

Project:			
South of Coventry Parish Council Meeting Notes			
Date:	Tuesday 19 March 2019	Time:	14:00 – 15:00
Location:	Room 3.12, Riverside House		
Contact:	Ragu Sittambalam (WDC)	Email:	ragu.sittambalam@warwickdc.gov.uk
		Tel:	01926 456016

Participants:

Cllr Rowena Hill - Abbey
 Cllr George Illingworth - Abbey
 Cllr Pam Redford - Stoneleigh & Cubbington
 Cllr Trevor Wright - Stoneleigh & Cubbington

Robert Taylor - Baginton PC
 Jan Lucas - Bubbenhall PC
 Archie Taylor - Burton Green PC
 Paul Davies - Finham PC
 Richard Hancox - Stoneleigh & Ashow PC

Ragu Sittambalam – Site Delivery Officer (WDC)
 Aspia Jannat – Planning Assistant (WDC)

Apologies:

Cllr Michael Coker - Abbey

Meeting Notes:

	Agenda	Additional Notes
1)	Purpose of SoC Parish Liaison Meetings RS outlined the background and purpose of this and future meetings to give updates on current applications, discuss constraints, challenges as well as sharing information between Parish Councils and Ward Councillors. The intention is for meetings to be held every 3 months. RS explained the areas plotted on the SoC plan.	RS to organise next meeting
2)	Introductions Around the table introductions.	
3)	Updates on Current Applications:	
	a. W/18/0522 – Sub-Regional Employment (Allocation DS16)	
	The sub-regional employment allocation comprises of land otherwise known as Whitley South and Gateway South located north and south of the allocation respectively. Whitley South has an approved outline permission with reserved matters for UKBIC, Gateway South has been approved by	

<p>planning committee but has not yet had permission issued (due to legal agreement negotiations). The land has been removed from the Green Belt through the Local Plan.</p> <p>-RS advised that ground investigations are underway to ascertain what contaminants are present.</p> <p>-Concerns were raised over this as an issue, how contaminants would be dealt with and how this would be monitored.</p> <p>-It was highly suggested that Environmental Health Team need to address the issues involved with that site/get other specialist to share their views.</p> <p>-Cllr Illingworth stressed that the advice given by environmental health are listened to by planners.</p> <p><u>JLR Matters</u></p> <p>-Concerns were raised to understand what will happen if the roadbridge does not go forward and whether this will compromise Gateway South.</p> <p>-Cllr Redford reported that queries relating to this are with Bill Hunt, Deputy-Chief Executive to be answered.</p>	<p>RS to check up on condition wording</p> <p>RS to invite EH to next meeting to briefly discuss the issue</p> <p>RS to investigate restrictions imposed as part of the WCC Highways response</p>
<p>b. W/18/0643 – Kings Hill – 2500 Dwellings and Associated Works</p>	
<p>Kings Hill is a site allocated for 4000 dwellings, 1800 dwellings are planned to come forward within the Local Plan Period (up to 2030). There is an application submitted for 2500 dwellings which includes a primary school, secondary school and local centre.</p> <p>-RS highlighted that the applicant submitted updated information end of January.</p> <p>- RS updated that with the additional highways information submitted, a consultation is underway for WCC and CCC to assess the application and issue a consultation response.</p> <p>-Views were expressed about Lioncourt being resistant to carry out public consultation.</p> <p>-RS stated the position regarding education with there being a need for the primary school early into the development and that there was no capacity in the surrounding area (from Coventry City and Warwickshire County Education). PD set out that the school had not been contacted about capacity.</p> <p>-Cllr Illingworth stated that traffic assessment was based on false assumption that future occupants would predominantly travel north rather than south.</p> <p>-Coventry City Council is the determining authority for the access roundabout to the north of the site application which is not yet determined.</p>	
<p>c. W/17/2357 – Westwood Heath – 425 Dwellings</p>	
<p>Westwood Heath is a housing allocation with a hybrid planning consent for 425 dwellings and a convenience store at outline with 129 dwellings in approved full.</p>	

	<p>-RS met with Crest Nicholson who are currently discharging pre-commencement conditions with a view to start development toward the end of the year.</p> <p><i>RS informed the group that Crest Nicholson may attend the next meeting to update on progress and future plan.</i></p> <p>-To mitigate traffic issues, it was suggested that there is a need to carry out more consultation and improve the junction before the construction of homes.</p> <p>-Questions were asked regarding the timeline of when the infrastructure of so many developments will take place.</p>	<p>RS to check conditions of approval RS to produce timeline for infrastructure provision in the area</p>
d. W/17/2086 – Hob Lane – 90 Dwellings		
	<p>The site at Hob Lane, Burton Green has an approved permission for 90 dwellings and is currently under construction</p> <p>-The Parish Council originally supported this development but were disappointed with lorries using Hob Lane, which has caused issues in the community.</p> <p><i>RS advised that we can pursue enforcement/monitoring if the developer is not working in accordance with their approved construction management plan.</i></p>	
e. UK BIC		
	<p>UKBIC forms part of the Whitley South portion of the sub-regional employment site and has had reserved matters approved.</p> <p>-Planning process was there to ensure it was for JLR, what impact does the change of condition to allow for UKBIC's occupation have in future.</p> <p>-Many questioned if there are officers who ensure the conditions of development are complied with its legal agreement.</p> <p><i>RS responded that it is for a breach to be reported for enforcement to then monitor and take action if required.</i></p>	<p>RS to review report and action</p>
f. Land North of Rosswood Farm – Allocated for 80 Dwellings		
	<p>The site is located in Baginton; no formal application has been submitted for the site but is being prepared.</p> <p>-This site is promoted by 2 different developers (Sworders and Three Spires Capital on behalf of landowners).</p> <p>-Parish consultations have been encouraged by WDC with both developers confirming that it will be carried out prior to submission.</p>	
4)	A46 Update:	
	a. Phase 1	
	<p>Phase 1 of the A46 which refers to the works proposed at the Stoneleigh Junction of the A46 to make it into a grade separated roundabout.</p> <p>-The side and slip road orders have been re-advertised, it is not yet confirmed whether the Department for Transport will require a public inquiry to be heard.</p>	

	<p>-No confirmation has been given as to when construction is to commence.</p> <p>-There are issues with planning applications whereby Highways England are not yet considering the upgrade as 'committed' and are therefore either restricting or requesting additional information for schemes.</p>
	<p>b. Phase 2</p> <p>Phase 1 of the A46 which refers to the works proposed at the Stoneleigh Junction of the A46 to make it into a grade separated roundabout.</p> <p>-£1.8m of Department for Transport funding has been awarded for early feasibility and design development for the second phase of the link road.</p> <p>-There is not a confirmed route for the link road although indicatively it would span from the upgraded Stoneleigh Junction to Westwood Heath with potential to connect to the University of Warwick and provide a future link to the A45/A452.</p>
5)	<p>Neighbourhood Planning:</p> <p>Intended to be a standing item on future agendas where Parish Councils can update the group on how their neighbourhood plan is progressing (where applicable)</p> <p>-WDC have been carrying out presentations on CIL to which neighbourhood plans can increase the proportion of CIL money allocated to Parish Councils.</p> <p>-Baginton & Bubbenhall have a made neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>-Finham are currently working on their neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>-Burton Green have a pre-consultation draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>-Stoneleigh are currently working on their neighbourhood plan.</p>
6)	<p>South of Coventry SPD:</p> <p>This is a supplementary planning document being prepared that will sit under the Warwick District Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans (where made/adopted). The intention is for the document to articulate the vision for the South of Coventry area providing policy guidance in areas that are not as detailed in current policy documents.</p> <p>-Cannot progress with SoC SPD due to elections and being in purdah.</p> <p>-This SPD will not be allocating sites and will conform with WDC local plan policies and Neighbourhood Plans (where are a sufficiently advanced stage).</p>
7)	<p>Any other Business:</p> <p>- Concerns were raised collectively over the assumptions made around ONS figures for Coventry's population and the knock on effect it would have on neighbouring authorities such as Warwick District Council to deliver development to address Coventry's housing need.</p> <p><i>RS stated that the Local Plan is the adopted policy document of WDC as a Local Planning Authority and would continue to be the policy document used until such time that a partial or full plan review was triggered to review housing requirements and need.</i></p> <p>- AT announced that he would likely be stepping away from Burton Green PC and so someone else would attend future meetings.</p>

	<p>-Concerns were expressed regarding the A46 Link Road and where future phases will be.</p> <p>-Cllr Illingworth queried if HS2 delay the implementation of the housing build, could it affect the housing trajectory WDC.</p> <p><i>RS responded that WDC would be within its right to state that HS2 presented an exceptional disruption as a national priority which, given its presence in the District would not be considered to be a reasonable stance that a developer could use to argue that the Council did not have a 5-year supply of deliverable sites in the absence of case law to the contrary.</i></p>
8)	<p>Action to be taken:</p> <p>-RS to arrange the next meeting in June which would be after the elections. <i>This is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday 19/06/19 at 10:00-11:30</i></p> <p>-RS to look into traffic management in the event of the bridge not being constructed and implications for vehicle management at Gateway South <i>The applicant has set out interim access arrangements as per WCC Highways response;</i></p> <p><i>The TA states that all infrastructure required to support the Gateway South proposal can be delivered in a single phase (para's 5.10 & 9.1), however interim access arrangements will be required to allow the site to be built whilst the Whitley South infrastructure scheme ie. new bridge over the A45 is constructed. It is stated that the restrictions within the Accessibility Report ie. barred routes (Siskin Drive, Rowley Rd west, Mill Hill, Stoneleigh Road, Bubbenhall Road) will be adhered to in order to minimise impacts on the local network, that Bubbenhall Road is unsuitable to use as a construction access route, and therefore access would either need to be via the airport by negotiation or to route from Toll Bar, along Rowley Road and the route of the proposed Link Road. On completion of the new bridge or the A45 westbound slip roads use of Rowley Road would cease.</i></p> <p><i>This is secured through conditions and approved documents</i></p> <p>- RS to check conditions of approval for access arrangements at Westwood Heath <i>From the decision notice there aren't specific conditions other than those relating to the construction management plan that relate to the access specification. All documents that have been submitted to address conditions do not include those relating to the construction management plan. The ongoing submission is all available publicly under reference W/17/2357.</i></p> <p>-RS to look into UKBIC changes to the condition and future implication <i>The condition was varied under application W/18/1942 to change the occupancy condition to;</i></p> <p><i>With the exception of any floorspace to be occupied by UKBIC, The first 8,500 square metres (GFA) of floorspace within the development shall be occupied by Jaguar Land Rover. With the exception of any building to be occupied by UKBIC, no other buildings shall be occupied within the development until Jaguar Land Rover have fully occupied 8,500 square metres of B1 floorspace within the technology campus.</i></p> <p><i>REASON: Since the particular requirements of Jaguar Land Rover formed part of the very special circumstances for permitting this inappropriate development within the Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>This was on the basis that UKBIC presented significant economic benefits in its own right and that the land had been removed from the Green Belt so the policy context changed. If a future variation was submitted to allow another business to occupy the site, then it would be assessed on its own merit.</i></p> <p>-RS to put together a timeline to show when infrastructure will start from SoC developments.</p> <p>-RS to contact WCC Highways to see if someone could attend the next meeting</p>

	-RS to contact WDC Environmental Health to see if someone could attend the next meeting
--	---