



NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH BOROUGH PLAN REVIEW – FURTHER WRITTEN STATEMENT IN RELATION TO ‘MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS’ (MIQS)

Representations on Behalf of FCC Environment

This ‘Further Written Statement’ has been prepared on behalf of FCC Environment as part of their engagement on the Publication Draft Plan, ahead of the examination hearing sessions.

We hope that these representations are taken in the spirit they are made. The intention is to assist the Council in the preparation of a robust plan that is resistant to challenge and to support the continued allocation of land at the former Judkins Quarry (referred to as Land at Tuttle Hill (Ref: SHA3) in the Draft Plan).

It should be noted that these representations have not sought to respond to each question within the hearing statements, only those that are relevant to FCC Environment’s original representations on the Draft Local Plan.

Matter 5 – Strategic and Non-Strategic Allocations

Issue 2: Strategic Housing Allocations

Policy SHA3 Land at Tuttle Hill

53. Are each of the Strategic Housing Allocations and their policy requirements soundly based? Are they justified, deliverable/developable and supported by the evidence?

In relation to Strategic Housing Allocation SHA3 Land at Tuttle Hill, we support the allocation on the basis that it would contribute towards the soundness of the Borough Plan given its clear compliance with the Plan’s overarching strategy and objectives and its consistency with national policy.

We have already provided detailed information on how the site achieves this within our Regulation 19 consultation response and do not intend to repeat them here. The allocation is also supported by ‘Housing Deliverability Evidence’ at page 149 of the Council’s latest ‘Updated Housing Land Supply Background Paper’ (UHLSBP) (CD31).

In addition, a Statement of Common Ground has been prepared which includes a ‘Deliverability Statement’ that confirms an agreement between the Council and FCC Environment that the site is deliverable. This confirms that the site has proven to be viable, though not capable of withstanding a policy-compliant level of affordable housing or the full value of financial contributions requested in connection with the development.

While supporting the proposed allocation and its deliverability, we do have specific concerns regarding the current drafting of Policy SHA3 and the Sustainability Appraisal that has been carried out in support of the allocation. The latter contains inaccuracies, a



lack of overall clarity in terms of how it has been prepared and scored, in addition to a lack of any formal conclusions on the assessment of individual sites.

In terms of the policy requirements under Policy SHA3, a total of 11 out of the 14 proposed “key development principles” set out the requirement for different financial contributions that should be made towards various services, facilities or infrastructure. We would question if these should be classified as “key development principles” and therefore whether it is appropriate for them to be listed within the policy wording.

54. Which of the Strategic Housing Allocations now have planning consent and for those which do, does this alter any of the key development principles which apply?

In relation to Strategic Housing Allocation SHA3 Land at Tuttle Hill, an outline planning application for up to 400 dwellings was submitted in February 2024 (ref: 040102) and the planning application is expected to be determined at Planning Committee in 2024. Determination of the application is therefore well advanced and should be concluded prior to the adoption of the Local Plan.

55. Does the evidence support the expected delivery trajectory on each site?

The updated detailed site-specific trajectories are shown in a table at Appendix B of the UHLSBP. For SHA3, the table indicates a total capacity of 325 units, with completions only coming forward from year 2029/30 (i.e. beyond the 5 year supply period). However, the allocation is for ‘at least’ 350 units, with an outline planning submitted in February 2024 for up to 400 units. The units are currently expected to come forward from 2026/27, with a total of 125 units to be delivered within the five year Plan period (as shown within the suggested changes to the projected completions within the ‘Housing Delivery Evidence’ for SHA3).

56. Are the requirements for contributions towards Warwickshire Police and Nuneaton Justice Centre justified, in accordance with national policy and supported by evidence.

We would question the requirement for these financial contributions to be set out as “key development principles”, as they are not appropriate under such a description. A total of 11 out of the 14 proposed principles set out the requirement for different financial contributions that should be made towards various services, facilities or infrastructure.

Any contributions would in any case be drawn out during the planning application process and those needed to make the scheme acceptable may differ from those set out in the policy wording. As drafted, they are not compatible with the development of a brownfield site where there are abnormal works and costs which need to be accounted for within a Viability Assessment. Their wording should be amended by providing a more general comment on the need for contributions, subject to financial viability, in line with the final paragraph of Policy S1.



57. Do the key development principles adequately reflect the evidence in respect of sports provision and archaeology.

As discussed under Q56, most of the key development principles for Policy SHA3 relate to financial contributions (11 out of 14), including towards sports activity (no. 11). However, we consider that the wording should be rectified by providing a more general comment on the need for contributions and where those contributions may be appropriate, subject to financial viability in line with the final paragraph of Policy S1.

There is no reference to archaeology in the key development principles.