

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held at Stoneleigh Village Hall, Stoneleigh on Thursday 11th May 2017 at 7.30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman – Cllr R.Hancox, Cllr J. Astle, Cllr H Fryer, Cllr J. Mackenzie, County Councillor W Redford and District Councillors N. Harrington and Mrs P Redford.

APOLOGIES:

Cllr W Redford sent apologies for being delayed for the start of the meeting.

There was one member of the public present.

10. Minutes

The Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 13th April 2017 were circulated and were signed by the Chairman.

11. Declarations of Interest

Cllr J Mackenzie declared an interest in an upcoming planning application which will be discussed at the next Ordinary Council meeting in June.

Cllr R Hancox declared an interest in Planning Application number W/17/0517.

12.Matters arising

HS2 Update

The Parish Council has been contacted by a journalist from BBC Warwickshire regarding the planned HS2 line through Stoneleigh and Ashow. It was agreed that Mr Martin Smith from the Stoneleigh Action Group and Cllr H Fryer will respond on the Parish Council's behalf.

The Clerk will send a copy of the Social Media Policy to Cllr H Fryer, and Cllr H Fryer will ask Mr Martin Smith to follow the policy when communicating with journalists.

Cllr H Fryer reported that that Warwickshire County Council cancelled the planned Forum regarding the HS2 funding.

HS2 Ltd also cancelled the planned meeting at Stoneleigh Park in May.

Local Plan

Cllr H Fryer reported that she sent two letters to MP Jeremy Wright on the Council's behalf regarding the Local Plan. The letters are attached at pages 15 and 16, along with accompanying notes at pages 17-18. A reply has been received from Chris Elliot, attached at pages 19 – 20.

It was agreed that Cllr H Fryer would write to MP Jeremy Wright regarding the response received from Chris Elliot.

A letter from the CPRE regarding the Local Plan has been circulated to the Parish Council. It was agreed that the Parish Council would support this letter. The letter is attached at pages 21 – 23.

To consider the separation of Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

It was agreed to remove this item from the agenda whilst the Parish Council await the outcome of the upcoming Boundary Review. The Chairman reported that due to the General Election the Boundary Review will now start in November.

Cllr W Redford arrived at 19.44pm.

13. Reports

Police Report

No police report received this month

The Clerk is to email PC Ed King regarding the difficulty of signing up to the new format of the newsletter.

County Councillor W Redford

Cllr W Redford reported that he is no longer part of the Highways Department at the County Council, and is now the Chairman of Adult Social Care.

District Councillor N Harrington

Cllr N Harrington gave the following report:

There have been 8 burglaries in Kenilworth and Leamington in recent weeks. Cllr N Harrington urged Councillors to be vigilant and call 101 if any suspicious activity is noticed.

At the Annual District Council meeting, Cllr Jane Wright stepped down, and Cllr Alan Boad was elected the new Chairman. Cllr A Boad's chosen charity is Testicular Cancer Awareness.

The Stoneleigh Abbey Planning Application has been withdrawn but will be re submitted.

Cllr N Harrington informed the Council that the planned Forum meeting on 18th May regarding fund applications to HS2 was postponed due to to purdah.

Cllr N Harrington also reported that the redevelopment at St Nicholas park and Newbold Comyn will be delayed until 2018 or later.

Cllr N Harrington also reported that the Leamington brakes football team will be relocating to Europa Way, resulting in the sale of the Harbury lane plot for permanent and temporary pitches for the Travelling Community.

There will also be a new Headquarters for Warwick District Council, with 650 parking spaces. The existing Council building at Riverside house will be sold for housing.

District Councillor Mrs P Redford

Cllr P Redford informed the Council that the delay in building the leisure centres was exacerbated by the fact that the leisure centre at Newbold Comyn was broken into vandalised.

14. Public Session

No members of the public wished to address the Council.

15. Finance

a)

Income / Expenditure

Balance brought forward	£27,270.25
-------------------------	------------

Receipts

Interest	£8.73
----------	-------

Precept – First Half	£8421.00
----------------------	----------

£8429.73

Payments to 31st April 2017

Xerox	£1.14
-------	-------

WALC Subscriptions	£272.86
--------------------	---------

Warwick District Council - Footway Lighting	£180.89
---	---------

(£454.89)

£35,245.09

At Co-operative Bank plc, Birmingham

A/C 6101168500 (Current)	£9767.50
--------------------------	----------

A/C 6101168550 (Instant Access)	£5061.89
---------------------------------	----------

A/C 6101168556 (14 Day Deposit)	£20,415.70
---------------------------------	------------

£35,245.09

Cheques paid in April

301327 Xerox (UK) Ltd	£1.14
-----------------------	-------

301328 WALC subscription	£272.86
--------------------------	---------

301329 Warwick District Council	£180.89
---------------------------------	---------

b) Cheques to be authorised for May

301331 S Windridge – Salary, expenses and website back pay	£791.41
--	---------

Plus stationery and VAT credit due to over charge

301351 Ashow Church	£500.00
---------------------	---------

301352 Stoneleigh Church	£500.00
--------------------------	---------

301353 Stoneleigh and Ashow News	£300.00
----------------------------------	---------

301354 Aon Insurance	£419.44
----------------------	---------

301355 Tele-Traffic UK Ltd (Speed camera calibration)	£298.50
---	---------

It was agreed to accept the offer from Bubbenhall Parish Council to pay half of the invoice due to Tele-Traffic (minus VAT). The Clerk is to liaise with the Clerk at Bubbenhall Parish Council when the invoice is received.

c) To review the summary of income and expenditure – year ending 31st March 2017

This was approved by the Council and is annexed at pages 24, 25 and 26

d) To review the Asset Register

The Asset Register has been updated, and a straight line depreciation of 20% per year applied. The Asset Register was approved by the Council and is annexed at page 27

e) To review the ring fenced monies for 2017- 2018

The Ring Fenced money list has been updated, and was approved by the Council. (This is annexed at page 28)

Cllr H Fryer reported that she is in the process of obtaining quotes for the Ashow Noticeboards.

The amount ringfenced for the noticeboards increased from £875 to £1550, to reflect the £875 Grant received plus £675 set aside by the Parish Council.

Cllr R Hancox confirmed that he will check whether the defibrillator needs to be included on the Council's Insurance.

Cllr H Fryer asked whether more money can be set aside for planning consultations in the Future. It was agreed that the Clerk will prepare a monthly budget so that the Council can easily see how much money is available.

f) Local Councils in England and Wales – Annual Governance Statement 2015/16

The Parish Council acknowledged their responsibility for ensuring that there is a sound system of internal control, including the preparation of the accounting statements. This annual governance statement is approved by Stoneleigh & Ashow Parish Council.

g) Local Councils in England and Wales – Accounting Statement

The Parish Council acknowledged their responsibility for the preparation of the accounts and confirm, to the best of their knowledge and belief, with respect to the Council's accounts for the year ended 31st March 2017 that they present fairly the financial position of this Parish Council.

h) To consider an intermediate review of accounts – Significant Events and Trust Funds

The Parish Council has considered whether any litigation, liabilities or commitments, events or transactions, occurring either during or after the year-end, have a financial impact on this smaller authority, and, where appropriate have included them in the accounting statements.

It was confirmed that Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council do not manage any Trust Funds.

16. Planning

New Planning Applications

Cllr R Hancox confirmed that a planning application in Ashow was received just before the meeting. This has not been received by all Councillors and will be discussed at the meeting on 15th June.

Application Number: W/17/0517 App. Type: Planning Permission
Proposed new first floor to bungalow and ground floor side extension
Address: 17 Stoneleigh Close, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DE

Having previously declared an interest in this application, Cllr R Hancox left the room at 20:17

The Council confirmed that there are no observations.

Cllr R Hancox returned at 20:19

Application No: W/17/0702

Description: Refurbishment and alteration of existing two storey office building, including new render; new fenestration including alterations to openings; new flat roof; installation of new ASHP equipment; minor external landscaping works and a single storey extension to infill under the existing balcony.

Address: Unit 164, Stoneleigh Park, Kenilworth

Applicant: LaSalle Investment Management

Closing dates: **15th May**

No observations

Progress of Planning Applications

Application Number: W/17/0539 Proposed Lawful Development

Description: Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for proposed loft conversion with 3No velux windows to rear elevation in accordance with drawing 21/12/16-01 A submitted to the LPA on 27/03/2017 with the materials used in any exterior work to be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the original dwellinghouse.

Address: 4 Long Row, Ashow Road, Ashow, Kenilworth, CV8 2LE

Closing date 28th April

It was established that the Planning Department have confirmed that the Parish Council are not required to comment on this application for Proposed Lawful Development.

Application No: W/17/0516

Description: Erection of a single storey extension; installation of Air Source Heat Pumps; replacement roof, fenestration & cladding; brick work to be rendered; replace flat roof over porch with a pitched roof; form 2no. windows within north elevation and 1no window, within the south elevation. Minor landscaping alterations.

Address: Unit 180, 10th Street, Stoneleigh Park, Kenilworth, CV8 2LS

No observations**Application No:** W/17/0510 LB**Description:** Widening by 1.4metres of existing double garage**Address:** Yew Tree Cottage, Stareton Lane, Stoneleigh, Kenilworth, CV8 2LL**No observations****Application No:** W/17/0509**Description:** Widening by 1.4metres of existing double garage**Address:** Yew Tree Cottage, Stareton Lane, Stoneleigh, Kenilworth, CV8 2LL**No observations****Application No:** W/17/0399 LB

Description: proposed LBC application for: 1. replacement of all noted windows with single glazed metal windows 2. rebuilding the front oriel bay window (on the Coventry Road) 3. opening up an existing window to a larger original opening and installing a single glazed metal window

Address: North Lodge, Coventry Road, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DT**This application has been approved****Site Address:** Land adjacent 8 Birmingham Road, Stoneleigh, Coventry, CV8 3DD

Description of development: Erection of two semi-detached dwellinghouses with garaging, parking and access provision, following demolition of existing garage

Application Reference: W/16/1187

Appellant's name: Court (Warwickshire) Ltd

Appeal reference: APP/T3725/W/17/3169080**Closing date:** 18th April.

The District Council has confirmed that the highways department are satisfied with the visibility of the entrance to the development. There is still some confusion regarding previous comments on this application. Cllr P Redford confirmed that this application has gone to appeal and the District Council await the result.

17. Correspondence

The Chairman has received an email from Mr and Mrs Burdett regarding a planning application, and asking members of the Parish Council to visit the site.

Cllrs D Jack and R Hancox confirmed that they are happy to attend the site.

Cllr J Mackenzie confirmed that the Parish Council have merely voiced the comments of Planning Officer at each application, and there has been no material change to the previous objection.

It was agreed that when a new planning application for the property is received by the Parish Council, Cllr R Hancox will contact the residents and confirm a date for representatives of the Council to visit the site.

The Clerk reported that Coventry Airport have contacted the Parish Council to invite comments on a new public consultation. A public drop in session will be held on 21st June. Cllr J Astle, and Cllr N Harrington agree to attend on behalf of the Parish Council.

Cllr R Hancox reported that he recently met with representatives of the Village Hall to discuss the ROSPA safety report received in September.

The Stoneleigh Village Hall & Playing Fields Trust have agreed to adjust the gates, cut back the bolts, monitor the basketball hoop, and remove the post at the edge of the playground area.

Stoneleigh Village Hall & Playing Fields Trust have asked the Parish Council to consider repainting the equipment as it is getting rusty. The Parish Council have agreed to get the equipment cleaned and painted.

There is a concern regarding the playground matting as this have moved, creating a trip hazard. Two swing seats have also been damaged. The Parish Council will obtain a quote for this work.

It was also decided that the Parish Council would ask Mr Joe Ball, the Village Hall caretaker, to check the playground equipment regularly. The Clerk and Chairman will contact Mr Ball.

18. Questions to Chairman

Cllr P Redford asked Cllr R Hancox whether the Parish Council are aware of residents that are trained to use the speed gun.

Cllr R Hancox replied that there are currently three people who have undertaken the required training, although this will soon reduce to one.

Bubbenhall Parish Council have stated that trained residents from Bubbenhall Village will be available to operate the speed gun, once the police confirm safe locations for the speed gun to be operated in Stoneleigh. Cllr P Redford reported that she has spoken to the police, who have confirmed that there is only one safe location for the speed gun.

It was agreed that a notice will be placed in the Parish Magazine when the risk assessment by the police has been completed asking for more volunteers to operate the speed gun.

Cllr J Mackenzie mentioned the parking issue in Stoneleigh raised by Mr Chris Hadfield at the Parish Council meeting in April.

Cllr W Redford was asked whether anything can be done to address the parking problems in Stoneleigh. Cllr W Redford confirmed that there is nothing that the County Council can do and that this is a matter for the police.

Cllr R Hancox has spoken to the police regarding the parking issues, and has been informed that the only option available is to ask residents of the village to be as considerate as possible when parking in the village.

Cllr R Hancox will write to Mr C Hadfield to confirm the outcome of the discussion at the meeting.

Cllrs D Jack and J Astle left the meeting at 20:59 pm.

19. Meetings

The next Ordinary Meeting of the Parish Council will be held on Thursday 15th June 2017 at Stoneleigh Village Hall, Stoneleigh at 7.00 p.m.

20. Closure

The business having been completed the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.01 p.m.

Chairman

22nd April

Dear Jeremy Wright

In a telephone call with Jessica Wood this morning I discussed the parish council's concerns that due Process is not being followed in the consideration of Warwick District Councils Modified Local Plan which is currently out for consultation. Comments are required to be submitted by the 5th May 2017. The Parish Council wishes to seek your guidance in respect of the issue of transparency. This is an area which is causing concern among your constituents as it does not appear to be given due consideration by Warwick District Council, (WDC).

I have attached for your information a letter sent to the Planning Inspectorate by CPRE who also raise the issue of transparency. As the CPRE states the Inspector has delivered his comments to WDC but as this document has not been published it is impossible to know to what extent the proposed modifications to the Local Plan represent his views and conversely where they reflect the aspirations of WDC and CCC.

The three Memorandums of Understanding, (MoU's), which are guiding the current modifications have also been shown to have inaccuracies. The Inspector for WDC Local Plan may request changes to the Local Plan but he cannot ask for changes to the MoU's as this would require an agreement between all of the Inspectors examining the Local Plans concerned. This will mean that any mistake in the individual MoU's will be proliferated in the Local Plan. The modified Local Plan has been sent out for consultation but we would request that the local Plan should be suspended until this issue is resolved.

Stoneleigh and Ashow is a parish where the Modified Local Plan proposes considerable change as a parish of less than 500 properties it will be asked to accommodate up to 4,000 additional houses. This will be achieved at the loss of large areas of Green Belt in the narrow gap between Coventry and Kenilworth. The parish is considering writing to the Planning Inspectorate with our concerns but we wish to discuss whether this is the best course of action to take. We are aware that up to date statistics suggest that this important section of Green Belt may not be required for development. We are also aware that once it is removed from the Green Belt it cannot be reinstated. It is important that WDC does not sacrifice the District's valuable green belt, particularly if this step is not required. WDC is not protecting its Green Belt land and we would ask that there is a consistent strategy with other authorities in the district and that they should follow the policy set by CCC who are choosing to protect this irreplaceable asset as far as possible

As WDC and CCC have allowed such a short consultation period for their Local Plans we wish to register our complaint concerning transparency with WDC We also wish to register our objections concerning the inaccuracies within the three M o U's and again request that the Local Plan is suspended until accurate figures are prepared.

Kind regards

Cllr. Hazel Fryer

For Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council

Dear Jeremy

In a recent telephone conversation with Caroline Pickering we raised the Parish Council's concerns that due process is not being followed in the consideration of Warwick District Council's (WDC) Modified Local Plan which is currently out for consultation. We are aware that comments are required to be submitted by the 5th May 2017. The Parish Council wishes to seek your guidance in respect of the issue of transparency as this is an area which is causing concern among your constituents and it does not appear to have been given due consideration by WDC.

We have attached for your information a series of points that we have prepared outlining the concerns of the parish but these are only brief notes on what is a difficult and complex situation.

1. In our previous email we included a letter sent to the Planning Inspectorate from CPRE who also raise the issue of transparency. CPRE make the point that the Inspector has delivered his comments to WDC but as these comments have not been published it is impossible to know to what extent the proposed modifications to the Local Plan represent his views and conversely where they reflect the aims of WDC and Coventry City Council (CCC).

2. The Leader of the Council for WDC has signed three Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) with CCC concerning the accommodation of:

- A. CCC's overspill housing in this district;
- B. CCC's Affordable Housing Needs;
- C. Sub Regional Employment land (only for Coventry) in this district

The three MoUs are not in the WDC Local Plan and have not been subject to public consultation during the Local Plan Examination despite the fact that they will have a major impact on the WDC Green Belt. The MoU documents are within Coventry City Council Local Plan Library where they are not easily accessible for members of the general public.

3. The three MoU documents which are guiding the current modifications have been shown to have inaccuracies. The problem for the Inspector for the WDC Local Plan concerns the fact that he may request changes to this Local Plan but he cannot ask for changes to the MoU documents as this step would require an agreement between all of the Inspectors examining the Local Plans concerned. This inability to change the MoU documents will mean that any mistake within an individual MoU will be proliferated in the Local Plan which will not be based on sound information. The modified Local Plan has been sent out for consultation but we would request that this should be suspended until this issue is resolved. Stoneleigh and Ashow is a parish which will be the subject to considerable change under the Modified Local Plan. A parish of around 900 properties will be asked to accommodate up to 4,000 additional houses; this will be achieved at the loss of large areas of Green Belt in the narrow gap between Coventry and Kenilworth. We are considering writing to the Planning Inspectorate with our concerns but we wish to discuss whether this is the most appropriate approach for the Parish to take.

We are aware that up to date statistics suggest that this important section of Green Belt may not be required for development and that once it is removed from the Green Belt it cannot be reinstated. It is important that WDC does not sacrifice the District's valuable green belt assets if this step is not required. WDC are not adopting a consistent strategy and we would ask that this is remedied and that WDC should reflect the policy set out by CCC who are choosing to protect their irreplaceable asset as far as this is possible.

As WDC and CCC have allowed such a short consultation period for their Local Plans we will register our complaint concerning transparency with WDC. However we also wish to register our concerns about the material inaccuracies within the three MoUs and again request that the Local Plan is suspended until accurate figures are prepared.

Kind regards

Cllrs. Hazel Fryer and Jane Mackenzie
For Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council

Comments on the Modified Warwick District Local Plan.

1. The Warwick District Council (WDC) Local Plan should concern the proposals for this district but the document proposes major development for the benefit of Coventry in Warwick District's Green Belt. The need for this development has not been put out for public consultation or examined in the Local Plan Hearings, however, the Chief Executive of WDC has stated that this proposal will be approved this summer.
2. The distribution of Coventry City Council (CCC) overspill housing into Warwickshire districts is based on an inaccurate formula which has been concealed from WDC residents and has not been subject to public consultation. The only information on this formula is located within CCC's Local Plan Examination Library.¹
3. The justification for the development is given as the 'Memorandum of Understanding' signed by the WDC Leader of the Council. The housing MoU and two further MoUs that have been signed have not put into the Local Plan and have not been subject to public consultation.²
4. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to co-operate on cross border issues but *'the duty to cooperate is not a duty to agree'*. The NPPF also states that *'there is no definitive list of actions that constitute effective co-operation under the duty.'*³ CCC has set out in its Local Plan low levels of Housing provision, Affordable Housing provision and Employment Land provision. CCC requires that the Warwickshire districts provide the shortfall that they choose not to accommodate. Unfortunately WDC has been uncritical in putting the requirements of CCC before the interests of WDC residents.
5. The Duty to Co-operate has not been fairly applied; Solihull shares a long border with Coventry but has refused to take any overspill development despite the fact that the Tile Hill area has ideal public transport and brown field sites that are absent from our district.⁴
6. Coventry is now part of the West Midlands Combined Authority and any future planning of expansion should be suspended until the Planning Policy of the Authority is agreed. There are strong indications that the 2006 -2013 Regional Spatial Strategy formulated under the former WMRA will be reinstated and this policy prohibited the hollowing out of Major Urban Areas into the Shires which left behind Zones of Depredation.
7. The projected CCC population increase of 89,000 in 18 years is unrealistic as there are very few employment opportunities. Justifying the development of the Green Belt land at Baginton to provide a major Coventry employment zone is unreasonable. The claim made by WDC in 2014 that the site would provide 16,000 jobs was reduced down in 2016 to 6,500.⁵ In reality the provision is more likely to be around 2,500 new jobs and it is accepted that 50% of these will be relocations from Coventry thus further hollowing out the City's fragile employment base. Analysis of the last ten years expansion shows that private industry is moving out of the major urban areas to a zone 10 to 20 miles outside.⁶

¹ A Formula based on Coventry Commuter Traffic Flows without knowing start or end destination.

² The Affordable Housing MoU, 2015 and the Employment Land MoU, July 2016.

³ Coventry Local Plan – Proposed Modifications, March 2017 Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum Report. APPENDIX III: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Affordable Housing 'Dwellings at rent or price that can be afforded by people who are in housing need and would otherwise be accommodated by the City Council.'

⁴ The Inspector's 2012 report on Solihull's LP confirms and accepts this situation.

⁵ WDC Chief Planning Officer in evidence to the LP Examination.

⁶ Birmingham University's analysis for the E3i Report.

8. CCC's population was stated to be 337,000 in 2015 which is approximately the same as 1971 when the City had major industries including automotive assembly, tractor manufacture, aircraft and aero engine manufacture, tool making, electronics and chemicals/weaving that were all private industries. These private industries have gone and the top ten employers are local government, central government and education bodies all reliant on taxpayer subsidy and are unlikely to significantly expand. The population contains 38,000 students living in the City who are counted as permanent residents although most of them leave after qualification.⁷

9. WDC houses many of the 13,000 Coventry University students who live outside the City but these numbers have not been taken into account when assessing WDC's role in meeting CCC unmet housing need. The CCC formula applied for counting student units as 'housing equivalent' is not consistent with WDC's methodology and inflates the CCC's housing numbers⁸. This has resulted in CCC's future growth and OAN being unrealistically inflated and used as an unmet housing need.

10. CCC has decided to allocate 28.3% of its total new housing as Affordable Housing and requires WDC to increase its Affordable Housing percentage to 47% to provide for the shortfall for Coventry. This formula was accepted by the WDC Council leader when he signed the Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding.⁹ Details of this AHMoU were not included in the Local Plan and have not been the subject of public consultation.

11. The Local Plan Examination has ignored the failure of both WDC and CCC to comply with the NPPF requirement to carry out a Sustainability Assessment for Coventry's proposed development requirements.¹⁰ The allocation of Kings Hill for 1,800 to 4,000 houses has not been the subject of a Sustainability Assessment to determine whether this is a suitable location for Coventry. This is also the case with the Baginton Sub-regional employment site which has not had a Sub-regional Sustainability Assessment, which must now include the wider WMCA area. As these major development proposals do not comply with the National Planning Policy it should be recommended that they are halted.

12. The Current WDC Local Plan process is seriously flawed. The examination ended in December 2016 when it was accepted that the housing numbers were not known either for Warwick District or Coventry City. The WDC LP Consultation Period is due to end on the 5th May 2017. Negotiations between the Inspector and the Council are being held in private; this makes it difficult for residents of the district who are being forced to comment on an unknown situation which cannot be democratic.

13. The WDC Local Plan is not fit for purpose as the current document is unreadable and significant information is missing. Solihull MBC has rewritten their Local Plan to provide a readable document but WDC have added tables and crossing out to an already confused and out of date document. This is a failure by WDC to comply with their approved policy of Community Involvement and transparency. The deficiencies are sufficiently serious to warrant a legal challenge to the current local plan if it progresses to the approval stage.

Stoneleigh & Ashow Joint Parish Council
26th April 2017

⁷ G L Hearn Study for CCC repeated at WDLP Examination.

⁸ CCC uses 2 student units = 1 house, WDC uses a ratio of 3 student units = 1 house.

⁹ The MoUs are only found in the CCC and WDC Examination Libraries.

¹⁰ Sustainability is the 'golden thread' running through the National Planning Policy Framework.

Dear Jeremy,

Thank you for your letter of 2nd May regarding the concerns raised by Stoneleigh and **Ashow Parish Council. The Parish Council's concerns fall in to two areas** – one regarding the housing numbers and the consequential need to allocate land at Kings Hill; the other regarding the Local Plan process and specifically the Main Modification consultation. I will deal with each of those in turn.

Housing Numbers

The Parish Council raise concerns about the Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MoU has been in the public domain since before it was agreed by the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Committee and has been subject to consultation (in 2016) as well as detailed scrutiny through the Local Plan hearings. Likewise, the formula behind it, has also been published (at the time it was agreed by the Councils and again during the Local Plan examination) and indeed it **remains on the Council's Local Plan website as part of the Local Plan evidence base** here: https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/3420/lp31pm_lp32pm_-_appendix_5_-_shadow_epb_covering_report_-_29-9-15 . The formula was also subject to scrutiny during the Local Plan hearings. In this context a number of the points raised by the Parish Council in relation to the MoU are not accurate and the Council remains satisfied that it was necessary (in the context of the NPPF) for Warwick District to play a significant role in meeting unmet housing need from Coventry and that the MOU provides a rational and sound method to identify the extent of this.

The Parish Council's notes raise a variety of other points regarding the MOU, housing numbers, the Duty to Cooperate and employment land. The Parish Council raised all these points through the Local Plan hearings. Warwick District Council would disagree with many of the points raised and has explained why during the hearings. It would involve a very lengthy and detailed letter to address each of the specific points raised here. However, the important point is that the Local Plan process has provided the opportunity for these points to be discussed through the hearings and we are now in the hands of the Inspector who will set out his conclusions and the reasons for them in his final report.

One point I do want to specifically address is regarding the overall housing need in Coventry and Warwickshire. During the Local Plan hearings a variety of figures have been put forward, some significantly lower than that supported by the Council, and some significantly higher. Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council explain in their note **that they have supported a lower figure. The Council's approach** has been to work closely with the all the Councils in Coventry and Warwickshire to commission independent expert evidence (from GL Hearn) regarding housing need, taking the **Government's Household Projections as a starting point. The approach has been** carefully designed to ensure full compliance with the NPPF and associated guidance. The evidence prepared has been subject to detailed scrutiny through the Local Plan hearings, not just in Warwick District, but also in Coventry. Whilst the final conclusions will not be known until the Inspector prepares his final report, it is fair to say that the **process has been rigorous and should the Inspector support the Council's position we** can all be confident this is a sound and robust starting point for the provision of housing.

The consequence of this, of course, is that we need to allocate land to meet that need, such as the Land at Kings Hill. I do understand that this emotive and that there are many different perspectives to consider. However, the Council has been thorough in considering site options (as has the Inspector through the hearings) and we consider that Kings Hill remains an appropriate location for a housing allocation.

Finally, before moving on to the matters regarding the process, it is important to **underline that the Council's approach is to support the delivery of high quality housing** and infrastructure and that we are taking a positive and proactive approach to support **the Government's agenda around boosting the delivery of housing. The Local Plan** is an important part of this and once adopted the Council will do all it can to enable high

quality development and support the establishment of thriving communities.

Local Plan Process

There are three point would like to address here:

a) The consultation document: the format and content of the schedule of modifications prepared for the current main modifications has been specified by the Local Plan Inspector. He has correctly asked the Council to prepare a document that shows all the modifications between the original submission document (2015) and that which is now being proposed. This approach has simplified the document and ensures that those wishing to comment can see all the changes since 2015 in one place. This is consistent with the regulations **and, in the Council's view, ensures transparent information is** provided following a lengthy and very complex process.

b) CPRE and Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council have raised concerns about the transparency of the current consultation. It must be understood that the Council is conducting this consultation on behalf of the Inspector. He has specifically asked for the consultation to take place in relation to a number of Main Modifications (see Local Plan Exam document

183 [https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4288/exam_183 -
outline of main modifications required from inspector](https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4288/exam_183_-_outline_of_main_modifications_required_from_inspector)). Concerns have been raised that the process he has specified does not include his reasoning for the inclusion (or exclusion) of modifications. The Inspector has responded to these concerns in a letter – Local Plan Exam document

184B [https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4325/exam_184b -
inspectors response to exam 184a](https://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/downloads/file/4325/exam_184b_-_inspectors_response_to_exam_184a) . **There is little I can add to the Inspector's** comments, except to say the Council is satisfied that the approach is compliant with the regulations and that the Local Plan examination has been conducted in a thorough and transparent way that has given ample opportunity for interested parties to have their say.

c) Both CPRE and Stoneleigh and Ashow suggest that there have been negotiations between the Inspector and the Council in private. This is untrue. There have been no negotiations and the Council has not been directly in contact with the Inspector since the hearings closed in December. There has been some email correspondence with him through the Programme Officer. However this was purely seeking clarification regarding Local Plan Exam document 183 to ensure the schedule of modifications was prepared in accordance with his meaning. The Inspector has made it clear that the contents of Exam 183 were not for discussion or negotiation and the Council has at no point sought to do this.

In summary, the Council is satisfied that the housing numbers it has proposed for the Local Plan are supported by the evidence and, through the MOU, dovetail with Local Plans being prepared elsewhere in Coventry and Warwickshire. The Council is also satisfied the Examination process and the Main Modifications consultation (take as a whole) has provided a transparent process that complies with the regulatory framework.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Elliott
Chief Executive



41A Smith Street
Warwick CV34 4JA
Telephone: 01926 494597
office@cprewarwickshire.org.uk
www.cprewarwickshire.org.uk

Standing up for the Warwickshire Countryside

Sarah Richards FRTPI
Chief Executive
The Planning Inspectorate
4/08 Eagle Wing
2017
Temple Quay House
Bristol BS1 6PN
Sarah.Richards@pins.gsi.gov.uk

26 March

Dear Ms Richards

WARWICK DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

We write because we are extremely concerned about the process that is being followed by the Planning Inspectorate in examining Warwick District's local plan.

The Publication Draft Local Plan and Focused Changes were submitted to the Secretary of State by Warwick District Council in January 2015. This was the latest in a long series of different versions, many of which bore little relationship to their predecessors. Although there had been consultation on the submitted version, it had been limited to the 'soundness' of the plan. Some important changes were subsequently made but not consulted upon.

The Examination of the Local Plan commenced in Spring 2015. Hearings took place in May-June 2015 and between July and December 2016. CPRE was one of the many participants. The day after the examination hearings closed in December 2016, the inspector wrote to the Council, saying that they had requested him to recommend 'main modifications' that would make the plan sound. He said he would liaise with the Council on these through the Programme Officer. No other party was involved in this process. WDC councillors and officers have repeatedly refused to provide any information on these closed-door discussions, stating that the Inspector had asked for all dealings at this stage to be confidential. To outward appearances this has all the hallmarks of a 'stitch-up' between the Inspector and the Council.

The Council has recently published 89 pages of modifications, without justifications, and is consulting on them until 5 May. Many of the modifications are very detailed and it is difficult to accept them as 'main modifications'. In commenting on the modifications, there is no way of knowing which of them were required by the inspector and which have been introduced by the Council for their own purposes.

It is also impossible to make meaningful comment on these latest proposals without knowing what conclusions the inspector has reached, and why he reached them. CPRE put forward a number of fundamental objections to the plan which bore directly on its soundness, but the modifications largely disregard these. It is not clear whether the inspector has rejected our objections (and if so why), or whether he has simply ignored them.

To take housing provision as one example, CPRE argued at the Examination that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Coventry and Warwickshire joint local authorities' Memorandum of Understanding on which the plan depended were both seriously defective, and that the housing provision put forward by the Council could therefore not be relied upon, making the plan unsound. In particular, no evidence had been provided by Warwick District Council about the level of provision for Warwick District to meet Coventry's needs and there was no opportunity to challenge this.

Our evidence showed that the level of provision the Council proposed could not be delivered, and that the likely outcome would not be sustainable. We supported our arguments with a study commissioned from Alan Wenban-Smith, a highly experienced and well respected planning consultant. Yet we now find that the strangely precise total figure of housing numbers for the Plan period is left entirely unchanged in the so-called main modifications. Without knowing why this has happened, we are in no position to comment on either the modifications that have been made or the absence of necessary changes.

Furthermore, you will be aware from letters sent by CPRE Warwickshire to your office about the linked Coventry Local Plan that the housing requirements for Warwick District are derived from a large projection of population growth for Coventry, and a policy to meet its needs in adjacent Districts. ONS 2014-based projections for Coventry, available since May 2016, forecast an increase of 79,000 population from net international migration into the city 2015-2031. This is the result of the assumption that such students arrive and do not leave. In fact the local university evidence is that nearly all do. And it is government policy that they should. Evidence that the numbers are wrong is before the Inspector holding the Coventry Plan Examination, and she has indicated that further sessions may be required on this.

If as we anticipate the Coventry Local Plan's population projections have to be substantially lowered, the basis for the housing requirement put forward by Warwick District Council and seemingly accepted by the Warwick Local Plan will be wrong. But there is no Examination of the overall figures that the Memorandum of Understanding has used and divided up between the City and District Councils.

It seems to us that the Warwick Local Plan process has degenerated into a shambles. It is the very antithesis of the open, transparent process that the Government appears to desire. The Inspector has colluded with the Council behind closed doors to the detriment of other participants at the Examination of the plan. Those with a legitimate interest in the plan have been kept in the dark to the extent that they are now in no position to respond meaningfully to the proposed modifications. All this makes a mockery of the principle of examining a local plan in public.

The current consultation is a sham. The consultation document mixes a multitude of changes already presented to the Examination with some changes apparently required by the Inspector but it fails to make clear which are which or why the most recent changes are necessary or why other potential changes have not been adopted. Interested parties are left to search for needles in a haystack. The NPPF requires **effective** discussion and consultation with local communities and other interested parties but the current consultation exercise obfuscates and appears to be designed to ensure that no further changes could be justified through this process. This consultation does not comply with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement and the process fails to meet the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

We request that as Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate you step in now to suspend the the current Examination process pending

- completion and publication of a report by the inspector setting out his interim conclusions on the Plan and the reasons he has reached them.
- Full justification for the modifications that the Council now proposes to make, with reference to the inspector's interim report.

- Further sessions of the Coventry Local Plan Examination on the population and housing requirement in the light of evidence on international student flows, and completion and publication of that Inspector's Report.

Please will you also direct that all communications between the Inspector and Warwick District Council since he completed the public hearings in December 2016 be published on the Examination website.

We consider that the local plan is legally challengeable in its present form because the process that has produced it is so seriously defective and contrary to the interests of natural justice.

We look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely

SIR ANDREW WATSON
Chairman, CPRE Warwickshire

Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

Summary Income and Expenditure Account for the year ended 31st March 2017

31/03/2016	INCOME	31/03/2017
15,965.00	Precept	£16,263.00
34.00	Council Tax Support Grant	£466.00
25.03	Bank Interest	£20.62
180.00	Concurrent	£170.00
0.00	Community Forum	£0.00
6,000.00	Grant Neighbourhood Plan	£0.00
2,038.00	Defibrillator	£0.00
	Tranparency Fund	£1,381.94
515.76	Other (Ashow notice boards)	£875.00
24,757.79		£19,176.56

31/03/2016	EXPENDITURE	31/03/2017
5,703.24	Clerk's Salary	9,342.21
276.30	Clerk's Travel Expenses	225.00
1,288.32	Office Maintenance	1,288.32
323.16	Postage/Telephone	335.30
1,131.18	Stationery	255.31
	Equipment / Maintenance	812.08
446.17	Insurance	404.11
5,975.00	Neighbourhood Plan	0.00
50.00	Course Fees	125.00
	Publications	0.00
1,521.46	Grants	1,451.55
389.00	Hire of Rooms	348.50
443.00	Subscriptions/Donations	398.00
160.00	Audit	160.00
3,387.46	Council Elections	0.00
613.88	Miscellaneous (Inc pay roll)	1,012.42
	Gateway Planning Inquiry	0.00
239.50	HS2	0.00
1,660.00	Defibrillator	0.00
23,607.67		16,157.80

2015/2016	Cumulative Fund Balance	2016/2017
23,412.96	Balance B/Fwd 1st April 2016	24,563.08
<u>24,757.79</u>	Total Income	<u>19,176.56</u>
48,170.75		43,739.64
<u>-23,607.67</u>	Less Total Expenditure	<u>-16,157.80</u>
<u>24,563.08</u>	Balance C/Fwd 31st March 2017	<u>27,581.84</u>

Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

Balance Sheet for the year ended 31st March 2017

31st March 2016	Current Assets	31st March 2017
£1,748.08	Debtors (re-claimable VAT £302.86 and bank interest £8.73) interest of £8.73)	£311.59
£22,815.00	Cash at Bank	£27,819.25
£24,563.08	Total Assets	£28,130.84
Nil	Current Liabilities (unpresented cheques)	£549.00
£24,563.08	Net assets	£27,581.84
	Represented by:	
£24,563.08	Fund Balance	£27,581.84
	Reserves	
£24,563.08		£27,581.84

The above statement represents fairly the financial position of the authority as at 31st March 2017 and reflects its income and expenditure during the year.

Approved by Council: 11th May 2017

Signed.....

Chairman

Councillor R. Hancox

Signed.....

Responsible Finance Officer

Mrs Sarah Windridge



Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs S Windridge

FIXED ASSET REGISTER AS AT 31st MARCH 2017

The assets are subject to straight line depreciation

As at 31st March 2017 the following assets were held:

	Purchase Price	Purchase Price	Current Value
Photocopier	2009	£761	£0
2 Sets of Swings + Safety Surface	Unknown	£6,180	£0
Playground Equipment	2013	£11,000	£2200
Speed Gun	2014	£1215	£729

(The purchase of the swings and safety surface was undertaken by the Leigh Educational Charity and donated to the Council for the benefit of the children of Stoneleigh. The playground equipment was donated to the Parish Council by Warwick District Council).

The basis of current valuation of the assets is based on a depreciation of 20% per year.

The Council is the Registered owner of two plots of land in Stoneleigh Village as shown in Warwickshire County Council Records: - V.G. 146 (GDS 1 & 2), Commons Registration Act 1965.



Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

Clerk: Mrs S Windridge

Ring fenced monies at as 31st March 2017

Defibrillator	£378.00
Warwick District Council – Rural Footway Lighting	£361.77
Parish Plan – Stoneleigh Village	£1,141.89
Community Plan	£815.87
Election Expenses	£1500.00
Coventry & Warwickshire Gateway Project	£1,085.00
Neighbourhood Plan	£3,000.00
Grant Speed Gun	£1,205.00
Ashow Noticeboards	£1550.00
Planning Fees	£200.00
Transparency Fund	£1381.94
Total	£12,619.47