to take reference from the farmstead buildings would not be justified and **MM110** would necessarily remove it.

[17] Appendix 2 in document OTH/32 Statement of Common Ground between NBBC and The Arbury Estate – dated 31 August 2016.

218. The policy addresses the setting of the adjacent canal but as submitted includes aspects of detail which would not be justified and would reduce flexibility in bringing the site forward and therefore would not be sound. An over-arching criterion within the policy to require development proposals to address the Canal would strike the appropriate balance between respecting and preserving its setting but also ensuring development does not turn its back on this significant asset. Additionally, the Policy should be strengthened to emphasise development proposals need to positively respond to the landscape and ecological value of the Canal. **MM111**-**MM114** would do this and I recommend them for justification and effectiveness.

219. It is proposed to utilise the Turnover Bridge across the canal as a foot and cycle link from residential allocation HSG3 to the east, and then through site EMP1 westwards to Bermuda Park. This would form a desirable and direct off-road route which would have a positive role in reducing dependency on the car. There is legitimacy to the concerns that the Turnover Bridge, as a heritage asset, may not in safety terms be a feasible option, subject to further detailed analysis. As such the Plan as submitted is unsound in assuming this to be the case. Accordingly, I recommend **MM100** for effectiveness to require a crossing over the canal such that if the Turnover Bridge is not technically feasible then an alternative bridge provision will be made. I have amended the wording of **MM100** to ensure consistency with MM56 for the adjoining HSG3 site and to include navigational safety as a consideration should an alternative bridge be required.

EMP4 – Coventry Road (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

220. The site is partly in the Green Belt sandwiched between the railway line and commercial development to the west and Coventry Road and housing to the north and east. To the south is Griff Hollows with an official Gypsy and Traveller site beyond. The site performs lowly in terms of the purposes of Green Belt as evidenced in the Joint Green Belt Study (Parcel N6) and is in large part already subsumed within the urban fabric of this part of Nuneaton. Elements of the northern part of the site are previously developed.

221. In terms of exceptional circumstances, the path along Griff Hollows currently forms a clear, readily recognisable boundary. Given the extent of surrounding development, the development of the site in line with the allocation would not represent unchecked sprawl, encroachment into open countryside or result in any merging between Nuneaton and Bedworth. Employment use of the site would be well-related to existing homes and jobs and adjacent to Bermuda Park station and bus routes, thus positively contributing to a sustainable pattern of development. Consequently, there are exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundary here.

222. The site was designated as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) in 2014 and is known as the Griff Hollow Quarry LWS. The site was identified for survey in the Ecology and Geodiversity Assessment (EGA) 2014 [document F6] and various recommendations presented in the 2016 EGA [document F8.3, page 4]. Analysis of the site concluded that the northern part has less overall ecological value and development here could be supported in tandem with enhancements to the southern part of the site adjacent to the Griff Hollows LWS. This mitigation is important as assessed in the SA report for this site which

concludes (based on the 2016 EGA) that short term negative effects are neutralised and improved over time once mitigation and connectivity has been implemented.

223. Accordingly, I recommend **MM119** which would insert a new criterion into the Policy which would maintain habitat connectivity in the southern part of the site, including maintaining an open corridor, and **MM120** to amend the key development principles for the site to also include a requirement for biodiversity offsetting. Accordingly, I also recommend **MM122** to make clear the net capacity of the site is approximately 8.6ha to indicate not all of the site would be developable.

EMP5 Caldwell Road

224. During the course of the examination planning permission was granted on appeal[18] for residential development on the proposed employment allocation at Caldwell Road in Nuneaton. At 0.6 ha in size its de-allocation would not undermine the delivery of the employment strategy in the Plan. It would not be justified or effective to retain the site for employment uses. Accordingly, I recommend **MM23** and **MM123** to remove the allocation from the Plan.

Bedworth Employment Sites

EMP6 School Lane (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

225. This site is a modest allocation of some 2ha which has been presented in the Plan as part of the adjoining larger HSG6 housing allocation to the west. The site is bounded by the B4113 Coventry Road and employment uses to the east and M6 to the south. The site is Green Belt but due to its location and the extent of urbanising influences around it, it is part of a poorly performing parcel (BE5) in the Joint Green Belt Study.

226. In terms of altering the Green Belt here the proposed allocation would utilise clear, readily recognisable and permanent boundaries. As an enclosed parcel of land between the M6 and built development, the allocation would not result in harmful encroachment into countryside. Development would, in combination with site HSG6, result in a continuous built-up frontage along the western part of Coventry Road but the reality is that there is already a strong blurring of Bedworth and Coventry due to the continuous built-up frontage to the east of the B4113 opposite this site. The brief gap provided by the site is weakened by the dominance of the elevated M6, the pylons and enclosure from adjoining development. EMP6 would not result in the sort of harmful merging of neighbouring towns which national policy in the NPPF seeks to avoid.

227. The site is well connected to the M6 via the B4113 Longford Road and notwithstanding local survey work [OTH/62], EMP6 has been appropriately modelled in the STA without adverse impacts. It is within walking and cycling distance of large parts of Bedworth and directly adjacent the bus corridor, including existing bus stops, on the B4113. It is a sustainably located site for

[18] APP/W3710/W/17/3182644

which there is no credible evidence of harm to highway safety. It would form part of a sustainable pattern of development.

228. Taking all of these site-specific factors, together with strategic considerations discussed under Issue 2 above, there are the exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundary to facilitate needed employment development.

EMP7 Bowling Green Lane (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

229. As the 2016 Employment Land and 2015 Joint Green Belt studies illustrate, there are limited options for strategic employment land releases at Bedworth even though its proximity to the M6 and Coventry are significant attractors for investment in new jobs. The Plan proposes a single large site at Bowling Green Lane to the south-west of the town in the Green Belt. In terms of strategic exceptional circumstances, the site at 26ha, would be a strategic site capable of accommodating larger premises. The site would also be highly visible from the M6, which the evidence base and LEP identifies as a key factor for attracting investment.

230. In many perspectives the site is not part of any wider, open countryside. It is a reasonably contained site where development would not represent unrestricted sprawl. The M6 to the south and Bowling Green Lane to the east provide clear, readily recognisable and permanent boundaries. Open countryside to the south of the M6 would maintain separation with Ash Green. The openness of the shallow valley of the River Sowe to the east would also be maintained.

231. Bowling Green Lane is well-related to large residential areas of Bedworth west of the A444 and within walkable and cycling distance from Ash Green. Buses already pass near the site and the submitted policy requires contributions to bus services and infrastructure. There is scope to improve cycle connections to the area, including from Bedworth town centre and this would be necessarily confirmed in Policy EMP7 by **MM125**, which I recommend for effectiveness. Overall, it would contribute to a sustainable pattern of development. Bringing this all together, I find there would be exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundary here.

232. Whilst the site has a good profile from the M6, access would involve utilising the road network to the south of Bedworth. The STA work demonstrates a need to enhance the capacity of the B4113 Longford Road and School Lane junction to facilitate this site and the Plan recognises the need for this site to contribute to highway mitigation identified through the STA. To enable both EMP7 and HSG6 to come forward, improvements to capacity on School Lane, including land currently outside of the public highway, would be required. The submitted Plan is largely silent on this and therefore unsound. To remedy this additional policy content clarifying that further land will be required to facilitate improvements along School Lane is proposed in **MM124** and I recommend it for effectiveness.

233. Appreciable volumes of additional traffic would be generated along School Lane, but it is already a relatively busy suburban road that connects the northern fringes of Coventry to Bedworth. The living conditions of residents on this road would not be significantly harmed including in relation to air quality as demonstrated in the updated air quality assessment [G5]. The

existing carriageway is of reasonable width and could be realigned or widened along the frontage of the HSG6 site. In principle, School Lane would provide an appropriate route for access to this site, subject to a new junction with Bowling Green Lane/Church Lane.

234. Given the location of primary and secondary schools in the area additional text in the policy on implementing an HGV routing strategy via School Lane only would be necessary for soundness. Any wider HGV ban or weight limit restriction would be a separate traffic regulation matter. Through the modified policy, the requirement is on the development to demonstrate what measures it will put in place to ensure HGV traffic avoids Goodyers End and Ash Green. Accordingly, I recommend **MM124** for Plan effectiveness.

235. To the south east of the site is Exhall Hall which comprises a Scheduled Ancient Monument and listed buildings. Having regard to the comprehensive Heritage Assessment of the NBBP [J7.1, p220] the setting of the heritage assets is to some degree compromised by the elevated concrete M6 junction 3 immediately to the south, the pylons that pass directly over the Hall and the dilapidated modern farm buildings at Hall Farm. The harm of the proposed allocation on the setting of these heritage assets would be negligible and significantly outweighed by the significant benefits of employment creation. In light of the SOCG with Historic England additional text should be added to EMP7 to manage development closest to the heritage assets and I recommend **MM126** with a slight amendment to clarify that the issue is managing the scale of development as per the evidence at paragraph 22.5.1 (2nd bullet point) of the Heritage Assessment.

Employment/Mixed-Use Sites on the Coventry Fringe

EMP2 – Pickards Way[19] (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

236. The site is situated on the south-east quadrant to Junction 3 of the M6 and at 18ha is of the strategic size needed for modern businesses. Whilst employment land to the south has taken time to come to fruition and has evolved to become a quasi-retail area it is, however, a smaller area than EMP2 and does not have the same profile to the M6. The size and location of EMP2 has been tested through the ELS work and is the sort of site supported by the LEP as being necessary to meet forecast employment growth. The site is well-related to the edge of Coventry and would form part of a sustainable pattern of development in accordance with the modified spatial hierarchy in Policy DS2.

237. The site forms part of a patchwork of fields bounded by the A444 to the west, housing to the east, employment development to the south and the elevated M6 to the north. It is not a tranquil area or readily interpreted as part of a wider area of countryside. From my observations on site, including from the public footpaths across it, the Joint Green Belt Study is robust that the host parcel (BE5) performs relatively poorly in terms of the purposes of Green Belt.

238. The proposed allocation would be contained by the existing physical features described above and the A444 to the west would form a clear, recognisable and permanent new boundary to Green Belt. The degree of encroachment

[19] Described as 'Phoenix Way/Wilson Lane' on plan submission.

into countryside would be limited and the allocation would not result in unrestricted sprawl or result in the merging of Longford with Ash Green. There would remain a good degree of separation to Neal's Green (even when taking site NUN286/317 into account) and Ash Green to the west. EMP2 would, in a modest way, consolidate the extent of development along the B4113 corridor but I do not find it harmful to the purposes of Green Belt which are already weak at this urban location. Overall, there are exceptional circumstances, at both the strategic and site specific levels, to alter the Green Belt boundary at this location.

239. The STA outputs show that the site, at a strategic level, is acceptable in highway safety terms. The housing element of the allocation would have separate access onto Wilson's Lane which is a residential area. The allocation would be accessible by walking and cycling from southern parts of Bedworth and Longford, and close to the Sustrans Cycle Route N52. The nearby B4113 is a bus corridor between Bedworth and Coventry and some buses ply the adjacent Wilson's Lane. The new railway station at the Ricoh Arena and bus facilities are approximately 1 mile to the south of the site which moderately enhances its connectivity. The site would be sustainably connected.

240. Within the wider EMP2 allocation it is proposed to accommodate 73 dwellings at the eastern fringes of the site adjacent to existing housing at Longford. This would be logical given access can be suitably achieved from Wilsons Lane as modelled in the STA. Given the level of housing need identified, together with the site-specific reasons set out above, there are exceptional circumstances for a modest amount of housing here, through an altered Green Belt boundary in accordance with the fourth tier of Policy DS2. As submitted the housing section of the policy does not identify the full infrastructure requirements and is therefore unsound. **MM116** would insert a new criterion seeking a contribution to primary medical care and I recommend it so that the Plan is justified.

EMP3 – Prologis Extension (proposed alteration to Green Belt)

241. In earlier iterations of the Plan it was proposed to include employment land to provide an extension to the strategic employment area at Prologis Park, Keresley (a cross-boundary site with Coventry City). Concerns relating to its Local Wildlife Site (LWS) status and regarding Great Crested Newts led to its removal from the Publication Plan. However, in light of the recent de-designation of the site as a LWS[20] and the detailed mitigation strategy prepared by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, upon which Natural England have been consulted, I am satisfied that the specific environmental issues can be satisfactorily mitigated. This is presented in a SOCG signed by both NBBC and directly neighbouring Coventry City Council.

242. At the time of plan submission, there was a modest shortfall against the employment land requirement identified in the Coventry and Warwickshire ELMOU for the Borough (including meeting unmet need for land for Coventry). Against this backdrop, there is a need to consider the release of additional land in the Borough to support the wider Coventry economy and the reasonable prospect of providing jobs to residents in the Borough. At a

[20] March 2017 following a Habitat Biodiversity Audit Panel

strategic level this provides the necessary exceptional circumstances to consider altering the Green Belt. This site would make a useful contribution to meeting those unmet needs.

243. Reference has been made to undeveloped land and vacant premises on Prologis Park but on the whole Prologis Park is a vibrant and healthy strategic employment site. The Council's ELR reasonably takes into account existing land supply and demonstrates a clear, strong residual need for additional, deliverable employment land.

244. The 5.3ha site is contained, bounded by strong landscaping to the north along Exhall Road, industrial units to the south at Prologis Park and housing to the west at Keresley. The site forms a logical extension to the employment development on this former colliery site. The site would not represent an encroachment into open countryside or result in the merging of Keresley and Ash Green or more widely with Bedworth. Exhall Road would provide a clear, defensible and permanent boundary for Green Belt. Accordingly, at the local level, exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt to allow this site to be allocated.

245. The proximity of the LWS to the east of the site and the small pond on-site would not preclude development. Both can be addressed through the new policy EMP3 proposed in **MM117** and the strategic development principles in Policy SA1 in terms of requiring mitigation.

246. Given the clear and pressing need for employment development, the resolution of site-specific environmental issues, the demonstration of exceptional circumstances in relation to altering the Green Belt and the ability of this site to form a logical extension to the successful regeneration of the former Coventry Colliery site, the inclusion of this site as an employment allocation would be justified to ensure the Plan is sound. I therefore recommend the site is allocated as EMP3 for 5.3 hectares for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses together with key development principles to secure sustainable development and supporting text to assist implementation of the policy. This would make the Plan justified, effective and positively prepared I recommend **MM1**, **MM22**, **MM27, MM28** and **MM117** on this basis.

Overall Supply of Employment Land

247. On submission the Plan sought to allocate 103 hectares of employment land within an overall requirement for 113 ha. Netting the difference between the loss of 0.5ha at EMP5 in Nuneaton and the additional of 5.3ha at Prologis Park, Keresley the revised supply figure would be 107.8ha. Whilst the land supply of 107.8ha is below the 113ha requirement set out in the ELMOU there is very little evidence that the wider sub-regional economy would be adversely affected by this shortfall. I am satisfied that the land supply is justified as being what could be sustainably delivered when taking account of the existing constraints within the Borough. I therefore recommend policy DS4 on development needs and associated monitoring targets are amended to the 107.8ha figure through **MM9, MM15, MM19** and **MM26** in order for the Plan to be justified and effective.

248. The Plan contains an employment land trajectory which shows significant take up in the years immediately following plan adoption. There is some doubt

about the realism of this although it seems clear that the principal demand is for larger, strategic sites which require Green Belt alterations confirmed on Plan adoption. There is already evidence of positive latent demand for employment land in the Borough as demonstrated by a submitted planning application on site EMP1[21]. The profile of the employment land trajectory needs to reflect that examination has taken longer than envisaged and to smooth out early, high rates of delivery. **MM16** and **MM17** would present the basis for a more realistic trajectory and I recommend them for Plan effectiveness.

Conclusion on Issue 6

249. Subject to the proposed modifications set out above I find the overall strategy of the Plan to support the local economy and the proposed sites and employment policies to deliver it to be justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with national policy, and therefore sound.

Issue 7 - Is the Plan's approach to the natural environment, including Air Quality and Flood Risk, soundly based?

Policies on Natural Environment

250. As submitted Policy NE1 covers the broad matter of 'Green Infrastructure' and appropriately responds to the evidence in, amongst other sources, the comprehensive Nuneaton and Bedworth Landscape Capacity Study 2017 [T13], the Nuneaton and Bedworth Green Infrastructure Plan 2009 [W3] and the Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull Sub-Regional Green Infrastructure Strategy 2013 [W6]. Given the significant scale of development proposed in the Borough Policy NE1 is vital in securing an appropriate dividend of natural and semi-natural green space to support biodiversity, human well-being, flood management and cultural heritage. A number of proposed allocations present key opportunities to secure meaningful green infrastructure in accordance with Policy NE1.

251. Policy NE1 on submission requires development proposals that affect watercourses to provide an 8-metre easement. As worded, this would not be effective and therefore not sound. The policy needs to be clarified that the 8-metre specification would be in relation to watercourses classified as Main River and introduce flexibility for other watercourses. **MM157** would do this and I recommend slightly amended wording, as advised by the Environment Agency in their Main Modification consultation response, for effectiveness.

252. As submitted Policy NE2 is ambiguous with criterion (d) inferring that new developments would address existing open space deficiencies. As such Policy NE2 on this point would not be justified or consistent with national policy, which requires infrastructure to be directly related to the development and would be unsound. **MM158** would amend criterion (d) thus ensuring the policy would be consistent with national policy. Additionally, for effectiveness the policy should clarify that open space, other than children's play or sports pitches, could multi-function as flood storage where appropriate (as referenced in the PPG[22] and Section 11.8 of the Level 2 SFRA) and **MM159** would

[21] LPA ref 034901
[22] PPG Paragraph 7-051-20150323

introduce this. **MM160** would clarify that community parks would be part of wider Green Belt alterations proposed in the Plan and I recommend it for effectiveness.

253. Policy NE3 sets out the general approach to biodiversity and geodiversity including mitigation and where necessary compensation. This has been informed by, amongst other things, a comprehensive Ecology and Geodiversity Assessment (EGA) in 2016 [F8.1-F8.3]. As submitted the policy recognises the ecological hierarchy but lacks specificity in relation to international and national sites and is therefore unsound. **MM161** would introduce additional text in the policy giving clearer protection to the SAC site and SSSIs and I recommend it for effectiveness and consistency with national policy. In respect of local sites, policy NE3 includes duplication which affects policy effectiveness. **MM162** would address this and I recommend it accordingly.

Air Quality

254. There are two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the north of Nuneaton town centre. The A47 Leicester Road Gyratory AQMA designated in 2007 and the B4114 Midland Road to Corporation Street AQMA designated in 2009[23]. Both are located on arterial road routes where they pass through more compact densities of development. Both are designated for exceedances of the Nitrogen Dioxide (NO^2) annual mean objective of 40µg/m^3. In 2011 the Council produced an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) [NBBC/27] which identified measures the Council would take to improve air quality and the significant partnership role with Warwickshire County Council (WCC) as the transport and highway authority.

255. The Council has commissioned and maintained a proportionate assessment and analysis of air quality in the Borough in terms of understanding both existing air quality issues and the associated effects of the NBBP. A specific air quality update and screening assessment was prepared in 2015 [NBBC/26] by Air Quality Consultants (AQC). As proposals in the Plan and associated traffic modelling through the S-Paramics model in the STA evolved, AQC prepared an updated air quality assessment issued in early 2017 [G5]. As the examination has progressed and further data has become available, AQC prepared an updated Air Quality Assessment in March 2018 [NBBC/55] which includes the updated housing requirement. Examining the scope, content and methodology of these assessments, they are competent and consistent with what is required by the NPPF and PPG. There has also been appropriate synergy between the outputs of the STA traffic modelling and the air quality assessments.

256. In terms of SEA and SA, scoping of the environmental baseline of the Borough lists relevant policies and programmes (Appendix 1, Table 1 of SA Scoping Report [D5]) including air quality assessments and the AQAP. Further updates to SA were able to reflect on the outputs of the subsequent Air Quality Assessments prepared for the Council. Air quality is reflected in SA objectives 14 and 15 and in turn Objective 7 and other policies of the Plan, including Policy HS2 on Strategic Accessibility and Sustainable Transport which requires development proposals to address potential impacts on AQMAs. It is also

[23] Both at a time of Euro III emissions standard

noteworthy that Policy BE3 also requires major residential development to minimise potential for pollution, including air. As such the submitted Plan would appropriately respond to Action 7 of the AQAP in terms of the role of the Borough Plan in improving air quality.

257. The evidence shows that there are other locations where concentrations of NO^2 would increase as the result of the scale of planned growth[24] although not in exceedance of the 40µg/m^3 objective. Not recognising this would not be sound. Accordingly, Objective 7 should be modified as per **MM3** to recognise there are locations, other than AQMAs, where air quality needs to be carefully considered. I have amended the wording of **MM3** slightly to provide clarity.

258. The AQAP emphasises that traffic management through and around Nuneaton town centre and modal shift more generally are central planks to any strategy to improve air quality in the AQMAs. Table 9 of the AQAP shows improving traffic flows and vehicle emissions standards as having the highest impact. In terms of the evidence, whilst HGVs and buses are a relatively small proportion of the traffic flow in the AQMAs they are disproportionately large contributors to Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) and in turn NO^2. More generally, the AQMAs were designated at a time when the emissions standard was Euro III. During the Plan period the emissions standard has moved to Euro VI so that by the end of the plan period these standard vehicles will form the majority of vehicles on the road. I recognise that there is some scepticism around emissions standards, but this is addressed in the latest 2018 AQC assessment at paragraphs 4.10-4.11 including the move away from laboratory testing to 'Real Driving Emissions'. On this basis it is reasonable to assume that the continuing decrease of older vehicles on the road network will reduce emissions, and diesel cars and vans registered for approval since 2017, will generate even lower emissions as more stringent controls apply (as per paragraph 4.12 of NBBC/55). It is also reasonable to assume an increasing transition to hybrid and fully electric vehicles. The West Midlands Low Emission Bus Delivery Plan 2016 [OTH/35] seeks to guide and support the transition of the West Midlands bus fleet towards zero or low emissions over the period to 2035.

259. In broad terms, the modelling applied in the air quality assessments of the Plan (set out in section 3 and Appendix A3 of NBBC/55) applies recognised modelling using latest toolkits published by DEFRA and subjected to a model verification process. Overall, I find the Council's approach and evidence base to accord with the PPGs advice that it should be proportional to the nature and scale of development proposed and the level of concern about air quality.

260. I have taken into account the measures put in place by the Council to monitor air quality in the AQMAs and in particular the detail presented in the 2017 Air Quality Annual Status Report at Section 3.1 and appendices C and D on the methodology (including quality assurance) and location of diffusion tube monitoring. There has not been any systemic attempt to evade monitoring or produce poor and potentially misleading findings. In this regard I must rely to some degree on DEFRA in terms of the adequacy of data capture and the status report of February 2017 [NBBC/48] which recommended the revocation

[24] The Borough Model in NBBC/55 identifies 10 locations with adverse increases.

of the Leicester Road Gyratory AQMA and noted only marginal exceedances in the Midland Road/Corporation Street AQMA.

261. With regards to a more precautionary approach, the modelling undertaken to inform the 2017 and 2018 AQC assessments takes a prudent approach including the application of the latest Defra Emission Factor Toolkit. This is further exemplified in vehicle emissions and modelling assuming 'canyon' conditions (explained at Section A3 of NBBC/55), which has the potential at certain locations to over-estimate likely concentrations. I also note that although the automatic monitoring station was decommissioned at the end of 2016 at the Leicester Road gyratory AQMA and the AQMA itself has been recommended for revocation[25], this has not yet been enacted and the Council continues to monitor the location. This adds to the picture of a precautionary approach being taken.

262. Whilst there is emerging evidence which submits that air pollution could be impacting on areas like educational attainment and cognitive behaviour, there is an insufficient basis in respect of the Borough to restrict development or introduce additional policy controls on new development. The threshold of 40μg/m^3 remains the basis for assessing the Plan's impact on air quality as set out at paragraph 124 of the NPPF which requires compliance with and contributions towards the EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants.

263. In terms of the AQAP, traffic management measures[26], particularly around Nuneaton town centre, and measures through the Local Transport Plan to promote walking and cycling[27], including as part of new developments, would add further effectiveness in addressing air quality. A successful bid to the LEP as part of the Growth Deal to develop the Transforming Nuneaton Town Centre scheme has potential to improve traffic flows around the town centre. Further funding has been sought from the National Productivity and Investment Fund for improvements on the A47 in Nuneaton including improved pedestrian and cycling routes and removal of the redundant railway bridge at the eastern end of the Leicester Road gyratory AQMA. More widely, travel plans, and working towards the 15% modal shift in Policy HS2 (and in particular reducing single-occupancy car travel), would also have a role to play in reducing the number of car journeys. The proposed development strategy and proposed location of allocations offers the most appropriate strategy to facilitate modal shift in terms of aligning to the bus and rail corridors south of Nuneaton towards Coventry, including capitalising on the recent NUCKLE1 investment.

264. As submitted, I find, on important points of detail, however, Policy HS2 would not be sound in relation to air quality. It needs to be modified to recognise that proposals with transport implications need to consider their impact on air quality not just in relation to AQMAs but to other locations where the evidence indicates there would be concentrations close to the thresholds in the national objectives. A more flexible approach in Policy HS2 would also enable proposals to be assessed against any updates to national and local standards on air quality. Additionally, the policy should be more positively prepared to

[25] Section 2.1 of 2017 Air Quality Annual Status Report (NBBC/47)
[26] As identified in the 2017 Air Quality Annual Status Report, WCC in considering the implications of growth in the Plan through the STA have identified a number of transport schemes in Nuneaton town centre which are in the IDP.
[27] NBBC/49

state support for the provision of infrastructure which would assist air quality, such as electric vehicle charging points.

265. Furthermore, it is important to recognise that the Borough is seen as part of a pan-regional effort across the wider West Midlands to improve air quality. In this regard it would be justified to modify Policy HS2 to require proposals to accord with the West Midlands Transport Emissions Framework (WMMTEF) and its associated policies. A similar approach has been found sound in other Plans in the HMA. Given the policies and proposals of the Borough Plan are part of the actions to deliver the AQAP this should be referenced in the Plan for effectiveness. **MM145, MM147-MM150** would introduce these air quality related modifications into Policy HS2 and I recommend them accordingly.

Flood Risk

266. The Plan is informed by a Level 1 2008 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) [N1] which was augmented by a Level 2 SFRA in 2012 which was subsequently updated in 2016 [N5], including further assessment of potential canal inundation. I note the Environment Agency's concerns regarding the absence of further assessment following updated climate change modelling but note their pragmatism in getting an updated Plan in place, which is the reasonable approach to take. The proposed allocated sites largely avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3, although Gipsy Lane, Nuneaton (HSG3) contains parts of the Wem Brook floodplain and there are limited parts of North of Nuneaton (HSG1) where the Change Brook forms a tributary to the River Anker. The capacities of both sites can be achieved without developing land in areas of higher flood risk in accordance with the precautionary approach in Policy NE4 which requires more detailed flood risk assessments.

267. Clarity is needed in Policy NE4 to ensure land required for current and future flood management is safeguarded, and that account is taken of WCCs advice as a statutory consultee in its capacity as Local Lead Flood Authority. **MM163-166** would do this and I recommend them for plan effectiveness.

Conclusion on Issue 7

268. Subject to the inclusion of the MMs referred to above, the Plan is consistent with national policy and local evidence in its approach to preserving and enhancing the natural environment, including air quality and flood risk.

Issue 8 – Does the Plan make appropriate provision for retail, leisure, tourism and related uses? Are the Plan's policies for the hierarchy of retail centres positively prepared, justified and effective?

269. The submitted Plan identifies the town centres of Nuneaton and Bedworth and puts in place a focused policy framework to support their vitality and viability. The Plan is underpinned by a Retail and Leisure Study Update 2014 [X7.1] and a Town Centre Office Requirements study 2013 [X6] which identify a moderate need for additional comparison and convenience retail floorspace and commercial leisure uses and a demand for further office-based employment. This data is now of some age and does not reflect the adjusted housing requirement however given recent national retail trends and the identification of the economic regeneration within Nuneaton town centre as a strategic

priority in the latest LEP SEP [OTH/04], the floorspace figures in Policy TC1 would be justified minima.

270. In respect of tourism, the town centres provide an opportunity to sustainably accommodate tourism facilities (including tourist accommodation) and heritage activities. Accordingly, the Plan should express support for such proposals as part of the vibrant mix of town centre uses and I recommend **MM141** for consistency with national policy.

271. In terms of the nature of town centre growth progress is being made through the NBBC and WCC partnership to capitalise on the potential of Nuneaton town centre through the Nuneaton Investment Prospectus (March 2018) [NBBC/51] and the Transforming Nuneaton Opportunities initiative [NBBC/52]. This work is at an early stage such that I consider it appropriate that the detail is appropriately included in the emerging Town Centres Area Action Plan (TCAAP). To ensure consistency Policy TC2 should require town centre proposals in Nuneaton to have regard to proposals in the TCAAP and the aspirations of the 'Transforming Nuneaton' initiative and I recommend **MM142** so that the Plan would be effective and positively prepared.

272. Policy TC2 refers specifically to a café quarter in Nuneaton town centre which is identified at Appendix E of the submitted plan. There is little to demonstrate that the proposed quarter would be deliverable or why a café, as a main town centre use, should have to demonstrate why they could not be located in the conceptual café quarter. This would be counter to national policy to promote competitive town centres. **MM143-144** and **MM171** would remove the policy text and Appendix E relating to the proposed Café Quarter and I recommend them for effectiveness, justification and consistency with national policy.

273. Policy TC2 also introduces primary and secondary frontages and provides a clear policy framework of which uses will be permitted in such locations. Clarity is needed in presenting the primary frontages and primary shopping areas at Appendix D so that they are clearly distinguishable for future users of the document. **MM170** would do that and I recommend it for effectiveness.

Conclusion on Issue 8

274. Subject to the inclusion of the MMs referred to above, the Plan is consistent with national policy on ensuring the vitality of town centres.

Issue 9 - Whether the policies for housing, communities and the built environment are sound?

Policies for Housing

275. The Plan as submitted seeks 25% affordable housing provision on sites of 15 dwellings or more and 20% on sites of between 11 and 14 dwellings. From the evidence in the SHMA, the 2016 Affordable Housing Background Paper [S2] and the 2016 plan-wide viability work [H3] the 25% figure would be a viable and justified target for larger residential schemes.

276. The lower threshold of 20% on schemes of 11-14 dwellings originates from further plan-viability work (H3.1, page 47, para 3.3.9). This demonstrates

that residential schemes in this bracket can support an on-site affordable housing contribution of this scale. 20% when applied on such a relatively short range does not generate whole numbers, resulting in complexities around dealing with proportions on relatively modest schemes. In my view, this would not be effective and therefore unsound. 20% generally generates 2 dwellings on these sites and to simplify the Plan and boost housing delivery the requirement on sites of between 11 and 14 should be modified to 2 affordable units. I therefore recommend **MM127**, **MM130** and **MM131** which clarify the affordable housing requirement on schemes of 11-14 dwellings for effectiveness.

277. Policy H2 refers to Starter Homes but the Council recognises that national policy around affordable housing provision is in transition and other models and definitions may materialise. To further future proof the Plan and introduce some flexibility into Policy H2 I recommend **MM128** in terms of referring to supporting affordable housing schemes that would be in line with any updates to national policy and **MM129** which would cross refer to SPD guidance.

Policies for Healthy, Safe and Inclusive Communities

278. As submitted Policy HS5 is broadly entitled 'Health' and contains two policy objectives. The first is in relation to requiring health impact assessments on certain developments. The second part of the policy is entitled 'Fast Food Proposals' and seeks to address obesity by restricting A3, A4 and A5 uses to town centre locations and only at other locations subject to criteria (including 400 metres from secondary schools). The health profile evidence, including in the SA scoping report and in the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) [E2] reveals significant variations in life expectancy relative to deprivation, high levels of child obesity and worse than the average for England on indicators[28] relating to healthy eating in adults, adult obesity, diabetes, alcohol specific hospital stays and areas of mental health. More up-to-date information submitted during the examination in the 2017 Health Profile of the Borough [NBBC/53] and the Health Annual Status Report 2017 [NBBC/54] reaffirms the health challenges in the Borough.

279. The HIA for the Plan at paragraph 5.1.7 identifies where planning policy could be influential in relation to health and includes reducing access to unhealthy food, increasing opportunities for physical activity and creating environments that improve mental health and wellbeing. In line with the Marmot Review's recommendations, various strands of the Plan would pull together to improve active travel and improve good quality green spaces. However, it remains that there would be notable health inequalities and factors negatively affecting life expectancy that would justify further policy interventions in the Plan[29]. As submitted, however, the detail in Policy HS5 would not be effective, justified or consistent with national policy and therefore would not be sound.

280. To ensure the Plan would be effective I recommend that Policy HS5 is divided into two separate policies. This would enable those using the document to readily identify policy relating to HIAs and policy on healthy food

[28] See Figure 5-1, p15, document E2 – from Public Health England (2013).
[29] As per PPG paragraph 53-006-20170728

environments. **MM151** and **MM153** would do this and create a sound policy for requiring HIAs on major development proposals.

281. In terms of healthy food environments, the PPG states that where supported by evidence, LPAs can consider bringing forward local plan policies, and supplementary planning documents, which limit the proliferation of certain uses in identified areas. In assessing the evidence in the health profiles and the Council's further response on the matter [NBBC/61] it is clear from Public Health England data that for both child overweightness and obesity at reception year, Nuneaton and Bedworth is above both the Warwickshire and England averages. Similar parallels apply at the Year 6 cohort. The picture does not improve when looking at overweightness, obesity and diabetes diagnosis data for adults (16+), where again the Borough's statistics are higher than local and national averages.

282. The reasons for overweightness and obesity are complex but there is evidence[30] that managing the proliferation of hot food takeaways is an established way in which planning policy can positively intervene. The evidence as it relates to Nuneaton and Bedworth justifies an intervention and would align to the ongoing collaborative work with the local Health and Wellbeing Board and Clinical Commissioning Group to address health inequalities in the Borough.

283. As submitted the Plan takes a wide approach to include limiting restaurants, cafes and public houses as well as hot food takeaways. This would not provide sufficient differentiation between the many types of food and drink outlets. There is not the evidence to justify such a broad approach, it would be inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound. I therefore recommend that only the provision of additional hot food takeaways (Use Class A5) are managed through a new Policy HS7 'Creating A Healthier Food Environment', revised supporting text and monitoring indicators. Accordingly, I recommend **MM152** and **MM154-6** so that the Plan would be justified and consistent with national policy. The reasonable 400metre buffer around secondary schools and sixth form colleges would not result in a moratorium on additional provision, and in any event, the policy would specifically allow for additional hot food takeaways within town centres. I have however, amended **MM155** slightly to state that the 400-metre radius be measured from the principal point of access for effectiveness.

Policies for the Built Environment

284. The evidence through the Camco Study 2010 [G3] into the feasibility of renewable and low carbon resources in Warwickshire and Solihull reasonably points to very limited potential in the Borough for wind energy and that there would be constraints to large scale wind energy development. However, as drafted Policy BE2 would be unduly restrictive without appropriate justification and therefore would not be sound. I recommend **MM167** so it would be effective and consistent with national policy to support a transition to a low carbon future.

[30] At Section 7.6 of the HIA and elsewhere, including NBBC/61

285. Having regard to the PPG[31] there is evidence to justify the requirement for introducing the optional standard M4(2) for accessible and adaptable dwellings to apply to 35% of major residential development proposals. This includes the household survey that informed the 2010 Housing Needs Assessment prepared by Ecotec [document S1] which shows high numbers of households in the Borough with physical and mobility impairments. Further evidence through the SHMA shows that 35.4% of households in the Borough have at least one resident with a long-term limiting illness. This is higher than the averages for Warwickshire, the West Midlands and England. The 35% figure has been subject to viability testing and would be deliverable[32]. I therefore find this part of Policy BE3 to be sound.

286. Turning to the optional standard for water efficiency of 110/litres per person per day (pppd) this would appear to come from Warwickshire Sub-Regional Water Cycle Study 2010 [N3] which predicted a supply-demand deficit[33] and identified the Borough as being in an area of moderate water stress. The more up-to-date evidence in the Joint Warwickshire Partnership Water Cycle Study 2017 (WCS) [N6] concludes that there would be sufficient supply to meet planned growth across the sub-region within the plan period in the context of wider efforts of Severn Trent Water and others to improve water efficiency.

287. Building Regulations already set a mandatory national standard of 125 litres pppd such that there needs to be a clear need to set tighter standards. The WCS takes a precautionary assessment of the long-term beyond the plan period but there are various pathways towards achieving water neutrality as set out at Appendix F of the WCS other than the optional standard. Accordingly, the submitted Plan would not be justified in seeking the optional standard and therefore unsound. **MM168** would remove the requirement for the optional standard and I recommend it for the Plan to be justified.

Conclusion on Issue 9

288. Subject to the main modifications identified the development management policies for housing, communities and the built environment would be sound.

Issue 10 – Whether the Plan makes adequate provision for infrastructure to support growth? Whether the Plan, as a whole, is viable and therefore deliverable?

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

289. The submission Plan was accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2017 (IDP) [D4.1-D4.2]. The IDP is an iterative document and the schedule of schemes has been updated in 2018 [NBBC/69]. In terms of the approach to infrastructure planning, the policies for each of the strategic allocations identify relevant site-specific infrastructure or where proportionate contributions are needed for off-site provision. The IDP accords with NPPF at paragraph 162 in terms of establishing a cooperative and holistic

[31] PPG paragraph 56-007-20150327
[32] Updated Local Plan Viability Assessment 2016 [Document H3] summary point (xv), p.8
[33] Page 76, paragraph 6.4.10

understanding of the quality and capacity of infrastructure to meet forecast demands arising from the Plan's proposals.

290. In respect of Bulkington both strategic housing allocations require a contribution towards community facilities. It would not be justified, however, to specify in policy that a contribution should go to the Bulkington Village Community and Conference Centre. There should be flexibility in the policy for community contributions to be negotiated on each proposal depending on what would be required to meet the lawful tests at Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations (also at paragraph 204 of the NPPF).

Transport Planning

291. In relation to understanding the transport impacts of the Plan, there have been successive strategic transport assessments undertaken. The latest version, which reflects the submitted Plan's proposals, is the comprehensive 2016 Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) prepared by Vectos for WCC [document Z6.1-Z6.5]. The modelling has adapted during the examination including a reassessment/check in early 2018 [NBBC/40] together with outputs for Bulkington in early 2018 [NBBC/41] and further assessment work for sites in Bedworth following the Stage 2 hearings [NBBC/60 and 62].

292. The STA assesses the impact on the highway network to 2031 in terms of assessing 4 scenarios: the reference case (growth that would occur in any event), then the impact of the Plan's proposals in addition to this and then the impact of proposed mitigation in the STA on those two scenarios. An S-Paramics traffic model has been developed and the methodology takes a complex and multi-faceted approach to forecasting that accords with relevant guidance (webTAG). Various local surveys have sought to demonstrate the STA modelling under-estimates the impacts of the Plan's proposals, but they are not as comprehensive as the STA, including modelling future traffic behaviours and understanding the wider impact of proposed mitigations. Highways England in considering the impact of the Plan on the strategic road network are clearly satisfied with the STA [OTH/31] and this provides me with confidence that the approach taken has been robust.

293. The assumed modal shift to be targeted at 15% is aspirational but realistic. All of the proposed sites in the Plan present good opportunities for trips to be made by modes other than the private car. Policy HS2 should be widened so that all proposals, not just the strategic sites, should target the 15% objective. **MM146** would do this and make the Plan effective and positively prepared.

294. Overall, I find the STA and associated outputs to be robust evidence that accords with the requirement at paragraph 32 of the NPPF that Plans should be supported by a transport assessment to demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved, the need for major transport infrastructure has been reduced and improvements (mitigation) can be secured such that there would be no severe residual cumulative impacts. The STA also accords with NPPF paragraphs 156 and 162 and PPG Section 54 on transport evidence in plan-making, in informing policy content for transport infrastructure and assessing capacity of infrastructure for transport.

Viability

295. The Plan is accompanied by a plan-wide viability assessment 2016 [documents H3.1-3]. It is a comprehensive document that updates previous viability work and applies reasonable development costs and revenues assumptions to demonstrate that residual land values are within the bounds that are likely to be anticipated for willing landowners and developers in the terms expressed at paragraphs 173-174 of the NPPF and accompanying PPG[34]. The assessment has undertaken prudent sensitivity testing around potential affordable housing contributions to underpin the content of Policy H2.

296. The assessment is appropriate in identifying the caution that needs to be applied to employment generating developments but the general testing on residential typologies and further detailed testing of the proposed submitted strategic sites shows that the proposed scale of obligations and policy burdens does not threaten their ability to be developed viably. The one site where matters are more balanced is HSG4 Bedworth Woodlands because of the highways infrastructure needed to unlock the site but Policy HS1 includes the standard policy valve if there are viability challenges. In any event, only modest changes in revenue inputs can have a materially positive impact on viability, particularly for greenfield sites such as HSG4.

Conclusion on Issue 10

297. Where necessary the individual policies for strategic sites identify specific infrastructure requirements. Taken together with the generic policies relating to infrastructure and transport [Policies HS1-6] I conclude that, subject to the MM identified above, the Plan makes adequate provision for new infrastructure in a way which would be viable and therefore deliverable.

Issue 11 – Does the Plan contain an adequate framework for monitoring and implementation?

298. The submitted Plan includes an index of monitoring indicators for each policy. A number of targets need to be factually updated to reflect other modifications including the housing requirement and additional site allocations and to ensure internal consistency. These were presented in **MM172-MM174** and I recommend them for plan effectiveness. In addition to the monitoring framework in the Plan, Appendix I of the SA Report contains further detail on indicators for monitoring the underlying SA objectives.

299. Overall, I am satisfied, subject to the MMs identified, there would be appropriate monitoring arrangements in place to monitor Plan effectiveness and delivery.

Public Sector Equality Duty

300. The submitted Plan was accompanied by an Equality Impact Assessment [D7]. Relevant groups and people were invited to participate in the preparation of the Plan, including representatives of the Gypsy and Traveller communities, religious and faith groups and bodies representing the elderly and disabled.

[34] PPG Paragraphs 10-005-20140306 to 10-015-20140306

301. In respect of age and disability the Plan, subject to the MMs, is likely to have a positive impact in terms of delivering additional housing to latest Building Regulations standards as well as securing the optional technical standard M4(2) for accessible and adaptable dwellings on major residential proposals. In respect of Gypsies and Travellers, the impact of the Plan is to some degree uncertain because detailed site delivery is being progressed through a separate DPD. However, the Plan does include positively prepared policies for Gypsies and Travellers (Policies DS4 and H3) recognising that permanent and transit pitch requirements are to be regarded as minimums. I am satisfied that the combination of the criteria-based approach in Policy H3 and a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan will enable the Council to meet the identified accommodation requirements within the plan period.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

302. My examination of the legal compliance of the Plan is summarised below.

303. The Borough Plan has been prepared broadly in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS), which was updated in October 2018. The adoption of the Plan should be very close to the date anticipated in the LDS with any minor slippage due to the need to hold a further hearing into proposed modifications, which was not a factor within the Council's control.

304. Consultation on the Borough Plan and the MMs was carried out in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement 2015 and the minimum requirements in the 2012 Regulations.

305. Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out at all stages and is adequate.

306. The Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Reports (2016, as updated in 2018) set out why Appropriate Assessment is not necessary and Natural England supports this.

307. An objective of the Plan is to address climate change in all new development (Objective 8). Consequently, the NBBP includes policies designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change (notably Policies NE4, BE2, BE3 and HS2 amongst others). Importantly, the development strategy of the Plan seeks to align to homes with jobs and locate development where it can be accessed by a variety of means of travel including public transport, cycling and walking.

308. The Borough Plan complies with all relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

309. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

310. The Council has requested that I recommend MMs to make the Plan sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough

Plan satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

David Spencer

Inspector

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the Main Modifications.

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan

Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications

April 2019

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM1	Objectives	4.3	15	Amend text as follows: "Paragraph 4.3 Prologis Park should be added to the list of sites set out in sub-sections a) and b) which should be amended as follows: a) “Maintain and improve existing employment sites. Key sites include: * Attleborough Fields * Bayton Road * Bermuda * Prologis Park b) Provide additional employment land that is attractive to investors in the following locations: * Faultlands, Gipsy Lane * ~~Phoenix~~ Pickards Way / Wilsons Lane * Prologis Park * Coventry Road * Land at Caldwell Road Industrial Estate * Longford Road * Bowling Green Lane”
MM4	Objectives	4.9	20	Amend text as follows: "c) Protect and enhance the Borough's ecological and geological networks, in particular priority habitats and species, and minimising impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity".
MM5	Objectives	Map	21	Update key diagram to reflect new boundaries and correct road names
MM2	Objective 7	4.8	19	Amend text as follows:"4.8 To ensure that new development enhances and improves the natural environment, which includes biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape. This will have secondary benefits of improving the quality and appearance of the existing urban area. In particular"
MM3	Objective 7	4.8	19	Amend text as follows: "c) Minimise the negative impact of development and make improvements where possible to air quality, particularly in Air Quality Management Areas and at locations where Air Quality Objectives would be breached."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM6	Policy DS2	Policy box	23	Amend text as follows: "The role and function of each of the Borough's settlements is: ~~•~~ 1 Nuneaton has the primary role for employment, housing, town centre, leisure and service provision. ~~•~~ 2 Bedworth has ~~a supporting~~ the secondary role for employment, housing, town centre, leisure and service provision. ~~•~~ 3 Bulkington has ~~a supporting~~ the tertiary role for housing, shopping, leisure and local services. Bulkington is served by a district centre. ~~•~~ 4 'Northern fringe' of Coventry. This includes Keresley and Ash Green/Neal's Green. These areas have ~~local~~ supporting roles for housing, shopping and local services. Ash Green is served by a local centre. Most development will be directed to Nuneaton as the primary town. Other development will be directed to, or adjacent to, other settlements at a scale that reflects the role and function of the settlement and it's order in the hierarchy and the settlement's ability to accommodate change."
MM7	Policy DS2	5.6	23	Amend text as follows: "A settlement analysis report of Nuneaton and Bedworth proposes a settlement hierarchy for the Borough. The order of the hierarchy is set out within the policy. This was based on an analysis of the size of each settlement in the area, accessibility to a range of services and facilities and public transport provision. The report places Nuneaton at the top of the hierarchy as the most sustainable settlement in the Borough."
MM8	Policy DS2	5.7	23	Amend text as follows:"5.8 The main spatial areas of Nuneaton, Bedworth, Bulkington and the northern Coventry fringe are the most sustainable locations for growth. The locations for growth enables them to connect to, and utilise, the existing infrastructure in these areas. Objectives 1 and 2 aim to drive economic growth and diversify the Borough's economy to enable the business base to become more competitive and less exposed to economic shocks that may affect specific sectors. The borough has a history of high out commuting, it is therefore, vital that employment land is allocated through the planning process. The geographic spread of housing and employment development contributes to the viability and vitality of the Borough's economy and housing choices . It also contributes to economic growth in deprived areas as well as potentially rationalising and enhancing public transport corridors. Furthermore the delivery of new development under the allocations will deliver critical masses of development to enable significant development contributions towards community and transport infrastructure. The plan aims to deliver the wider aspirations of the sub region including the aspirations set out in the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership(CWLEP) Strategic Economic Plan (2016).The council's Economic Development Strategy(EDS) and action plan will also help to deliver the council's and the CWLEP's economic vision for the borough and wider sub region. The EDS has a key focus on fostering an environment for advanced manufacturing, professional services, research and development and small and medium enterprises."
MM12	Policy DS2	5.10	24	Amend text as follows:"• The Economic Development Strategy and Action Plan will include a work programme to assist in the delivery of strategic employment sites and town centre projects as well as proactively attracting investment."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM9	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	Policy box	26	Amend text as follows: "The following levels of housing and employment development will be planned for and provided within Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough between 2011 and 2031: a) ~~13,374~~ At least 14,060 homes. b) ~~103~~ At least 107.8 ha of employment land. c) At least 39 residential pitches and 5 transit pitches to accommodate Gypsies and Travellers."
MM10	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	5.20-5.21	27	Amend text as follows:"5.20 The Council must also consider the needs of Coventry City Council ~~area~~, as it has stated that ~~they~~ it is ~~are~~ unable to meet the objectively assessed need for the city within the~~ir~~ boundaries and so some redistribution within the Housing Market Area (HMA) is necessary to ensure housing needs are met. The Warwickshire authorities accept that Coventry City Council is unable to accommodate its full housing need. Each Council ~~will~~ therefore co-operated to establish a revised distribution of housing which ensures that the overall needs (4,408 dwellings per annum) across the housing market area will be met in full. The total objectively assessed need for the Borough for 2011-2031 is 10,040 dwellings (502 per annum). The 502 dwellings per annum is made up of three components: demographic based need (423 dwellings), supporting economic growth (73 dwellings) and improving affordability (6 dwellings) . As part of the redistribution of housing, the Borough ~~was asked~~ has agreed to take an additional 4,020 dwellings and has ~~The Council was unable to~~ signed ~~the~~ a Memorandum Of Understanding with the other authorities.~~ as evidence was not available to demonstrate that the level of growth could be accommodated. An update to the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), using the agreed sub-regional methodology has subsequently been undertaken which has identified, alongside other evidence, that the Borough can accommodate 2,330 dwellings from Coventry.~~ 5.21 The delivery of the housing development needs are broken down through the following means (base date 1st April 2018): a) Strategic Allocations: ~~8,851~~ (excluding HSG1 to avoid double counting) 5,582 b) Non-strategic Site Allocations: ~~940~~ 926 c) Site completions: ~~1,318~~ 2,382 d) Sites with planning permission (excluding HSG1) : ~~2,144~~ 2,148 e) Sites with planning permission on HSG 1 939 f) Remainder of HSG1 2,823 ~~e)~~ g)Windfall sites: ~~121~~ 247 Footnote: Windfall sites only includes years 2021-2031 to avoid double counting. d) does not include 10% non-implementation rate for small sites."
MM11	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	5.20-5.21	27	NB The updated housing trajectory graph to accompany this text as shown in the appendices will be inserted in the Plan after paragraph 5.22

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM13	Policy DS4 - Overall developmen t needs	5.22	28	Amend text as follows:"5.22 The Council will regularly review the Housing Trajectory. In assessing the delivery of housing the Plan has utilised a stepped trajectory. For the period 2011-2018 this has comprised the objectively assessed need for the Borough of 502 per annum. From 2018-2031 this will increase to 868 per annum to take into account the 4,020 shortfall from the Housing Market Area. This means that for the period 2011 -2018 there has been a backlog of 1132 dwellings and as the Borough has consistently under delivered against its target it is considered to be a 20%" authority i.e. it needs to apply a 20% buffer for choice and competition. ~~The Trajectory shows that it will be necessary for development to take a staggered approach in terms of delivery.~~ The site allocations which are currently in Green Belt are unlikely to ~~come forward~~ be considered before adoption of the Plan and will not begin to yield completions until 2020/21, therefore, the delivery significantly increases after this point. The following Housing Trajectory shows the timeline for the delivery of housing across the plan period."
MM14	Policy DS4 - Overall developmen t needs	New Paragraphs after 5.22	28	Amend text as follows:"5.23 The trajectory identifies that 12,454 dwellings will be developed by 2031, in addition to the 2,382 which were built from April 2011 to March 2018. Therefore, it is projected that 14,836 dwellings will be developed over the plan period. This is more than the identified requirement of 14,060 dwellings by 776 dwellings. This additional provision in supply will provide a degree of flexibility in the unforeseen event that some of the identified sites do not come forward as predicted. 5.24 The NPPF requires that the Council maintain a 5 year supply of housing sites. At adoption of the Plan for the five years 2018 to 2023 based on the projected completions in the trajectory there is a 5.5 years supply (with a 20% buffer) utilising the "Liverpool" method" (dealing with the shortfall over the remainder of the Plan period). This approach is justified given the Plan seeks to secure a sustainable pattern of development which includes sizeable urban extensions to Nuneaton (the primary and most sustainable settlement) which will take time to reach full delivery. Additionally, it has been necessary through the plan-making process to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundary at various locations. Accordingly, sites that are dependent on Green Belt alterations will only come forward post Plan adoption. Nonetheless, the trajectory results in a significant step-change in delivery. This will be regularly monitored, in accordance with the Housing Delivery Test, to inform a timely review of the Plan.
MM15	Policy DS4 - Overall developmen t needs	5.29	30	Amend text as follows: "5.29 The Coventry, Warwickshire and Hinckley and Bosworth Joint Committee considered and agreed an Employment Land Memorandum of Understanding (ELMOU) on the 21st July 2016. The purpose of the ELMOU is to ensure that the employment land needs of Coventry and Warwickshire can be met in full in line with national policy and the Duty to Cooperate. The need for the ELMOU was generated by a shortfall of 241ha of employment land provision within Coventry. The process for redistributing the shortfall is outlined in the ELMOU background report . The application of the redistribution methodology leads to an additional employment land requirement of 26ha for Nuneaton and Bedworth. This is in addition to the 87ha of employment land to meet the Borough's own needs, giving a total of 113ha. Based on evidence gathered to inform the Plan, the Borough is able to accommodate ~~103.6~~ 107.8 ha of employment land during the Plan period."
MM16	Policy DS4 - Overall developmen t needs	5.30	30	Amend text as follows:"5.30 The Council will regularly review the Employment Trajectory. The Trajectory shows that it will be necessary for development to take a staggered approach in terms of delivery. The site allocations which are currently in Green Belt are unlikely to ~~come forward~~ be considered ~~before~~ adoption of the Plan, therefore, the delivery significantly increases after this point. The following Trajectory shows the timeline for the delivery of employment across the plan period."
MM17	Policy DS4 - Overall	5.30	30	NB The updated employment trajectory graph to accompany this text as shown in the appendices will be inserted in the Plan after paragraph 5.30

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
	development needs			
MM18	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	Table 3	32	Amend text as follows: "DS4a - Housing completions - ~~13,372~~ 14,060 dwellings completions."
MM19	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	Table 3	32	Amend text as follows: "DS4b - Development of Employment Land - ~~103.6 hectares~~ 107.8 ha of land is development for employment uses."
MM20	Policy DS5 - Residential allocations	Policy box	33	Amend text as follows: "The following sites will be allocated for residential development and associated infrastructure uses as shown on the Proposals Map (strategic sites) and in Appendix A (non-strategic sites). Site Reference — Site Name — Dwellings HSG1 — North of Nuneaton — ~~3,331~~ 4,419 HSG6 — School Lane — ~~388~~ 220 HSG 12 — Former Hawkesbury Golf Course — 380 ~~NUN 061~~ — ~~Rear of 25-39 Whitburn Road~~ — ~~14~~ "
MM21	Policy DS5 - Residential allocations	Policy box	34	Insert additional paragraph at the end of the policy box stating: "Some of the non-strategic housing sites have biodiversity and heritage issues, including the setting of the Coventry Canal, which will need mitigating, or in exceptional circumstances, compensating, as part of any development proposal."
MM22	Policy DS6 - Employment allocations	Policy box	36	Amend table in DS6 policy box as follows: "EMP2 - ~~Phoenix~~ PickardsWay / Wilsons Lane - 18", "EMP3 - Prologis Extension - 5.3"
MM23	Policy DS6 - Employment allocations	Policy box	36	Site Reference — Site Name — Hectares ~~EMP5 — Caldwell Road Industrial Estate — 0.6~~
MM24	Policy DS6 - Employment allocations	Policy box	36	Add the following text after the table of sites in the policy box : "The wider Bermuda Park area, south of Nuneaton, including EMP1 and EMP4, is an employment location of regional significance for inward and local investment."
MM25	Policy DS6 - Employment allocations	5.42	36	Insert the following references at 5.42: "* Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (2016) *Updated Strategic Economic Plan* * Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (2016) *Economic Development Strategy* * Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (2016) *Economic Development Strategy: Action Plan 2016*"
MM26	Policy DS6 - Employment allocations	Table 5	37	Amend text as follows: "DS6a - Monitor the supply and delivery of allocated sites and report annually through the AMR - ~~103.6 hectares~~ 107.8 ha of land is developed for employment uses."
MM27	Policy DS7 - Green Belt	Policy box	37	Amend text in DS7 policy box as follows: "EMP2 ~~Phoenix~~ Pickards Way / Wilsons Lane", "EMP3 Prologis Extension"

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM28	Policy DS7 - Green Belt	Policy box	37	Amend text as follows: "Land Removed from the Green Belt The following strategic sites include land which is removed from the Green Belt: • HSG2 Arbury • HSG3 Gipsy Lane • HSG5 Hospital Lane • HSG6/ EMP6 School Lane • HSG7 East of Bulkington • HSG8 West of Bulkington • HSG9 Land at Golf Drive • HSG12 Former Hawkesbury Golf Course, Blackhorse Road • EMP1 Faultlands (including identified amendments to surrounding land) • EMP2 ~~Phoenix~~ Pickards Way/ Wilsons Lane * EMP3 Prologis Extension • EMP4 Coventry Road (including identified amendments to surrounding land) • EMP7 Bowling Green Lane • NUN181 Stockley Road • NUN286/NUN317 Burbages Lane"
MM29	New Policy DS8	Policy box	41	DS8 - Monitoring of Housing Delivery The Council will monitor the delivery of housing and publish progress against the trajectory. Where it is apparent that delivery rates are falling short of what was anticipated then the Council will take the necessary action to address any shortfall. Such actions may include (but are not limited to) a) working with developers and site promoters particularly of the two largest strategic sites to review the requirements and phasing of infrastructure provision, where such re-phasing would assist with viability; b) working with developers, site promoters and other interested parties to help unlock potential sources of funding for identified infrastructure: or c) considering the use of Compulsory Purchase Powers to help address known land acquisition issues; or d) bringing forward additional sites where it can be demonstrated that such sites will assist with delivery to address short term needs; Where additional housing sites need to be brought forward initial priority will be given to sustainable sites including town centre redevelopment opportunities in Nuneaton and edge of settlement sites unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits .

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM30	New Policy DS9	Policy box	41	DS9 - Review The plan will be reviewed (either wholly or partly) prior to the end of the Plan period in the event of one or more of the following circumstances a) Through the Duty to Cooperate, it is necessary to accommodate the development needs of another authority within the Borough and these development needs cannot be accommodated within the Local Plan's existing strategy. b) Updated evidence or changes to national policy suggest that the overall development strategy should be significantly changed c) Any other reason that would render the Plan, or part of it significantly out of date. In any event the Council will undertake a comprehensive review of national policy, the regional context, updates to the evidence base and monitoring data before the 31st March 2023 to assess whether a whole or partial review of the Plan is required. If, on assessment a review is required it will commence immediately and the Local Development Scheme will be updated 5.63 The Council acknowledges that there could be changes to Local Plan guidance and regulations which may see the need for an early review of this Plan or that such a review could be required because of planning circumstances in the Coventry, Warwickshire Housing Market Area
MM31	Policy SA1 - Development principles on strategic sites	6.17 - 6.19	44	Amend text as follows: "~~Community Facilities~~ ~~6.17 The provision of new facilities or the enhancement of existing facilities will be brought forward as part of each of the strategic allocations.~~ ~~6.18 These facilities will include, but are not limited to, local centres, community halls, sports facilities, play provision and open space provision within the Council's Open Space Strategy.~~ ~~6.19 If it is unviable to provide facilities on site then financial contributions to enhance or expand existing local facilities will be sought.~~
MM32	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Policy box	46	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision of ~~circa 3331~~ at least 4,419 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM33	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Policy box	46	Insert the following: "31. Development will be required to come forward in accordance with the concept plan."
MM34	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Map	46	Replace map to show new boundary of HSG1
MM35	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Map	46	Replace map with concept plan
MM36	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Policy box	47	Amend text as follows: "14. Provision of a strategic access road/spine road through the site with integrated footway and cycleway provision, provided in order to secure a sustainable pattern of development across the strategic site"
MM37	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Policy box	47	Modify text as follows: ~~"19. Retain higher ground (above 90m AOD) for appropriate open space treatment"~~

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM38	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	Policy box	48	Amend text as follows: "~~Landscape Buffer~~ ~~31. Development must not extend beyond the northern boundary of the site in order to preserve a farmland buffer between the A5 and edge of residential development. The northern boundary should also be enhanced to soften the development edge through new tree and hedgerow planting along with small copses of trees in field corners.~~"
MM39	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	6.32	48	Amend text as follows: "6.32 The site will deliver ~~3331~~ 4,419 new dwellings in a mix of sizes and tenures.
MM40	Policy HSG1	6.34	48	Amend text as follows:"6.34 A new distributor link road through the allocation will be provided to include primary access points on Weddington Road, The Long Shoot and Higham Lane. This should be delivered in line with the indicative route shown on the concept plan. The start and end ~~first two~~ points have already been provided as part of ~~the~~ extant planning permissions in these areas. The Strategic Transport Assessment assumed that this link will be fully operational by 2027. It is not included in full in the 2022 assessment as the level of development completed in this area, as defined in the Borough Plan trajectory, is less likely to trigger the necessity for the full link road. New bus infrastructure will also be required. The width of the main distributor road within the development site must be sufficient to cater for two-way bus movement in order to allow effective penetration of the site. The distributor road should ensure that: • all households within the individual developments are within 400 metres of a bus stop; • a highway link connects all the separate developments to each other and also the adjoining local highway network; and • the minimum width of road is 6.75 metres to effectively cater for bus turning movements in order to complement flexible bus routing options."
MM41	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	New Paragraph	48	Additional text as follows:" 6.35 A new junction will be formed with the A5 through the development at Calendar Farm."
MM42	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	6.39	49	Amend text as follows: "~~Landscape Buffer~~ ~~6.39 The northern boundary of the allocation has been defined to preserve a linear 'farmland buffer' between the A5 and the edge of the proposed residential development. The buffer is required to retain the landscape character along this stretch of the A5 which is considered to be visually prominent and thus new development would be detrimental. Further 'softening' of the northern boundary will be introduced by new tree and hedgerow planting and small copses of trees in field corners to filter views of the new edge of the urban area.~~"
MM43	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy Box	50	Amend text as follow: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 1525 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM44	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	50	Insert the following: "30. Development will be required to come forward in accordance with the concept plan."
MM45	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	50	Amend text as follows:"5. Provision of a ~~strategic access road~~ distributor link road through the site with integrated footway /cycleway provision in accordance with the concept plan. The distributor link road will need to secure a connection that links the site to the A444."
MM46	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	50	Amend text as follows:"8. Provision of footway/cycleway linkages to the existing footway/cycleway network including linkage to Bermuda Park Station, enhancement of Harefield Lane to reach the Bermuda village area to the east and contributions towards links to the north and east mapped in the Cycle Network Development Plan."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM47	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Map	50	Replace map with concept plan
MM48	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Map	50	Insert the following: "32. Development proposals, including the detailed masterplan for the site will be required to come forward in accordance with the concept plan."
MM49	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	51	Amend text as follows: "14. Asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House."
MM50	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	52	Add criteria under form of development as follows: " 30 As part of any design proposals, suitable measures should be specified to protect Spring Kidden and North Woods ancient woodlands from any significant impact"
MM51	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	52	Add criteria under form of development as follows: "31 Development proposals must submit a comprehensive masterplan for the site"
MM52	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	6.44	52	Insert new paragraph as follows: "6.45 Any development should take the opportunity to secure an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, both Grade II* Listed Buildings included on the Heritage at Risk Register. Alternatively a Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement could be agreed in relation to the building. Any Heritage Partnership Agreement would not replace a requirement to prepare an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate with measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, unless the Heritage Partnership Agreement would do the same. ~~This would help to offset impacts to the RPG derived from the perception of the possible reduction in the quantity of surrounding rural landscape around the parkland and the reduced degree of separation between the parkland and development and the potential cumulative effect of development in other areas (for instance HSG2 and or EMP8) encroaching upon the rural setting of the park.~~"
MM53	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	54	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 575 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM54	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	54	Amend text as follows: "6. Any transport improvements/upgrades required along Gipsy Lane as a result of the development and to the Gipsy Lane/Coventry Road junction, which would be required prior to construction / first occupation. Any improvements to the alignment of Gipsy Lane should take account of existing valued highway trees."
MM55	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	54	Amend text as follows: "9. Provision of cycle paths running north-south and east-west across the development as well as parallel to Gipsy Lane. The layout and position of internal cycle paths to the site boundaries should be capable of making effective connections to the cycle network provision within EMP1 and on to Bermuda Park."
MM56	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	55	Amend text as follows:"10. Enhancements to canal towpath and ~~Turnover bridge~~ a provision for the crossing of the canal to facilitate cycle usage. Development proposals will investigate suitability of using the Turnover Bridge and, if appropriate, then financial contributions will be sought for its delivery. Where demonstrated that this would not be technically feasible, alternative bridge provision that respects the heritage asset of the canal and does not adversely affect navigational safety will be secured."
MM57	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	55	Amend text as follows: "~~20. Exclude a parcel of 3.6 ha from development immediately adjacent to Red Deeps and Wem Meadows Wildspace~~"

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM58	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	55	Amend text as follows: "~~22. Enhance accessibility and the structural condition of heritage assets along Coventry canal.~~ New ~~housing~~ development should address the canal. ~~A detailed construction management plan should be implemented to reduce the effects of the development on the Coventry Canal and its associated habitats within the Griff and Wem Brooks.~~ Effects of the development on the adjoining section of the Coventry Canal and associated habitats within the Griff and Wem Brooks should be incorporated in the construction management plan. ~~Steps could also be taken in partnership with the Canal and River Trust to create a heritage walk along the canal~~"
MM59	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	55	Amend text as follows: "~~23. Further evaluation will be required to establish the heritage significance of and potential archaeological remains across the remainder of the strategic site prior to the determination of any planning application. The scope of the works should be agreed with the Warwickshire County Council Planning Archaeologist.~~"
MM60	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	Policy box	57	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 689 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM61	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	Map	57	Replace map with concept plan
MM62	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	Policy box	58	Amend text as follows:"19. Where possible ~~R~~retain areas of high quality ridge and furrow through careful siting of green space"
MM63	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	Policy box	58	Amend text as follows: "18. Retain the Nook and Flash Meadow Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) and additional wooded area between the Nook LWS and Woodlands Farm"
MM64	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	Policy box	58	Amend text as follows:"25. Protection of existing ecological network and nationally scarce grassland habitats. ~~and also possible any~~ All offsetting/ mitigation contributions ~~to restore degraded grasslands at Charity Spinney Meadows LWS.~~ should be within or related to the site."
MM65	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	Policy box	58	Insert the following: "26. Development will be required to come forward in accordance with the concept plan."
MM66	Policy HSG4- Woodlands	6.64-6.65	59	Amend text as follows: "Transport and Access 6.64 Primary access for vehicles will be provided via ~~a new four arm all movement roundabout on the A444 Bedworth Bypass to the north eastern edge of the site.~~ a new access from the site from Newtown Road with a A444 northbound slip and associated improvements to the existing highway network. ~~and associated improvements to the existing highway network~~. Other vehicular access points are available from Woodlands Road and Woodlands Lane~~/Bedworth Lane~~. Secondary access points may be required from Judd Close and Buttercup Way. The access strategy is informed by a specific transport assessment for HSG4 prepared in May 2018 that updates the STA modelling work. The access to the A444 will result in a loss of some of the ridge and furrow in this location which has medium heritage significance and whilst this is regrettable, it is necessary to enable the development of this site. There are extensive areas of ridge and furrow in this area and where possible developers will be encouraged to incorporate this within open space. Alternative locations for such an access would also have an effect on the landscape of the area. 6.65 The Transport Modelling Report commissioned by Warwickshire County Council set out a number of strategic road improvements in close proximity to HSG4 to mitigate potential cumulative impacts of all proposed strategic housing and employment allocations within the Borough Plan. The development of HSG4 is expected to contribute financially towards road improvement schemes in the Bedworth area set out in the Transport Modelling Report either via Planning Obligation or CIL provision."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM67	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	6.66	60	Amend text as follows: ~~"Historic Environment~~ ~~6.66 Any development should take the opportunity to secure an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, both Grade II* Listed Buildings included on the Heritage at Risk Register. Alternatively a Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement could be agreed in relation to the building. This would help to offset impacts to the RPG derived from the perception of the possible reduction in the quantity of surrounding rural landscape around the parkland and the reduced degree of separation between the parkland and development and the potential cumulative effect of development in other areas (for instance HSG2 and or EMP8) encroaching upon the rural setting of the park."~~
MM68	Policy HSG5 - Hospital Lane	Policy box	61	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 398 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM69	Policy HSG6 and EMP6 - School Lane	Map	64	Replace map to show new boundary of HSG6
MM70	Policy HSG6 and EMP6 - School Lane	Policy box	65	Amend text as follows:"1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least ~~388~~ 220 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes."
MM71	Policy HSG6 and EMP6 - School Lane	Policy box	66	Amend text as follows:"23. An average density of ~~40~~ 50 dwellings per hectare is considered appropriate given the predominantly urban character of the surrounding area."
MM72	Policy HSG6 and EMP6 - School Lane	Policy box	66	Amend text as follows: "26. Where used, green spaces should be positioned so as to retain areas of ridge and furrow and the existing trees on the site."
MM73	Policy HSG7 - East of Bulkington	Policy box	69	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 196 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM74	Policy HSG7 - East of Bulkington	Policy box	70	Amend text as follows:"8. Financial contributions towards ~~Borough wide strategic highway infrastructure works~~ Bulkington highways infrastructure identified in the Strategic Transport Assessment for Bulkington."
MM75	Policy HSG7 - East of Bulkington	Policy box	70	Amend text as follows: Key Development Principles "14. Financial contribution towards community facilities."
MM76	Policy HSG7 - East of Bulkington	Policy box	70	Amend text as follows: Key Development Principles "15. Financial contribution for primary medical care to be given to NHS Warwickshire North Clinical Commissioning Group or successor body."
MM77	Policy HSG7 - East of Bulkington	Policy box	70	Amend text as follows:"7. Any transport improvements/upgrades required along Nuneaton Road, Lancing Road, Bramcote Close and surrounding streets affected as a result of the development. The main access points are likely to be from Nuneaton Road and Lancing Road."
MM78	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Policy box	72	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision ~~of circa~~ at least 495 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM79	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Policy box	73	Amend text as follows: "10. Financial contributions towards ~~Borough wide strategic highway infrastructure works~~ Bulkington highways infrastructure identified in the Strategic Transport Assessment for Bulkington."
MM80	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Policy box	73	Amend text as follows: Key Development Principles "16. Financial contribution towards community facilities."
MM81	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Policy box	73	Amend text as follows: Key Development Principles "17. Financial contribution for primary medical care to be given to NHS Warwickshire North Clinical Commissioning Group or successor body."
MM82	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Policy box	73	Amend text as follows:"24. Site will require a concept framework to ensure the parcels that make up the site come forward in a comprehensive and cohesive manner. Development proposals should be in accordance with the concept plan including access arrangements."
MM83	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Policy box	73	Amend text as follows:"25. The northern parcel will require a strategic green edge to the north of the boundary to provide a defensible boundary. This area should include open space and the proposed allotments."
MM84	Policy HSG9 - Golf Drive	Policy box	76	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision ~~of circa~~ at least 621 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM85	Policy HSG9 - Golf Drive	Policy box	77	Amend text as follows: "7. Provision of on-site bus infrastructure and contribution to secure diversion of frequent local bus services to access the strategic housing site based on dialogue with Warwickshire County Council and bus operators, including evening and weekend services."
MM86	Policy HSG9 - Golf Drive	Policy box	77	Amend text as follows: "8. Financial contributions towards Borough wide strategic highway infrastructure works identified within the A4254 Corridor, including the B4114 Lutterworth Road Corridor."
MM87	Policy HSG9 - Golf Drive	Policy box	77	Amend text as follows: "9. Financial contribution towards the provision of footway/cycle way linkage from the Community Park through the site and linking to the cycle path leading to ~~Crowhill~~ the town centre and Bermuda Park."
MM88	Policy HSG9 - Golf Drive	Policy box	77	Amend text as follows:"14. A buffer to protect the setting of the Hill Farmhouse Grade II Listed Building which will include landscaping and screening to soften the views to and from the ~~Hill Farmhouse~~ Listed Building."
MM89	Policy HSG9 - Golf Drive	Policy box	77	Amend text as follows:"16. Site will require a concept framework to ensure the parcels that make up the site come forward in a comprehensive and cohesive manner. Development proposals should be in accordance with the concept plan including access arrangements."
MM90	Policy HSG10 - Attleborough Fields	Policy box	79	Amend text as follows: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 360 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM91	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	81	Amend text as follow: "1. Provision of ~~circa~~ at least 200 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes"
MM92	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	81	Amend text as follows: "~~3. Financial contribution towards existing local bus services and bus infrastructure~~"
MM93	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows: "8. Financial contributions towards a ~~new bridge across the railway line to provide enhanced access to the Weddington Green Trail and local cycle routes~~ full specification cycle path along Stoney Road using railway underbridge to link to the NCN52 and Sandon Park / Weddington Meadows POS."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM94	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows: "16. Protected ~~special~~ species surveys will be required at the site"
MM95	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows:~~"17. Provision of a bridge (or equivalent) over the main railway line to promote access to the Weddington Green Track. "~~
MM96	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows:"17. Enhance accessibility and the structural condition of heritage assets along Coventry canal. New housing should address the canal. A detailed construction management plan should be implemented to reduce the effects of the development on the Coventry Canal."
MM97	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows:"19. Enhancements to canal towpath"
MM175	HSG12 Former Hawkesbury Golf Course Blackhorse Road	New Policy box	new page	Policy HSG 12 former Hawkesbury Golf Course, Blackhorse Road Strategic housing site HSG12 will be developed for a mix of residential, canal marina and community facilities. **Key Development Principles** 1. Provision of at least 380 dwellings in a mix of dwelling types and sizes 2. Provision of a canal marina of up to 75 berths 3. Provision of a community building 4. Financial contributions to Warwickshire County Council towards the provision of the expansion of primary and secondary school places 5. Provision of Public Open Space including a Public Park around the existing and proposed pools. 6. Accessible cycle routes and footpaths to neighbouring facilities including schools 7. Provision of allotments 8. Financial contribution towards appropriate management and maintenance of the Public Open Space. 9. Financial contribution towards sport and physical activity 10. Financial contribution towards Bus Services in the area based on dialogue with Warwickshire County Council and bus operators. 11. Transport improvements /upgrades to local and wider strategic highway infrastructure works. **Form of Development** 12. Retention of valuable existing natural landscape, ponds and trees 13. Dwellings should address areas of open space both formal and informal and the canal where appropriate 14. Protected species are likely to be found on site and surveys will be required and any habitat requirements retained and connectivity enhanced within any development layout 15. Development shall not occur within the prescribed easements around mine shafts on the site

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM175	HSG12 Former Hawkesbury Golf Course Blackhorse Road	New Policy	new page	Strategic Housing Allocation HSG12 is a sustainable and deliverable urban extension to Bedworth. The site covers 29 hectares to the south-east of Bedworth and runs alongside the Coventry Canal. Strategic Housing Allocation HSG12 is a sustainable and deliverable urban extension to Bedworth. The site covers 29 hectares to the west if Bedworth and runs alongside the Coventry Canal. The site will deliver at least 380 dwellings in a mix of sizes and tenures. Because of the sites location adjacent to the Coventry Canal it will also deliver a canal marina of up to 75 berths. The site is within a single ownership and is expected to be delivered by an overarching planning permission Footpaths and Cycle ways There are public footpaths which cross the site which should be maintained and enhanced and integrated into the site .An upgrade and completion of the National Cycle Network Route 52 will be provided through the site with connections to the wider cycle network Canal Marina The sites sits alongside the Coventry Canal and an up to 75 berth marina will form a focal point of the development. Residential development will be designed so as to complement the Marina.
MM175	HSG12 Former Hawkesbury Golf Course Blackhorse Road	New Policy	new page	Landscape and Open Space The northern portion of the site will be utilised as open space. Valuable existing natural landscape, ponds and trees will be retained. this will include the existing pools on the site. Existing public footpaths and rights of way across this portion of the site will remain and be enhanced to ensure public access to the land School Provision Educational contributions will be required to ensure the expansion and reorganisation of both primary and secondary provision .Developers are encouraged to engage in early dialogue with the Local Education Authority to determine what level of financial contributions are required towards school expansion to address demand for school places Sport and Physical Activity Developers are encouraged to engage in dialogue with the Borough Council to determine what level of contributions are required towards improvements to sport and physical activity. Transport The site will require 2 points of access from the strategic road network and will be accessed from Blackhorse Road.

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
				Contributions towards strategic highway improvements and bus infrastructure will be sought
MM98	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	84	Amend text as follows:"2 Any proportionate transport improvements/upgrades required along Gipsy Lane as a result of the development and to the Gipsy Lane/Coventry Road junction "
MM99	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	84	Amend text as follows:"3. A proportionate ~~F~~financial contribution towards the creation of a cycle path leading to the Bermuda Park Station including a toucan crossing on Coventry Road and creation within the site of a cycle path linking from the canal 'Turnover Bridge' to Coventry Road."
MM100	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	84	Amend text as follows:"4. A proportionate contribution toward enhancement of canal towpath and ~~'Turnover Bridge' to allow use as cycle path~~ provision for the crossing of the canal to facilitate cycle usage. Development proposals will investigate suitability of using the Turnover Bridge and, if appropriate, then financial contributions will be sought for its delivery. Where demonstrated that this would not be technically feasible, alternative bridge provision that respects the heritage asset of the canal and does not adversely affect navigational safety will be secured~~.~~ Also creation of cycle path within development ~~leading towards Bedworth employment sites~~."
MM101	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	84	Amend text as follows:"6. ~~Developer contribution towards diverting existing frequent local bus service(s) into the employment site in order to enhance accessibility for local residents~~ Upgrades to the existing bus stops on the edge of the site to include covered bus shelters and seating"
MM102	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:~~"7. Developer contribution to secure provision of bus infrastructure at prominent locations within the employment site to complement point 6. "~~
MM103	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:~~"8~~ 7. A proportionate financial Developer contribution towards Gipsy Lane Canal Bridge Strengthening/Widening Works to enhance local bus service accessibility to the employment site from Griff Roundabout, Coventry Road etc."
MM104	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows: "~~9~~ 8. A proportionate financial contribution towards the road improvement schemes in the A444 Corridor as set out in the Transport Modelling Report. "
MM105	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~11~~ 10. A proportionate ~~F~~financial contribution towards delivery of an area wide Green Infrastructure SPD (or equivalent) that promotes species movement along identified green corridors."
MM106	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:~~"12. Provision of a wayleave for the electricity pylon"~~

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM107	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:~~"13. Provision of landscape buffer and ecological mitigation and enhancement in the south western corner of the site and provision of wildlife corridors alongside the Coventry Canal potential local wildlife site and Griff Hollows Local wildlife site. "~~
MM108	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows ":~~14.~~ 11. Development should be set back from the northern boundary of the site to allow for landscape buffer and ecological mitigation for Griff Hollows Local wildlife site."
MM109	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~15.~~ 12. Development should be set back from the Coventry Canal corridor to the East of the site to allow for landscape buffer and ecological mitigation. ~~along with~~ This should include tree and shrub planting to limit the effects on the canalside views along Centenary Way."
MM110	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~17. Scale and massing of any development should make reference to the size of the farmstead buildings. "~~
MM111	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~18. Any employment units fronting onto the Coventry Canal Corridor should be limited to those of a smaller scale (height) and should be orientated so the shorter side or 'gable end' of the building fronts onto Coventry Canal Corridor "~~
MM112	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~19. Use of colour graduation on elevations from dark at the base to light colours near rooflines to better integrate development into the landscape "~~
MM113	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	86	Amend text as follows:"21. New development should address the canal. Effects of the development on the adjoining section of the Coventry Canal and associated habitats within the Griff and Wem Brooks should be incorporated in the construction management plan.
MM114	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	6.132	86	Amend text as follows: "~~Landscape Character~~ ~~6.132 The landscape character of the site is open countryside. The site is also at an elevated position and has limited opportunities for dense tree planting. On this basis, the scale and mass associated with B8 uses would be unsuitable for the landscape character of the area and therefore proposals for B8 uses will be resisted on this site.~~"
MM115	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	6.133	86	Amend text as follows: "6.133 The south western part of the site is defined as part of the Griff Hill Quarry Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Natural England has confirmed that the ecological interest in this part of the SSSI has been removed and thus have no objection to the employment site coming forward. ~~Some of the ecological mitigation will be located in this part of the site to retain the biodiversity link with the remainder of the SSSI to the south of Gipsy Lane.~~"
MM116	Policy EMP2 ~~- Phoenix~~ Pickards Way~~-~~/ Wilsons Lane	Policy box	88	Amend text as follows: "14. Financial contribution for primary medical care to be given to NHS Warwickshire North Clinical Commissioning Group or successor body."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM117	New Policy	Policy box and supporting text	90	Insert following policy: "Policy EMP3 – Prologis Extension Key Development Principles: 1. Provision of approximately 5.3 ha of employment land for B1, B2 and B8 uses. 2. Provision of habitat creation and enhancement to: a. Enhance the favourable conservation status of the local population of great crested newts (a European protected species); and b. Ensure that there is no net loss of biodiversity. 3. Crushed stone public footway from Pilgrims Walk to New Road / country park, running along the eastern side of the site. 4. New car park for the country park and access off New Road to serve the car park, constructed in crushed stone / grasscrete or other suitable material to be agreed in conjunction with the council, who will manage and maintain the car park. Form of Development: 5. Retention/enhancement of landscape screening to the northern and southern boundaries (plantation woodland), and eastern boundary (hedgerow). 6. Provision of new landscape screening on the western boundary and enhancements to existing structural planting on the site. 7. Habitat creation, enhancement, and subsequent sympathetic management, along the northern, western and southern boundaries to maintain and increase suitable breeding and terrestrial habitat for great crested newts, and to provide sustainable habitat connectivity with Prologis Country Park (local wildlife site) to the east/south-east: a. Retention of existing waterbody (southern boundary) and creation of new waterbodies; b. New hibernacula; c. Management of retained grassland; and d. Access roads to have appropriate connective measures for amphibians to allow their safe passage along the southern boundary. 8. Retention of existing surfaced path to New Road. 9. Retention of mown footpath link from Pilgrims Walk (at south-west corner of site) to existing surfaced path linking to New Road and the country park (at north-east corner of site). 10. Vehicular access to be provided from Pilgrims Walk. 11. Building height to be restricted to 15m to ridge closest to the western boundary. 12. Suitable sewage connection to the existing foul drainage network. 13. Provision of an integrated surface water management scheme. 6.144 Strategic employment site EMP3 comprises an extension to an existing employment park and will contribute to meeting the strategic employment needs of the borough and job creation objectives of the Borough Plan. The site is located to the north of Plot H at Prologis Park, and its southern boundary borders Pilgrims Walk which also serves Plot H. It mainly comprises poor semi-improved grassland, together with plantation woodland along the northern and southern boundaries, including a pond to the south. The site will deliver approximately 5.3 ha (gross) for employment uses, including access, parking, servicing and landscaping / habitat enhancement. The final net figure will be determined by the design and layout of the site. The final scheme layout will need to provide a wayleave for the overhead power lines. Biodiversity Land to the east/south-east of the site is subject to a non-statutory local wildlife site designation (Prologis Country Park Local Wildlife Site). A key feature of the local wildlife site is the meta-population of great crested newts (a European protected species) that it supports, which the on-going management of the country park has specific objectives for. The EMP3 site itself includes a small pond which supports breeding great crested newts, and to ensure that the favourable conservation status of the local great crested newt population is maintained, the site will require on-site mitigation and additional off-site mitigation in the adjacent country park. Beyond the mitigation measures for great crested newts, development of EMP3 will result in an overall loss of habitat, but much of this will be poor semi-improved grassland of low biodiversity distinctiveness. However, to ensure that there is no net loss of biodiversity, the proposed development will be subject to a Warwickshire Biodiversity Impact Assessment to identify the level of compensatory habitat creation/enhancement that will be required either within the Prologis Country Park, or at another appropriate off-site location. Transport and Access

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
				Access to the site will be via the existing road infrastructure within Prologis Park (Winding House Lane / Central Boulevard) with access points taken from Pilgrims Walk. Existing footpath routes will be retained. There is potential for separate access points for HGVs and cars, however this needs to take existing landscape and ecological constraints into account. A secondary vehicular access off New Road to the north will serve a proposed car park for the country park and will not be accessible to the wider employment site. The Transport Modelling Report commissioned by Warwickshire County Council set out a number of strategic road improvements in close proximity to EMP3 to mitigate potential cumulative impacts of all proposed strategic housing and employment allocations within the Borough Plan. The development of EMP3 is expected to contribute financially towards the A444 corridor road and Bedworth area improvement schemes set out in the Transport Modelling Report, either via Planning Obligation or CIL provision."
MM118	Policy EMP4- Coventry Road	Policy box	91	Amend text as follows: Forms of Development 11. Smaller scale (and height) development (similar scale to the adjacent Bermuda Industrial Estate) will be located nearer to the residential edge to the north and east ~~and adjacent to the Griff Gypsy and Traveller Site~~ 14. Maintain an open corridor to the south of ~~through~~ the site accommodating the Centenary Way with appropriate tree and shrub planting to limit effects on views along this PRoW
MM119	Policy EMP4- Coventry Road	Policy box	91	Amend text as follows:"16. Areas of high distinctiveness should look to be preserved to form part of a network of natural habitats. Habitat connectivity to the south should be maintained to allow connections to the wider LWS. including along the southern boundary of the site"
MM120	Policy EMP4 - Coventry Road	Policy box	91	Amend text as follows: "4. Financial contribution towards the delivery of biodiversity enhancement on land to the South of Centenary Way (Griff Hollows Local Wildlife Site) and biodiversity offsetting."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM121	Policy EMP4- Coventry Road	6.145	92	Amend text as follows:"6.145 Land directly to the south of EMP4 was part of the Griff Granite Quarry and was extensively quarried throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The site is now restored and designated as the Griff Hollows Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The Centenary Way long distance footpath crosses south ~~centre~~ of the site. Griff Brook runs, in culvert, parallel with Centenary Way. ~~An overhead power line cross the southern part of the site.~~ "
MM122	Policy EMP4 - Coventry Road	6.146	92	Amend text as follows: "6.146 The site will deliver ~~circa~~ approximately 9ha gross (8.6 ha net) for employment uses including parking and servicing areas. The site is in two ownerships but all landowners see the value in working together to bring the site forward in a comprehensive and integrated manner. It is essential that landowners come to a voluntary agreement based on an equitable equalisation mechanism to ensure that the contributions to off-site and on-site infrastructure requirements are met. The final net figure will be determined by the design and layout of the site."
MM123	Policy EMP5 Caldwell Road Industrial Estate	Policy box and paragraphs	93	~~Strategic employment site EMP5 will be developed for employment uses comprising Use Classes B1, B2 and B8.~~ ~~Key Development Principles:~~ ~~1. Provision of circa 0.6 ha of employment land~~ ~~2. Financial contributions towards Borough wide strategic highway infrastructure works identified within the A444 Corridor~~ ~~Form of Development:~~ ~~3. Provision of landscape buffer along north west and western edge of the site adjacent to Coventry Canal~~ ~~4. Development should seek to enhance the setting of nearby listed buildings by complementing the form, mass, density, design and materials of the historic buildings to the north of the site~~ ~~5. Development should not dominate views towards the historic buildings and churchyard to the north of the site~~ ~~6.151 Strategic employment site EMP5 comprises a small scale extension to an existing industrial estate that will contribute to meeting the strategic employment needs of the Borough and job creation objectives of the Borough Plan. The site is located in the Hill Top area of Nuneaton and comprises open land within an existing built up area. The land has been the subject of previous planning applications for residential uses which have been refused by the Planning Authority and upheld at appeal on grounds of residential amenity.~~ ~~6.152 The site will deliver 0.6ha for employment uses including parking and servicing areas via the existing access onto Caldwell Road. The site is in a single ownership and is expected to be delivered through an over-arching outline permission. The final net figure will be determined by the design and layout of the site.~~ ~~6.153 The allocation will be delivered within the first 5 years after adoption.~~ ~~Transport~~ ~~6.154 The Transport Modelling Report commissioned by Warwickshire County Council set out a number of strategic road improvements in close proximity to EMP5 to mitigate potential cumulative impacts of all proposed strategic housing and employment allocations within the Borough Plan. The development of EMP5 is expected to contribute financially towards the A444 corridor road improvement schemes set out in the Transport Modelling Report either via Planning Obligation or CIL provision.~~ ~~Landscape Buffer~~ ~~6.155 The enhancements and landscape buffer required adjacent to Coventry Canal will maintain and enhance ecological connectivity in the area as well as providing landscape and historic benefits. The landscape buffer should retain and enhance the existing boundary and should also provide an extension of broad-leaved plantation.~~

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM124	Policy EMP7 Bowling Green Lane	Policy box	95	Amend text as follows:"2.Provision of a new junction onto Bowling Green Lane at the School Lane junction with associated traffic lights and any transport improvements/new junctions and upgrades required along Bowling Green Lane and School Lane (in conjunction with both the development of HSG6 and either by agreement with the landowner or securing the transfer of the land to the highway authority to facilitate the use of highway powers for land outside of the HSG6 allocation. The developer will be expected to submit for agreement an HGV routing strategy which will show HGV's accessing/egressing the site from the School Lane direction and avoiding the Local Schools on Bowling Green Lane, Ash Green Lane and Wheelwright Lane"
MM125	Policy EMP7 - Bowling Green Lane	Policy box	95	Amend text as follows:"3. Financial contributions towards Borough wide strategic highway infrastructure works identified within the Bedworth area and provision of a cycle network within the site as well as contributions to links beyond the site to residential areas and toward Bedworth Town Centre."
MM126	Policy EMP7 - Bowling Green Lane	Policy box	96	Amend text as follows: "9. Provision of enhanced buffer in the south eastern corner to protect the setting of the Exhall Hall Scheduled Ancient Monument and Listed Buildings, as well as ensuring that the scale of development does not detract from the prominence and importance of the listed buildings."
MM127	Policy H2 - Affordable Housing	Policy box	101	Amend text as follows: "The Council will seek to negotiate 25% affordable housing where residential development proposals consist of 15 dwellings or more, and ~~20%~~ for 2 units where residential development proposals consist of between 11 – 14 dwellings, irrespective of any demolitions."
MM128	Policy H2 - Affordable Housing	Policy box	101	Amend text as follows: "Proposals which boost affordable housing delivery will be considered constructively in line with any updates to national policy, including Starter Homes exception sites which will be exempt from meeting the affordable housing requirements."
MM129	Policy H2 - Affordable Housing	Policy box	101	Amend text as follows: "Proposals must consider how they accord with the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document"
MM130	Policy H2 - Affordable Housing	7.25	102	Amend text as follows:"7.25 The 2015 SHMA identifies a range of affordable need percentages according to different projection scenarios . The 2016 Affordable Housing Background Paper by GL Hearn states that 25% affordable housing provision would be appropriate subject to viability . Work undertaken by Dixon Searle Partnerships has identified that an affordable housing target of 25% is viable on developments of 15 dwellings or more. Where the calculation would result in a fraction of a dwelling the number will be rounded up. DSP also identified that a target of 20% affordable housing could be applied on developments of ~~10~~ 11-14 dwellings . Given local circumstances, ~~this lower development threshold target will also be applied~~. rather than a % the Council will negotiate for 2 units on all of these sites."
MM131	Policy H2 - Affordable Housing	7.43	105	Amend text as follows: "Indicator H2a Developments of 1~~0~~1-14 dwellings and 15+ dwellings where ~~20%~~ 2 units and 25% respectively of affordable housing is negotiated."
MM132	Policy H3 - Gypsies and Travellers	Policy box	106	Amend text as follows: "The following criteria will be used to identify suitable strategic sites for at least 39 residential and 5 transit pitches to be taken forward in a Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations Plan, for the period 2016/2017 to 2031/2032:"

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM133	Policy H3 - Gypsies and Travellers	7.47	107	Amend text as follows: "7.47 This policy recognises the need to plan for additional sites for Gypsies and Travellers. It sets out the criteria that will be used to identify potential locations for residential and permanent pitches through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan. The criteria are based on those used to select the strategic housing allocations. The criteria will also be used for determining planning applications in the interim period before the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan is adopted. The Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan will follow on from the Borough Plan in a separate document and will identify specific sites to meet the pitch requirements identified above. This policy will also be used to determine applications on unallocated sites prior to and after the Gypsy and Traveller Sites Allocations document is adopted."
MM134	Policy E1 - Existing employment estates	Policy box	108	Applications for economic uses, focusing particularly on use classes B1(b), B2 and B8, on the strategic employment sites and the portfolio of existing employment sites ~~for economic uses~~, ~~focusing particularly on use classes B1(b), B2 and B8 uses~~ will be approved subject to them satisfactorily meeting the policies in the plan. ~~to meeting the following criteria:~~ Applications which can demonstrate the following will be considered favourably: a). Inward investment development, providing high quality and high density employment opportunities ~~(this will be supported by a Supplementary Planning Document).~~ b). Employment ~~S~~sectors in line with those prioritised in the Economic Development Strategy, which include: • Advanced Manufacturing • Professional Services • Research and Development c). ~~Applications~~ The ~~generating~~ generation o~~f~~ permanent jobs that will help diversify the local economy. d). Employment and training schemes to maximise local employment opportunities and help address skill deficits in the local population
MM135	Policy E1 - Existing employment estates	Policy box	108	*At end of policy insert:* Proposals that promote appropriately located tourism activities to attract and sustain visitor numbers will be supported.
MM136	Policy E1 - Existing employment estates	8.6	108	Amend text as follows: "Delivery Mechanisms 8.6 The delivery mechanisms for this policy are as follows: ~~• Supplementary Planning Document dealing with inward investment and density standards.~~ • Economic Development Strategy, inclusive of: o Reviewing the promotion of suitable employment and associated actions, e.g. the marketing of the sites o Actively working with partner organisations that can assist in attracting new businesses "

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM137	Policy E1 - Existing employment estates	Policy box	110	Amend text as follows: "The redevelopment, and/ or expansion of existing employment sites listed in Table 11 (as shown on the Policies Map) for B use class employment purposes will be approved. This table will be subject to review annually to take account of monitoring, which will be reported in the AMR. Where existing sites become vacant or are unlikely to serve a role for employment, the Council will work in partnership to secure an appropriate alternative reuse. The partnership working will be driven by the Council's Economic Development Strategy. The sites listed in Table 12 (as shown on the Policies Map) will not be protected from non-economic development type proposals. These sites are considered acceptable for alternative uses during the plan period. The Council's Economic Development Strategy will assist in the determination of alternative uses."
MM138	Policy E2 - Existing employment estates	Policy box	111	The sites listed in Table 12 and shown in appendix E will not be protected from non-economic development type proposals. *At end of policy insert:* Proposals on employment sites for non employment uses must demonstrate how they meet the following tests: A. Is the site allocated for employment land? B. Is there an adequate supply of allocated employment sites of sufficient quality in the locality (the relevant settlement within the District) to cater for a range of business requirements? C. Is the site capable of being serviced by a catchment population of sufficient size? D. Is there evidence of active marketing? E. Could employment redevelopment be brought forward, taking account of site characteristics (including physical factors, accessibility and neighbouring uses) and would redevelopment be viable? If employment redevelopment is not viable, could mixed use redevelopment be brought forward? F. If firms are likely to be displaced through redevelopment, is there a supply of alternative suitable accommodation in the locality to help support local businesses and jobs? Would this promote or hinder sustainable communities and travel patterns?
MM139	Policy E2 - Existing employment estates	Table 11	111	Move School Lane site from table 11 into table 12
MM140	Policy E2 - Existing employment estates	8.11	113	In relation to proposals on employment sites for non employment uses, the assumption is that allocated sites are protected. When considering if the site is capable of being serviced by a catchment population of sufficient size, regard should be had to what the balance between population and employment in the relevant area is. In addition, account should be taken of what the impact of employment loss on commuting patterns might be, as well as whether there would be a detrimental impact on the local economy from loss of the employment land. When considering evidence of active marketing of employment sites proposed for non employment sites, we would recommend a requirement for active marketing for two years. In addition, how the size and quality of space matches local demand should be demonstrated, taking account of market conditions and expected future trends.

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM141	Policy TC2	Policy box	119	*At end of policy insert:* Proposals that promote appropriately located tourism and heritage activities to attract and sustain visitor numbers will be supported.
MM142	Policy TC2	Policy box	119	*At end of policy insert:* Proposals should be in line with proposals within the Town Centres Area Action Plan and the aspirations of the 'Transforming Nuneaton' initiative.
MM143	Policy TC2	Policy box	119	Amend text as follows: ~~"Nuneaton town centre café quarter Proposals in Nuneaton town centre for restaurants and cafes (Use Class A3) and drinking establishments (Use Class A4) should be directed to the Café Quarter as defined in Appendix E. When granting planning permission for A3 or A4 uses within the defined Cafe Quarter, permitted development rights for changes of use to A2 from A3 or A4 will be removed.~~ ~~Proposals for new A3 or A4 uses outside the Café Quarter should only be considered if the following criteria can be demonstrated:~~ ~~• There are no suitable sites available.~~ ~~• The vitality and viability of the café quarter will not be undermined.~~ ~~• There is sufficient demand to warrant extra provision. "~~
MM144	Policy TC2	Policy box and accompanying text	119	*Delete references to Appendix E - Café quarter*
MM145	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	Policy box	128	Amend text as follows:"(c) The impact on Air Quality ~~Management Areas (AQMAs)~~ and measures proposed to ensure impact is not exacerbated."
MM146	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	Policy box	128	Amend text as follows: ~~"All strategic sites~~ Proposals should target ~~are required to achieve~~ a 15% modal shift to non-car based uses by including provisions which promote more sustainable transport options."
MM147	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	Policy box	128	Add the following text after the last paragraph: "The council supports the provision and integration of emerging and future intelligent mobility infrastructure that may help to deal with the issue of air quality, such as including electric vehicle charging points. **Proposals must consider how they accord with the Supplementary Planning Documents Transport Demand Management Matters and Air Quality."**
MM148	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility	Policy box	128	*At end of policy insert:* Proposals should be in accordance with the 'Movement for Growth' strategy of the Transport for West Midlands and the West Midlands Transport Emissions Framework and associated policies.

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
	and sustainable transport			
MM149	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	10.12 - 10.13	129	Amend paragraph between 10.12 and 10.13 as follows: "The WMMTEF and its associated policies set out transport's role in tackling air quality issues for the wider region, which in combination with the policies in the Borough Plan, will further help air quality."
MM150	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	10.22	130	Amend text as follows:"10.22 The delivery mechanisms for this policy are as follows: • SPD 'Transport Demand Management Matters', to cover: o Standards for car parking o Sustainable transport standards and considerations e.g. cycle parking requirements, safe accessibility • Nuneaton town centre transport study – to be led by Warwickshire County Council • Air Quality Action plans **• SPD on Air Quality**
MM151	Policy HS5 - Health	Policy box	138	Amend text as follows: ~~"A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required for all applications that also meet the threshold for requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment (Schedule 1 and 2).~~ ~~For all other applications that create health impacts a HIA is required. A screening assessment can be undertaken utilising the Department of Health screening assessment 88 . The assessment criteria will be identified within a Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning for a healthier area – Nuneaton and Bedworth'.~~ ~~Where applications do not include a HIA, justification and explanation should be provided which demonstrate that the proposal has limited impacts to health. This can be achieved by undertaking a screening assessment as a minimum.~~ All major development proposals will be required to demonstrate that they would have an acceptable impact on health and wellbeing. This should be demonstrated through a: a) Health Impact Assessment where significant impacts on health and wellbeing would arise from that proposal; or b) Health Impact Assessment Screening Report which demonstrates that the proposed development would not overall give rise to negative impacts in respect of health and wellbeing All HIAs shall be undertaken in accordance with the Council's HIA Supplementary Planning Document. Where a development has significant negative or positive impacts on health and wellbeing the Council may require applicants to provide for the mitigation or provision of such impacts through planning conditions and/or financial/other contributions secured via planning obligations or CIL ".

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM152	Policy HS5 - Health	Policy box	138	Amend text as follows: ~~"Fast Food Proposals~~ ~~To limit the development of environments that encourage obesity, A3 – A5 uses (restaurants and hot-food take-always) should be directed to town centres as set out in Policy TC3 – Hierarchy of Centres. Outside of Nuneaton and Bedworth town centres, A3 – A5 use proposals will be permitted providing:~~ ~~• The proposal is not within 400 metres of the boundary of a secondary school.~~ ~~• The proposal does not jeopardise the provision of an essential local service.~~ ~~• The proposal does not increase the number of units under the A3-A5 use class to over 20% of the centre's total usage.~~ ~~• Customer visits by car would not unacceptably impact on existing or proposed public transport provision, traffic movements, road or pedestrian safety.~~ ~~• A sequential assessment is provided which demonstrates that there are no other sequentially preferable sites. "~~
MM153	Policy HS5 - Health	10.51	138	Amend text as follows:"10.51 The development of an SPD will assist in determining how a HIA should be undertaken as well as the criteria that should be included as part of any assessment. As an example it is anticipated that the HIA will need to assess impact on childhood obesity. This will also build upon the current Health Impacts Tool Kit being developed by Birmingham City Council and which is expected to be rolled out across the West Midlands Combined Authority(WMCA) area. The development of this toolkit to date has involved partnership working with representatives from the development industry and Public Health England (PHE). Once launched it is expected to carry with it an associated accreditation supported by PHE. In the event that this tool kit is not rolled out across the WMCA or the toolkit is shown to be inappropriate for a specific development proposal, the HIA SPD will provide guidance as to alternative tool kits that will support health considerations in new developments across the borough. Over time there may be a need to update criteria in light of new health evidence."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM154	Policy HS5 - Health	10.47	139	10.47 Health and well-being are key issues at the national and local level. Alcohol abuse and obesity are particular health concerns for the Borough . Health is not simply about access to medical facilities, it is also about lifestyle. Physical activity can also play an important part of health and wellbeing. This element is dealt with through Policy HS6 – Sport and Exercise. This policy focuses on elements of health that are not picked up elsewhere in the Plan. 10.48 The policy stipulates a HIA requirement for applications which meet the threshold for an EIA. Using the EIA as a trigger for a HIA is considered an appropriate threshold because it is extremely likely that the application will impact health. Planning applications not requiring an EIA are likely to create impacts on health, however identifying an appropriate scale of application is challenging. Ultimately the impact is likely to vary even for applications of similar use classes. Consequently, the policy recommends a screening process be undertaken by the applicant to assist in determining the need for a HIA. The submitted HIA will be assessed by Warwickshire Public Health during the determination period. ~~10.49 A HIA was undertaken at the Preferred Options stage of the plan, and recommended the plan includes a restrictive policy regarding fast food outlets . Whilst there is evidence to suggest obesity levels may be higher in areas of high numbers of fast food outlets, there is no conclusive evidence of this relationship. However, the Council aims to contribute to creating healthy environments where possible and has therefore introduced criteria which must be adhered to for any future fast food proposals for A3 - A5 uses, both within and outside of town centres.~~ ~~10.50 Implementing a 400 metre fast food buffer around secondary schools has proven to be a successful measure where implemented in other Local Authorities . A 400 metre buffer is chosen as this is thought to equate to a five minute walking time.~~ 10.51 The development of an SPD will assist in determining how a HIA should be undertaken as well as the criteria that should be included as part of any assessment. ~~As an example it is anticipated that the HIA will need to assess impact on childhood obesity.~~ Over time there may be a need to update criteria in light of new health evidence. Borough Plan Objectives 10.52 This policy delivers the following Borough Plan objectives: • Objective 8 Evidence Base 10.53 The evidence base related to this policy is as follows: • Health Impact Assessment – Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan (Ben Cave Associates, 2014) Delivery Mechanisms 10.54 The delivery mechanisms for this policy are as follows: • Agreement with Warwickshire Public Health to be developed regarding assessment of HIA • Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning for a healthier area – Nuneaton and Bedworth' • Continue partnership arrangements with healthcare providers and Warwickshire police ~~• Planning applications for A3 - A5 uses will be determined based on the above criteria on 'Fast Food Proposals'~~

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM155	New Policy	New Policy	144	*Create new Policy HS7:* Policy HS7 - Creating a Healthier food environment To limit the development of environments that encourage obesity, A5 uses (hot-food take-aways) should be directed to town centres as set out in Policy TC3 – Hierarchy of centres. Outside of Nuneaton and Bedworth town centres, A5 use proposals will be permitted providing: • The proposal is not within a 400 m radius of the principal point of access to an existing secondary school or sixth form college. This will not apply when the buffer zone overlaps with a town or local centre. • The proposal does not jeopardise the provision of an essential local service • The proposal does not increase the number of units under the A5 use class to over 20% of the centre's total usage. • Customer visits by car would not unacceptably impact on existing or proposed public transport provision, traffic movements, road or pedestrian safety. • A sequential assessment is provided which demonstrates that there are no other sequentially preferable sites. Proposals should be in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning for a healthier area – Nuneaton and Bedworth'.

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM156	New Policy	New Policy supporting text	144	Amend text as follows: "A HIA was undertaken at the Preferred Options stage of the plan, and recommended the plan includes a restrictive policy regarding fast food outlets . Whilst there is evidence to suggest obesity levels may be higher in areas of high numbers of fast food outlets, there is no conclusive evidence of this relationship. However, the Council aims to contribute to creating healthy environments where possible and has therefore introduced criteria which must be adhered to for any future fast food proposals for A5 uses, both within and outside of town centres. Implementing a 400 metre fast food buffer around secondary schools has proven to be a successful measure where implemented in other Local Authorities . A 400 metre buffer is chosen as this is thought to equate to a five minute walking time. Borough Plan Objectives This policy delivers the following Borough Plan objectives: • Objective 8 Evidence Base The evidence base related to this policy is as follows: • Health Impact Assessment – Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan (Ben Cave Associates, 2014) Delivery Mechanisms The delivery mechanisms for this policy are as follows: • Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning for a healthier area – Nuneaton and Bedworth' • Planning applications for A5 uses will be determined based on the above criteria on 'Creating a healthier food environment' Monitoring The indicators and targets that will be monitored for this policy are outlined in Table: Indicators and targets to be monitored for Policy HS7. Monitoring ref - Indicator - Target HS7a - Monitor the number of applications for use class A5 within 400 m of the principal point of access of existing secondary schools and sixth form colleges, excluding applications falling in town, district or local centres - Zero HS7b - Monitor the number of units under A5 use class as a percentage of each local and district centre - 20% maximum"
MM157	Policy NE1 - Green Infrastructure	Policy box	145	Amend text as follows: "Where development proposals have a watercourse classified as Main River within their boundary, ~~an 8 metre easement should be left between the watercourse and the development edge~~ as a minimum developers should set back development 8 metres from the top of the bank or landward toe of any flood defence. Greater widths may be appropriate where forming GI, open space or ecological corridors. Easements will also be sought on smaller watercourses where possible to maintain ecological and green corridors.~~to help improve connectivity and create green corridors."~~
MM158	Policy NE2 - Open space	Policy box	149	Amend text as follows: "d) Addressing ~~deficiencies of~~ open space needs arising from the development ~~in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility~~ through new provision or improving existing provision in line with standards set out in the Open Space Strategy."

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM159	Policy NE2 - Open space	Policy box	149	*At end of policy insert:* New open space can multi-function as flood storage where appropriate. Children's play or sports pitches will not be acceptable areas of flood storage.
MM160	Policy NE2 - Open space	11.19	150	Amend text as follows:"11.19 A key element of the Open Space Strategy is to ensure that all properties in the Borough have access to a community park. This means that all residents will be within 600 metres or 10-12 minutes walking distance of a community park. To achieve this aim, current deficiencies will be addressed by: • Improving open spaces to create community parks at Change Brook Close, Buttermere Recreation Ground, St Giles, Blackberry Lane and Anderton Road; • Providing new open space in Whitestone, The Long Shoot and Bulkington; • Providing new community parks and/or improving existing community parks to meet the needs of the residents of the strategic housing sites. Proposed community parks will be removed from Green Belt as part of the related development proposals"
MM161	Policy NE3 - Biodiversity and geodiversity	Policy box	153	Add extra paragraph at the end of the policy box as follows: "Special Areas of Conservation and Sites of Special Scientific Interest Developments that would adversely affect Special Areas of Conservation or cause significant harm to Sites of Special Scientific Interest will not normally be granted planning permission."
MM162	Policy NE3 - Biodiversity and geodiversity	Policy box	153	Amend text as follows: "~~Any proposal that directly or indirectly impacts on a locally designated site must show that the benefits of the development proposal will outweigh the immediate loss of biodiversity and/ or geodiversity before development is permitted.~~"
MM163	Policy NE4 - Managing Flood Risk and Water Quality	Policy box	157	Amend text as follows: "Flood Risk Management Schemes (Flood Defences) ~~Where potential developments might compromise the existing flood risk management function, the supporting FRA must demonstrate how the risks will be avoided, mitigated or redeveloped and that any risks both within the site and to sites further downstream will not increase.~~ Land that is required for current and future flood management will be safeguarded from development."
MM164	Policy NE4 - Managing Flood Risk and Water Quality	11.50	160	Amend text as follows:"11.50 As of 15 April 2015, ~~all matters relating to surface water management are now managed by~~ Warwickshire County Council ~~as the LLFA~~ are statutory consultees on major planning applications for surface water".
MM165	Policy NE4 - Managing Flood Risk and Water Quality	11.51	160	Amend text as follows:"11.51 Surface water run-off should be managed at source, at a discharge rate no greater than the equivalent greenfield rate, for all return periods up to the 1 in 100 year (1% AEP) flood event, plus climate change event. Where this is not possible, developers should contact the LLFA at the earliest convenience for advice on suitable surface water drainage techniques. The Warwickshire County Council standing advice design guide should be taken into consideration when designing SuDS"

Main Modification reference	Borough Plan Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Proposed Main Modification
MM166	Policy NE4 - Managing flood risk and water quality	Table 27	162	Amend text as follows: "The number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of Environment Agency and Local Lead Flood Authority on grounds of flood risk."
MM167	Policy BE2 - Renewable and low carbon energy	Policy box	168	Amend text as follows: "~~One small scale wind energy turbine, between 5 kW and 20 kW electricity power output, with a maximum height of 15 metres to hub, will be appropriate on school premises, industrial estates and farms provided there is:~~"
MM168	Policy BE3 - Sustainable design and construction	Policy box	173	Amend text as follows: "• ~~Meet the optional Building Regulations Standard for water efficiency of 110 litres/per person/per day and~~ install rain water harvesting systems in the curtilage of all new buildings."
MM169	New appendix		183	Amend Appedix to Appendix E - Employment estates suitable for alternative uses Insert new appendix with maps to show individual 'Employment estates suitable for alternative uses'.
MM171	Appendix E		219	Remove Appendix E ~~Café Quarter~~ and delete map.
MM170		Policy map	217	Swap 'Primary frontage' and 'Primary shopping area' key colours.
MM172	Index of monitoring indicators		249	Amend text as follows: "DS4a - Housing completions - ~~13,372~~ 14,060 dwellings completions."
MM173	Index of monitoring indicators		249	Amend text as follows: "DS4b - Development of Employment Land - ~~103.6 hectares~~ 107.8 ha of land is development for employment uses."
MM174	Index of monitoring indicators		250	Amend text as follows: "DS6a - Monitor the supply and delivery of allocated sites and report annually through the AMR - ~~103.6 hectares~~ 107.8 ha of land is developed for employment uses."

Borough Plan additional modifications

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM1	1. Introduction	Consultation	1.8	7	Amend text as follows: "~~This document seeks your views on the publication draft version of the Plan,~~The council consulted on the Publication version of the Borough Plan, which ~~is~~was the version the ~~C~~council ~~would like~~wished to adopt as its final policy. ~~To make comments, please complete the response form which can be found on the Council's website www.nuenatonandbedworth.gov.uk/boroughplan~~"	To reflect the consultation having finished
AM2	1. Introduction	Consultation	1.8	7	Insert new sub-heading after 1.8 as follows: "Main Modifications: September - December 2018", and insert new paragraph below as follows: "The council consulted on the Main Modifications proposed for the Borough Plan, which were identified by the Inspector examining the Borough Plan."	To update plan following main modifications consultation
AM3	3. Issues facing the borough	Issues associated with the local environment	3.4	13	Amend text as follows: "~~• There are only three Local Nature Reserves in the Borough.~~"	To remove unnecessary text. Incorrectly regarded as an issue - local wildlife sites are the actual measure of whether ecological sites are being

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
						appropriately identified and designated.
AM4	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	4.3	15	Amend text as follows: "b) Provide additional employment land that is attractive to investors in the following locations: • Faultlands, Gipsy Lane • ~~Phoenix Way/~~ Wilsons Lane • Prologis Extension • Coventry Road ~~• Land at Caldwell Road Industrial Estate~~ • Longford Road • Bowling Green Lane"	To give clarity, as Phoenix Way has been renamed, and update text to reflect insertion of EMP3, and removal of EMP5
AM5	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	4.6	18	Amend text as follows: "e) A Green Infrastructure network of high quality, well connected, multi-functional open spaces, corridors and links that deliver benefits to the landscape, wildlife and the public ~~in line with the priority projects identified from the Borough's five green infrastructure zones~~."	To remove unnecessary text
AM6	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	4.7	18	Amend text as follows: "c) Enabling participation in active sport by building on the strengths of the ~~Pingles Leisure Centre~~ borough's leisure centres and other local facilities.	To give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM7	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	4.8	19	Amend text as follows: "a) Important open spaces such as Riversley Park, Miners Welfare Park, Whittleford Park and Community and Local parks are protected and enhanced. Landscape character, historic, geological and natural features ~~such as Arbury Historic Park and Garden, Stockingford Railway Cutting and Ensor's Pool~~ are protected and enhanced."	To remove unnecessary text
AM8	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	4.9	20	Amend text as follows: "e) Ensure development ~~makes links to~~ proportionately contributes to development of the wider cycling and walking networks serving development in order to encourage green travel."	To give clarity
AM9	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	Map	21	Remove A road label of A444 on The Long Shoot	Correcting mistake
AM10	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	Map	21	Remove A road label of A444 on Eastboro Way	Correcting mistake
AM11	4. Vision and objectives	Objectives	Map	21	Amend map to show updated strategic sites	To give clarity
AM12	5. Development strategy	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	5.21	27	Insert footnote for bullet 'a) Strategic Allocations' as follows: "Excludes HSG1 to avoid double counting."	To give clarity
AM13	5. Development strategy	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	5.21	27	Amend footnote 36 for bullet 'c) Site completions' as follows: "~~Completions on~~Includes HSG1 ~~deducted~~ to avoid double counting."	To give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM14	5. Development strategy	Policy DS4 - Overall development needs	5.21	27	Insert footnote for bullet 'd) Sites with planning permission' as follows: "Excludes HSG1 to avoid double counting."	To give clarity
AM15	5. Development strategy	Policy DS6 - Employment allocations	Policy box	36	Modify text as follows: "~~Phoenix Way /~~ Wilsons Lane"	To give clarity, as Phoenix Way has been renamed
AM16	5. Development strategy	Policy DS7 - Green Belt	Policy box	37	Amend text as follows: "HSG6/EMP6 School Lane / Longford Road"	To give clarity
AM17	5. Development strategy	Policy DS7 - Green Belt	Policy box	37	Modify text as follows: "EMP2 ~~Phoenix Way /~~ Wilsons Lane"	To give clarity, as Phoenix Way has been renamed
AM18	6. Strategic allocations	Policy SA1 - Development principles on strategic sites	6.17 - 6.19	44	Amend text as follows: ~~"Community Facilities~~ ~~6.17 The provision of new facilities or the enhancement of existing facilities will be brought forward as part of each of the strategic allocations.~~ ~~6.18 These facilities will include, but are not limited to, local centres, community halls, sports facilities, play provision and open space provision within the Council's Open Space Strategy.~~ ~~6.19 If it is unviable to provide facilities on site then financial contributions to enhance or expand existing local facilities will be sought.~~	Duplication of following paragraphs

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM19	Various			46	Replace all maps to remove scale, as the maps are not scaled to their size on the page. These maps are made up of the following sections/appendices: 7. Strategic allocations Appendix A - Non-strategic sites Appendix B - Conservation areas Appendix C - Town centres Appendix D - Town centre primary and secondary frontages Appendix E - District centres Appendix F - Local centres Appendix G - Scheduled monuments Appendix H - Ensor's Pool Appendix I - Local wildlife sites	Correcting mistake
AM20	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG1 - North of Nuneaton	6.32	48	Amend text as follows: "6.32 The site will deliver ~~3331~~ 4,419 new dwellings in a mix of sizes and tenures.	Inspector's recommendation
AM21	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	50	Amend text as follows: "~~6. Provision of land and contribution to new allotments in the north-eastern part of the site~~"	Similar to bullet point 12, therefore unnecessary
AM22	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG2 - Arbury	Policy box	51	Amend text as follows: "15. Improvements to the urban edge through ~~removal or re-grading of the mound and~~ use of a woodland planting belt in order to screen the urban edge. New woodland should be buffered on its eastern side by open space, which the existing houses should face"	To remove unnecessary text and give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM23	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG3 - Gipsy Lane	Policy box	55	Add the following text in under key development principles: "Financial contribution towards the road improvement schemes in the A444 Corridor as set out in the Transport Modelling Report."	Inspector's recommendation
AM24	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	6.62	59	Amend text as follows: "6.62 On–site open space will be limited but a financial contribution will be sought towards the upgrading of play facilities at the park on Heath Road/Newtown Road and financial contribution towards facilities at Miners Welfare Park in Bedworth. ~~The Miners Welfare Park is a 'destination park' within the Council's Open Space Strategy and the focus for open space provision in the local area.~~"	To remove unnecessary text
AM25	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG4 - Woodlands	6.66	60	Amend text as follows: "6.66 Any development should take the opportunity to secure an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, both Grade II* Listed Buildings included on the Heritage at Risk Register. Alternatively a Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement could be agreed in relation to the building. This would help to offset impacts to the RPG derived from the perception of the possible reduction in the quantity of surrounding rural landscape around the parkland and the reduced degree of separation between the parkland and development and the potential cumulative	Removing unnecessary text and correcting mistake

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
					effect of development in other areas ~~(for instance HSG2 and or EMP8)~~ encroaching upon the rural setting of the park."	
AM26	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG5 - Hospital Lane	Policy box	61	Amend text as follows: "5. Financial contribution towards the up-grading of the existing sports pitches at Anderton Road and facilities at Newdigate Recreation Ground and Miners Welfare Park"	Correcting mistake
AM27	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG5 - Hospital Lane	Policy box	62	Amend text as follows: "11. Provision of a footway/cycleway network through the site ~~linking Hospital Lane and Goodyers End Lane with Mavor Drive, Anderton Road and the existing/ expanded recreation ground~~ and contributions to the wider cyclepath network, including links towards Bedworth Town Centre."	To remove unnecessary text and give flexibility to route provision
AM28	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG6 and EMP6 - School Lane	Heading	64	Amend text as follows: "HSG6/EMP6 School Lane / Longford Road"	To give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM29	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG7 - East of Bulkington	Policy box	69	Amend text as follows: "2. ~~POS~~ Play and open space, including younger children's play, to be provided with appropriate management and maintenance arrangements"	To give clarity
AM30	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	Map	72	Replace map with to show the correct boundary, which does not cut across 78, 80 and 82 Coventry.	Correcting mistake due to error with mapping software
AM31	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG8 - West of Bulkington	6.93	73	Amend text as follows: "6.93 Strategic housing allocation HSG8 is a sustainable and deliverable extension on the western edge of Bulkington. The site covers ~~22.9ha~~ 25.1 ha and is effectively split into three parcels."	Correcting mistake
AM32	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	6. 120	82	Amend text as follows: "6.120 Strategic Housing allocation HSG11 is a sustainable and deliverable housing allocation in the Camp Hill area of Nuneaton. The site comprises previously disturbed former mining land associated with the adjacent Judkins Quarry. The developable area of the site is to the east of the Coventry Canal which is screened by woodland along both sides. The land to the west of the canal includes part of the designated Judkins Quarry Local Wildlife Site which supports a number of valuable habitats and species including Great Crested Newts. ~~This area will not be developed.~~ The land to the east of the canal is of less ecological value and has the greater potential for development. "	Correcting mistake

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM33	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows: "13. Retain views towards the man made ~~colliery~~ mound (Mount Judd) as a feature and landmark within the landscape "	Correcting mistake
AM34	6. Strategic allocations	Policy HSG11 - Tuttle Hill	Policy box	82	Amend text as follows: "16. Protected ~~special~~ species surveys will be required at the site"	Correcting mistake
AM35	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~11~~ 10. A proportionate ~~F~~financial contribution towards delivery of an area wide Green Infrastructure SPD (or equivalent) that promotes species movement along identified green corridors."	To give clarity
AM36	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	Policy box	85	Amend text as follows:"~~12. Provision of a wayleave for the electricity pylon"~~	To remove unnecessary text
AM37	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP1 - Faultlands	6.132	86	Amend text as follows: "6.132 The landscape character of the site is open countryside. The site is also at an elevated position and has limited opportunities for dense tree planting. On this basis, the scale and mass ~~associated with B8 uses would~~ of development should be ~~unsuitable~~ suitable for the landscape character of the area and therefore proposals ~~for B8 uses~~ which are not appropriate in terms of scale and mass will be resisted on this site."	To give clarity
AM38	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP2 - Phoenix Way/Wilsons Lane	Heading	87	Modify text as follows: "Policy EMP2 - ~~Phoenix Way /~~ Wilsons Lane"	To give clarity, as Phoenix Way has been renamed and correcting mistake

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM39	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP2 - Phoenix Way/Wilsons Lane	Policy box	88	Amend text as follows: "7. Transport improvements and upgrades required along Wilson Lane including the junction with ~~Phoenix Way~~the A444, and appropriate provision for pedestians and cyclists."	Inspector's recommendation and reflection of renaming of Phoenix Way
AM40	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP2 - Phoenix Way/Wilsons Lane	6.141	90	Modify text as follows: "6.141 It has been agreed with the Highway Authority that separate access points will be created for the proposed employment and residential uses on the site. All HGV parking and serving areas associated with the employment uses on the site will be accessed via a new entrance onto the B4113 ~~(Phoenix Way)~~. The final junction solution will be agreed following the completion of a Transport Assessment."	Correcting mistake
AM41	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP4- Coventry Road	Policy box	91	Amend text as follows: Forms of Development 11. Smaller scale (and height) development (similar scale to the adjacent Bermuda Industrial Estate) will be located nearer to the residential edge to the north and east ~~and adjacent to the Griff Gypsy and Traveller Site~~ 14. Maintain an open corridor to the south of ~~through~~ the site accommodating the Centenary Way with appropriate tree and shrub planting to limit effects on views along this PRoW	Updated to reflect smaller site size

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM42	6. Strategic allocations	Policy EMP4- Coventry Road	6.145	92	Amend text as follows:"6.145 Land directly to the south of EMP4 was part of the Griff Granite Quarry and was extensively quarried throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The site is now restored and designated as the Griff Hollows Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The Centenary Way long distance footpath crosses south ~~centre~~ of the site. Griff Brook runs, in culvert, parallel with Centenary Way. ~~An overhead power line cross the southern part of the site.~~ "	Updated to reflect smaller site size
AM43	7. Housing	Policy H1 - Range and mix of housing	7.9	99	Move footnote from the end of the sentence "There is also expected to be significant increases of people with dementia (98%) and mobility problems (78%) by 2031." to the end of the sentence after "The 2015 SHMA shows that between 2011 and 2031, the population aged 60-74 is expected to increase by 23.7%, with the population aged 75 and over expected to increase by 87.7%".	Footnote 45 in the wrong place
AM44	7. Housing	Policy H1 - Range and mix of housing	7.9	99	Add extra footnote to end of the sentence after "There is also expected to be significant increases of people with dementia (98%) and mobility problems (78%) by 2031" with the following reference "GL Hearn (2013). *Coventry & Warwickshire Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Final Report.*"	Inserting omitted reference
AM45	7. Housing	Policy H1 - Range and mix of housing	Table 7	101	Amend text as follows: "H1a - ~~Size of~~ Number of bedrooms in new dwelling completions - Completions in line with percentages set out in the most recent SHMA"	To give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM46	7. Housing	Policy H3 - Gypsies and Travellers	Policy box	106	Amend text as follows: "The following criteria will be used to identify suitable strategic sites for 39 residential and 5 transit pitches to be taken forward in a Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations ~~Plan~~ document, for the period 2016/2017 to 2031/2032:"	To give clarity
AM47	7. Housing	Policy H3 - Gypsies and Travellers	7.47	107	Amend text as follows: "7.47 This policy recognises the need to plan for additional sites for Gypsies and Travellers. It sets out the criteria that will be used to identify potential locations for residential and permanent pitches through the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations ~~Plan~~ document. The criteria are based on those used to select the strategic housing allocations. The criteria will also be used for determining planning applications in the interim period before the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations ~~Plan~~ document is adopted. The Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Plan will follow on from the Borough ~~Plan~~ document in a separate document and will identify specific sites to meet the pitch requirements identified above."	To give clarity
AM48	7. Housing	Policy H3 - Gypsies and Travellers	7.5	107	Amend text as follows: "• Prepare a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations ~~Plan~~ document to identify sites for permanent residential and transit pitches."	To give clarity
AM49	7. Housing	Policy H3 - Gypsies and Travellers	Table 9	107	Add new monitoring indicator: "H3d - Adoption of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations document in accordance with the latest Local Development Scheme - Refer to Local Development Scheme"	Inspector's recommendation

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM50	8. Employment	Policy E1 - Nature of employment growth	Table 10	110	Amend text as follows: "~~E1a - Development of Supplementary Planning Document - SPD to be produced post Borough Plan adoption~~". Also rename subsequent indicator references, restarting with E1a.	To reflect main modifications MM134 and MM136
AM51	8. Employment	Policy E1 - Nature of employment growth	Table 10	110	Amend text as follows: "E1c - The number of applications granted for non-economic development uses~~/~~ on strategic employment sites"	Correcting mistake
AM52	8. Employment	Policy E2 - Existing employment estates	Table 11	112	Amend total size of sites (ha) of Table 11 after removal of School Lane	Update necessary after main modification MM139
AM53	8. Employment	Policy E2 - Existing employment estates	Table 12	112	Amend total area (ha) of Table 12 after addition of School Lane	Update necessary after main modification MM139
AM54	9. Town Centres	Policy TC3 - Hierarchy of centres	Table 16	122	Under appropriate uses for district centre, add "Restaurants / eating establishments"	To give clarity
AM55	9. Town Centres	Policy TC3 - Hierarchy of centres	9.2	123	Amend text as follows: "The Nuneaton and Bedworth Local Shopping Study (March 2012) identifies an existing network of 6 district centres and ~~17~~ 18 local centres within the Borough as well as numerous neighbourhood centres and standalone shops. The provision of easily accessible shops and services such as convenience stores, pharmacies and post offices play an important role in meeting the day to day shopping needs of residents."	Correcting mistake

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM56	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	Policy box	128	Amend text as follows: "Transport proposals in line with those identified in the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Economic Plan, ~~and~~ Warwickshire County Council Local Transport Plan ~~(~~2011 - 2026~~)~~ and Warwickshire County Council Cycle Network Development Plan will be approved."	To update plan
AM57	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	Policy box	128	Amend text as follows: "c) The impact on ~~Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)~~ air quality and measures proposed to ensure impact is not exacerbated."	To allow sufficient flexibility to adapt to change in standards or national policy on air quality
AM58	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	Policy box	128	Amend text as follows: "c) The impact of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and measures proposed to ensure impact is not exacerbated. The council would support measures such as the provision and integration of infrastructure which may help to deal with the issues of air quality, such as electric vehicle charging points."	To provide suggestions on measures to improve air quality
AM59	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	10.21	130	Add the following documents to the evidence base list: "• Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (2016). *Updated Strategic Economic Plan.* • Air Quality Consultants (2017). *Air Quality*	Correcting mistake

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
					Assessment: Development Associated with the Borough Plan, Nuneaton and Bedworth."	
AM60	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS2 - Strategic accessibility and sustainable transport	10.22	130	Amend text as follows: "o Sustainable transport standards and considerations e.g. cycle parking requirements, ~~safe~~ safety and accessibility"	Correcting mistake
AM61	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS3 - Telecommunications and broadband connectivity	Policy box	133	Amend text as follows: "v. Proposals must include details of a satisfactory scheme to return the site to its former or improved condition once operations have ceased and any apparatus is no longer required. The applicant should expect that the LPA will request that a bond be provided under a ~~Section 106 agreement~~ planning obligation to cover the cost of decommissioning and/or restoration of the site."	Inspector's recommendation
AM62	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	Policy box	140	Amend text as follows: "b) New developments, and in particular strategic housing sites, will be required to plan from the outset for the integrated planning of a healthy environment for its communities. This includes the provision and maintenance for sport, physical activity, and community ~~halls~~ facilities as well as green infrastructure, open space, allotments, walking and cycling routes in line with policies NE1 and NE2. They should relate well to each other and to existing areas, and the new facilities and spaces	Inspector's recommendation

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
					should be safe, convenient, accessible and functional."	
AM63	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	Policy box	141	Amend text as follows: "d) In ensuring the timely delivery of infrastructure requirements, development proposals must demonstrate that full regard has been paid to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and all other policies and relevant strategies including the Playing Pitch Strategy~~,~~; Sport~~,~~ Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy~~,~~; Open Space Strategy~~,~~; Green Infrastructure and Allotment Strategy. The on-site provision, maintenance and management of sports and recreation facilities provided, will be secured through Section 106, as they will be needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms."	To give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM64	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	Policy box	141	Amend text as follows: "d) In ensuring the timely delivery of infrastructure requirements, development proposals must demonstrate that full regard has been paid to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and all other policies and relevant strategies including the Playing Pitch Strategy, Sport Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy, Open Space Strategy, Green Infrastructure and Allotment Strategy. The on-site provision, maintenance and management of sports and recreation facilities provided, will be secured through ~~Section 106~~ a planning obligation, as they will be needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms."	Inspector's recommendation
AM65	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	10.65	143	Amend text as follows: "• Identification, through all stages of the planning application process on all strategic housing sites, of the on-site and off-site ~~of the~~ requirements for sport, recreation, physical activity, community halls, green infrastructure, open space, allotments, and walking and cycling routes ~~requirements for strategic housing sites~~."	Correcting mistakes
AM66	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	10.65	143	Amend text as follows: "• Identification, through all stages of the planning application process on all strategic housing sites, of the on-site and off-site of the requirements for sport, recreation, physical activity, community ~~halls~~ facilities, green infrastructure, open space, allotments, walking and cycling routes requirements for strategic housing sites."	Inspector's recommendation

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM67	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	Table 23	143	Amend text as follows: "HS6a - Monitor the number of planning obligations received associated with ~~health~~ sport and exercise matters - Monitoring analysis will compare the overall monetary requirements identified in the IDP against what the Council receives"	To give clarity
AM68	10. Healthy, safe and inclusive communities	Policy HS6 - Sport and exercise	Table 23	144	Amend text as follows: "Monitor the amount of ~~s106~~ planning obligations contributions secured, and the on-site provision of relevant facilities"	Inspector's recommendation
AM69	11. Natural environment	Policy NE1 - Green infrastructure	Table 24	149	Amend text as follows: "NE1a - Green infrastructure - Provision of green infrastructure to support development in line with green infrastructure framework"	To give clarity
AM70	11. Natural environment	Policy NE3 - Biodiversity and geodiversity	11.3	153	Amend text as follows: "11.30 A small element of the Borough's ecological network consists of statutory designated sites, including SACs, SSSIs and LNRs. One site, Ensor's Pool, is currently designated all three. The majority of the network is made up of non-statutory Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) and potential LWSs, as well as priority habitats and species, woodland and ancient woodland, rivers and canals, and green corridors and stepping stones. In line with this, coherent physically connected habitat corridors and networks linking sites of higher ecological value are now recognised as essential. Additionally, non-statutory sites contribute to the greater good of conserving biodiversity and	To remove unnecessary text.

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
					geodiversity and are viewed as an integral component of the ecological network. ~~Consequently to slow and reverse species loss and habitat degradation, all sites in the ecological network will be given due protection according to their status.~~"	
AM71	11. Natural environment	Policy NE3 - Biodiversity and geodiversity	Table 26	155	Amend text as follows: "NE3e - Local <u>wildlife</u> sites in positive management - All local <u>wildlife</u> sites"	To give clarity
AM72	11. Natural environment	Policy NE5 - Landscape character	Policy box	162	Amend text as follows: "Major development proposals must take account of the landscape strategy set out in the Landscape Character Assessment (2012). Outside of the <u>strategic sites and</u> urban area developers must show they have sequentially considered development opportunities in areas of least landscape value first prior to any development proposals being permitted in higher value landscape character areas. The areas of search will follow the landscape hierarchy in the order set out below:"	Inspector's recommendation

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM73	12. Built environment	Policy BE2 - Renewable and low carbon energy	Policy box	168	Amend text as follows: "c) A decommissioning scheme is in place. The applicant should expect that the Council will request that a bond be provided under a ~~Section 106 agreement~~ planning obligation to cover the cost of decommissioning and/or restoration of the site.	Inspector's recommendation
AM74	12. Built environment	Policy BE2 - Renewable and low carbon energy	Policy box	168	Amend text as follows: "Development should connect to any existing community/district heating schemes where appropriate, and should also consider the viability of biomass heating, CHP and utilising surplus heat."	Inspector's recommendation
AM75	12. Built environment	Policy BE3 - Sustainable design and construction	12.46	176	Amend text as follows: "12.46 The Warwickshire Indices of Multiple Deprivation, the official measure of deprivation in the County, measures the rate of recorded crime for burglary, theft, criminal damage and violence. The number of the Borough's SOAs within the top 10% most ~~criminally~~ deprived for the crime domain increased from nine SOAs in 2007 to 15 SOAs in 2010, falling to 11 SOAs in 2015 .	To give clarity
AM76	12. Built environment	Policy BE4 - Valuing and conserving our historic environment	Table 33	182	Add the following text to the monitoring box: "BE4e - Review of conservation areas - complete review"	Inspector's recommendation
AM77	12. Built environment	Policy BE4 - Valuing and conserving our historic environment	Table 33	182	Amend text as follows: "~~BE4d - Harm to Scheduled Ancient Monuments - No harm~~". Also rename BE4e.	Duplication of monitoring indicator BE4c

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM78		New appendix		183	Insert a new appendix called as follows: "Appendix J - Employment estates suitable for alternative uses." Insert new appendix with maps to show individual 'Employment estates suitable for alternative uses'.	To give clarity
AM79	Appendix A - Non strategic sites		Map	201	Remove non strategic site NUN302 from overall map, as well as individual map	Correcting mistake
AM80	Appendices			220	Change appendix letters to reflect removal of appendix E	Updating appendix letters
AM81	Appendix G - Local centres		Map	231	Insert Coventry Road / School Lane local centre	Correcting mistake
AM82	Appendix G - Local centres		Map	241	Insert Weddington Terrace local centre	Correcting mistake
AM83	Appendix H - Scheduled Ancient Monuments		Map	242	Replace black and white map of St Mary's with a colour map	To give clarity
AM84	Index of monitoring indicators			250	Amend text as follows: "H2a - Developments of 1~~0~~1-14 dwellings and 15+ dwellings where ~~20%~~2 units and 25% respectively of affordable housing is negotiated - 100%"	To reflect main modification MM131
AM85	Index of monitoring indicators			250	Add new monitoring indicator: "H3d - Adoption of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations document in accordance with the latest Local Development Scheme - Refer to Local Development Scheme"	Inspector's recommendation

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM86	Index of monitoring indicators			250	Amend text as follows: "H1a - ~~Size of~~ Number of bedrooms in new dwelling completions - Completions in line with percentages set out in the most recent SHMA"	To give clarity
AM87	Index of monitoring indicators			251	Amend text as follows: "~~E1a - Development of Supplementary Planning Document - SPD to be produced post Borough Plan adoption~~". Also rename subsequent indicator references, restarting with E1a.	To reflect main modifications MM134 and MM136
AM88	Index of monitoring indicators			251	Amend text as follows: "E1c - The number of applications granted for non-economic development uses~~/~~ on strategic employment sites"	Correcting mistake
AM89	Index of monitoring indicators			257	Amend text as follows: "HS6a - Monitor the number of planning obligations received associated with ~~health~~ sport and exercise matters - Monitoring analysis will compare the overall monetary requirements identified in the IDP against what the Council receives"	To give clarity
AM90	Index of monitoring indicators			258	Add text to table: "HS6e - Monitor the amount of planning obligations contributions secured, and the on-site provision of relevant facilities - Increase in the resources secured for, and the provision, of relevant facilities"	Correcting omission
AM91	Index of monitoring indicators			258	Amend text as follows: "NE1a - Green infrastructure - Provision of green infrastructure to support development in line with green infrastructure framework"	To give clarity

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM92	Index of monitoring indicators			258	Amend text as follows: "HS7a - Monitor the number of applications for use class A5 within 400 m of the principal point of access of existing secondary schools and sixth form colleges, excluding applications falling in town, district or local centres - Zero"	To reflect main modification MM156
AM93	Index of monitoring indicators			258	Amend text as follows: "HS7b - Monitor the number of units under A5 use class as a percentage of each local and district centre - 20% maximum"	To reflect main modification MM156
AM94	Index of monitoring indicators			259	Amend text as follows: "NE3e - Local wildlife sites in positive management - All local wildlife sites"	To give clarity
AM95	Index of monitoring indicators			261	Add text to table: "BE4e - Review of conservation areas - complete review"	Inspector's recommendation
AM96	Index of monitoring indicators			261	Amend text as follows: "~~BE4d - Harm to Scheduled Ancient Monuments - No harm~~". Also rename BE4e.	Duplication of monitoring indicator BE4c
AM97	Glossary			268	Insert following text: "Major development - In relation to the provision of dwellinghouses where the number of dwellinghouses to be provided is 10 or more, or the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectares or more. In relation to all other types of development, development carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more."	Inspector's recommendation

Reference	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph / policy box / table / map	Page	Additional Modification	Justification
AM98	Glossary			272	Add in details about use classes	Representations made expressing no definition in glossary of use class terms used
AM99	Acronyms			273	Add "WMCA: West Midlands Combined Authority"	New acronym inserted as part of main modification MM153