

**To: The Deputy Leader and Members of the
Planning and Development Board**

**(Councillors Simpson, Reilly, Bell, L Dirveiks,
Hayfield, Henney, D Humphreys, Jarvis, Lewis,
Morson, Phillips, Smitten, Sweet, Symonds and
A Wright)**

For the information of other Members of the Council

This document can be made available in large print and electronic accessible formats if requested.

For general enquiries please contact David Harris, Democratic Services Manager, on 01827 719222 or via e-mail - davidharris@northwarks.gov.uk.

For enquiries about specific reports please contact the officer named in the reports

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD AGENDA

5 NOVEMBER 2018

The Planning and Development Board will meet in The Council Chamber, The Council House, South Street, Atherstone, Warwickshire CV9 1DE on Monday 5 November 2018 at 6.30 pm.

AGENDA

- 1 **Evacuation Procedure.**
- 2 **Apologies for Absence / Members away on official Council business.**
- 3 **Disclosable Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests**

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION (WHITE PAPERS)

- 4 **Planning Applications** – Report of the Head of Development Control.

Summary

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – applications presented for determination

The Contact Officer for this report is Jeff Brown (719310).

- 5 **Appeal Update** – Report of the Head of Development Control.

Summary

This report brings Members up to date with recent appeal decisions.

The Contact Officer for this report is Jeff Brown (719310).

- 6 **Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April – September 2018** - Report of the Chief Executive

Summary

This report informs Members of the progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Planning and Development Board for April to September 2018.

The Contact Officer for this report is Robert Beggs (719238).

- 7 **Exclusion of the Public and Press**

Recommendation:

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by Schedule 12A to the Act.

EXEMPT INFORMATION (GOLD PAPERS)

- 8 **Building Control Service** - Report of the Head of Development Control **(TO FOLLOW)**.

The Contact Officer for this report is Jeff Brown (719310).

JERRY HUTCHINSON
Chief Executive

Agenda Item No 5

Planning and Development Board

5 November 2018

**Report of the
Head of Development Control**

Appeal Update

1 Summary

1.1 The report brings Members up to date in respect of recent appeal decisions

Recommendation to the Board

That the report be noted.

2 Consultation

2.1 Consultation has taken place with the relevant Members and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

3 Appeal Decisions

a) Holmfield, Bennetts Road North, Corley

3.1 The proposal here was for the demolition of a single house in the Green Belt and its replacement with two new houses. It is clear from the decision that whilst the proposal did amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, there were no material considerations that were sufficient to amount to the very special circumstances needed to clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt.

3.2 The decision letter is at Appendix A

b) Corley Motorway Services

3.3 Members will recall the site visits to this site and the discussions held with the applicant to see if a revised scheme could be agreed without the need for an appeal. That did not arise and so the applicant appealed the Council's refusal.

3.4 The decision letter is at Appendix B and this grants planning permission.

3.5 The Inspector clearly agrees with the Council that the proposal is for inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However he considers that the harm caused is not significant. He does however give substantial weight to the appellants' evidence in respect of HGV numbers; the particular pressure

on this stretch of the motorway network and the actual operational issues experienced at the site. Little weight is given to the prospect of redeveloping the existing parking arrangements or indeed to the recent decision for a new Service Area at Rugby MSA. As a consequence he finds that these matters clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt.

c) Knowle Hill, Hurley

3.6 This is a welcome decision supporting Development Plan policies at a very local level. The letter is at Appendix C.

d) Thompsons Meadow, Grendon

3.7 This decision is disappointing but not really unexpected given the Government's objective of significantly increasing new housing development. In the absence of objections from any of the Technical Agencies, the Inspector found that there was no harm. The letter is at Appendix D.

The Contact Officer for this report is Jeff Brown (719310).

Background Papers

Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2018

by **Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/18/3205131
Holmfield, Bennetts Road North, Corley CV7 8BG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dereck Beverley against the decision of North Warwickshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PAP/2018/0234, dated 10 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing house and build two new 5 bedroom houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') and development plan policy;
 - if the development would be inappropriate, whether the harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Policy Background

3. Paragraph 145 of the Framework is clear that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate. However, it adds that exceptions to this are the replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces, limited infilling in villages, and the redevelopment of previously developed land which would not have a greater impact on openness than the existing development.
4. The Council consider that policy NW3 of the North Warwickshire Core Strategy (NWCS) referred to in their decision notice is out of date so carries little weight. Nonetheless, the policy, and its accompanying explanatory text, generally sets out which forms of development are inappropriate in the Green Belt and the settlements washed over by the Green Belt, and so is broadly consistent with the Framework.

5. Policy LP3 of the emerging Local Plan has been submitted for examination. It relates to the Green Belt and allows for limited infilling in settlements washed over by Green Belt or where the site is clearly part of the built form of the villages and where there is built form on three sides. This policy has not yet been adopted and so I can only give it limited weight.

Reasons

Inappropriate development?

6. The site is within the Green Belt. The site is largely undeveloped with only the limited remains of a dwelling in the western corner. The Council have calculated that building's volume, plus that available to it under permitted development allowances for extensions, as being around 640m³. This is roughly the same as the figures provided by the appellant on the drawings.
7. The Council calculates that the combined volume of the two dwellings would be 1227m³, and this is not disputed by the appellant. This is clearly significantly larger than the building currently on site even if it were renovated and extended. I understand that there was another dwelling on the site previously, but that this has not existed for around at least 30 years. I cannot therefore take account of it, notwithstanding the fact I have no details of its volume in order to assess if the proposed development would be materially larger.
8. The site is within a row of dwellings with open fields opposite and to the rear. To the northwest the houses are fairly tightly packed in long, narrow plots. To the southeast there are two houses in larger plots and then, further along the road, open land and agricultural buildings. The development would be seen as part of this ribbon of houses, with their large scale and spacious plots being particularly similar to the neighbouring properties to the south east. However this collection of dwellings does not, in my view, constitute a village and they are patently detached from the settlement of Keresley End. Furthermore these dwellings do not comprise a settlement washed over by the Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan, nor does the emerging Local Plan identify this group of dwellings as a Green Belt infill settlement, despite taking account of the conclusions of the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Green Belt Study.
9. The site would comprise previously developed land. Part g) of paragraph 145 of the Framework only supports the re-use of previously developed land where the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. The lack of built form on site currently, and the modest hedge along the site frontage, means the site appears very open. Due to the significant increase in development from that which currently exists on the site, the development would considerably affect the openness of the site. This would be both spatially, in terms of its volume, and visually as the two new dwellings would appear prominently.
10. Overall, the proposed development would be materially larger than the existing dwelling, could not be considered to constitute limited infilling in a village, and would have a greater effect on openness than the current development. Consequently I consider the proposal would not fall within the specific exceptions listed in paragraph 145 and therefore the proposed dwellings would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

Other considerations

11. Development should not be approved unless the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations. I therefore need to balance any other considerations against that harm.
12. I have considered the cases referred to by the appellant with respect to new dwellings in the Green Belt. However I have very limited details of these cases, and from the information I do have it appears that the houses were similar in size to the buildings they replaced or did not affect the openness of the Green Belt. That is not the case in this proposal before me, and in any event each proposal must be considered on its own merits.

Planning Balance and Overall Conclusion

13. The Framework advises that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts and that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. This proposal would cause harm to the Green Belt by virtue of its inappropriateness and because of its impact on openness.
14. I conclude that there are no other considerations that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and therefore there are no very special circumstances to justify the proposal. As such, the development would conflict with policy NW3 of the NWCS and LP3 of the emerging Local Plan, and the Framework which all aim to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.
15. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2018

by **M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: **22 October 2018**

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/17/3192501

Welcome Break Motorway Services, Smorrall Lane, Corley CV7 8NR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Welcome Break Group Limited against the decision of North Warwickshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PAP/2017/0104, dated 28 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to HGV parking incorporating associated infrastructure and works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of land to HGV parking incorporating associated infrastructure and works at Welcome Break Motorway Services, Smorrall Lane, Corley CV7 8NR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PAP/2017/0104, dated 28 February 2017, and subject to the schedule of conditions to this decision.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of the application, on 24 July 2018 the Government published a new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties have been given an opportunity to comment on the appeal in light of this. I have taken account of any comments received and considered this appeal in light of the new Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i) Whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt in terms of the Framework and development plan policy;
 - ii) The effect of the development on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt;
 - iii) If the proposal would be inappropriate development whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons

Background

4. The appeal site comprises some 2 hectares of grazing land to the south-east of the northbound section of the Corley Motorway Services Area (MSA), which is located along the M6 motorway. Beyond the southern boundary of Corley MSA, the area including the appeal site is largely countryside, with the exception of some ribbon development along Bennetts Road North, further south of the appeal site. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt.
5. The proposed scheme would provide an additional Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) parking area and associated infrastructure to serve Corley MSA. Access into and egress from the appeal site would be via the existing internal road network serving the MSA. The scheme also proposes floodlighting to the parking area and fencing/bunds along its perimeter. Surface water drainage would be to a new balancing pond.

Inappropriate development in the Green Belt

6. In refusing the application the Council has referred to Policy NW3 of the North Warwickshire Core Strategy 2014 (CS). This is a strategic policy which does not directly deal with the management of development in the Green Belt. Consequently, in determining this appeal I have had specific regard to the Green Belt provisions of the Framework.
7. Paragraph 146 of the Framework sets out certain development types which may not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. These include engineering operations, local transport infrastructure and material changes in the use of land. However, these exceptions only apply where the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. For the reasons I explain below, that is not the case in this instance. Accordingly, and since none of the other exceptions listed in the Framework apply in this case, the appeal scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Effect on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt

8. As set out under Paragraph 133 of the Framework the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
9. Openness has a visual and spatial dimension. In this case the appeal site is visually contained by a combination of existing boundary treatments, which would be augmented by additional new planting. These would to a large extent screen the new development, including the parked vehicles. Therefore, the visual impact of the proposed development on the Green Belt would be limited.
10. There are electricity pylons nearby, along with the buildings and infrastructure associated with the Corley MSA, and the M6 Motorway. Despite this extent of urbanisation, the appeal site is absent of any significant development. Consequently, the parking of large vehicles over a sizeable part of the appeal site would introduce a degree of spatial encroachment, which would erode its openness. In this case however, because of the transient nature of vehicles using the site the effect on openness would be less permanent. I therefore attach moderate weight to this effect on openness.

11. Development at the appeal site would result in an area of grazing land being developed upon and encroachment into the countryside. This would therefore conflict with one of the purposes for including land within the Green Belt. This is a further aspect of Green Belt harm.

Other considerations

12. The Framework advises that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'. It is stated that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
13. In this case the appeal scheme is predicated on the need for additional HGV parking spaces at Corley MSA, due to a number of factors. These include the overall growth in HGV traffic nationally and regionally, allied with the need to accommodate this. The evidence in the appellant's submissions supports this, to which I attach moderate weight.
14. Moreover, site specific reasons for additional HGV parking at Corley MSA have been advanced. At present Corley MSA has 60 standard HGV spaces plus 4 available spaces in the long load bay. Based on average traffic flows passing the site the existing level of parking provision falls short of the near 100 spaces required, in accordance with government policy advice¹. I attach substantial weight to this.
15. The appellant's evidence also confirms that the amount of HGVs travelling along the M6 is more than other motorways, and in particular the level of HGV traffic using Corley MSA is proportionally greater than other nearby MSAs. This is due to the location of Corley MSA along the M6, prior to the distribution of traffic onto other motorways. Consequently, it is at a key location where drivers take breaks. This is particularly significant, given that HGV drivers operate within legal driving times, and their stopping times are prescribed. In addition, drivers also need safe and secure facilities which Corley MSA provides. Moreover, the proposed HGV parking area would be close to the Strategic Road Network (SRN). In-line with government policy advice such facilities are more accessible to road users, and as a result, encourage drivers to stop and take a break. The letter from the Road Haulage Association also supports additional parking for site specific reasons at Corley MSA.
16. The appellant's Transport Assessment identifies that there is additional need for HGV parking arising from the high level of HGVs accessing but being unable to park at Corley MSA. At present, when the existing HGV parking area reaches 80% capacity, which occurs during the day and the night, drivers find alternative places to park resulting in unauthorised parking within the site, which causes hazardous incidents and environmental damage. On the other hand, some HGVs circulate the site and leave being unable to find space to park. This can be up to 70 HGVs in a night, which leads to parking on the egress slip road to the site, the hard shoulder, and also the refuge bays on the motorway. These activities raise safety concerns.
17. I acknowledge that some of the above incidents could be reduced by management and enforcement. Nevertheless, this would not address the cause

¹ DfT Circular 02/2013 - Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development

of these problems, which is the under provision of HGV parking. Highways England (HE) who are responsible for managing and maintaining the (SRN) in addition to not objecting to the appellant's proposals, also suggest that they may well offer safety benefits by reducing the likelihood of hazardous HGV parking and driver tiredness. It has also been suggested that unauthorised HGV parking is a consequence of driver's unwilling to pay for authorised parking. However, I have limited evidence to support this.

18. From the information before me the appellant has considered utilising the existing areas within Corley MSA more efficiently to increase HGV parking spaces. Whilst an option exists for creating some additional HGV parking at Corley MSA, this has been discounted for highway safety reasons in the opinion of the appellant's transport consultants. This would also limit the option for creating additional parking at the appeal site in combination with a smaller new parking area. The appellant has also reviewed two alternative parking schemes submitted by third parties and highlighted their shortcomings.
19. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the appellant has made reasonable endeavours in respect of considering alternative HGV parking arrangements. I also understand that the Council is commissioning a Borough wide survey in relation to HGV parking. However, as the findings of this are not before me at the time of deciding this appeal, I attach no weight to it.
20. The proposed requirement for the additional HGV parking spaces is based on the present and future HGV parking needs of Corley MSA, along with the number of vehicles not being able to park and leaving the site. In the absence of any strong technical evidence to the contrary, I accept the appellant's justification for the proposed level of HGV parking spaces. I also note that the Council has not disputed the site-specific shortfall of HGV parking spaces at Corley MSA.
21. Furthermore, Paragraph 107 of the Framework says that planning decisions should recognise the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages, to reduce the risk of parking in locations that lack proper facilities or could cause a nuisance. In light of this and for the above reasons, I attach considerable weight to the site specific requirement to provide additional HGV parking at Corley MSA.
22. A new MSA at Junction 1, M6 (Rugby) has been approved. However, from the limited information I have in respect of this, its associated requirement for HGV parking spaces is based on the need along that particular part of the motorway and area. In any event, I have no strong evidence to demonstrate that the MSA at Rugby undermines the appellant's detailed case for the proposed additional HGV parking at the appeal site. As such, I attach limited weight to this in the overall balance.
23. The appellant and third parties have referred me to other HGV parking facilities in the area, in support of their respective cases. Nevertheless, given my findings in respect of the specific shortfall and need for HGV parking at Corley MSA, I attach limited weight to such facilities.

Other Matters

24. I have noted concerns raised by third parties in respect of future buildings being provided on the appeal site for driver facilities. However, the appellant

has confirmed that HGV drivers using the proposed parking area would utilise the existing facilities. Moreover, any future proposals for development would have to be considered on their merits.

25. Other environmental concerns have also been raised by third parties. Based on the evidence submitted by the appellant and in the absence of any technical evidence to the contrary, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have any significant impact in respects of noise, light or emission pollution on the living conditions of nearby neighbours. Nor would it cause significant harm to matters of bio-diversity, wildlife and the local water environment, subject to conditions.
26. The submitted scheme is accompanied by a Road Safety Audit and there are no objections from Warwickshire County Council Highways or Highways England. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal raises no specific highway safety issues.
27. I acknowledge that the appeal site acts as part of a buffer between the Corley MSA and dwellings along Bennetts Road North and that the development would encroach into part of this. However, a certain buffer area would still be retained and a large extent of the proposed development would be screened by the existing and proposed landscaping. Some distant views of the appeal site from the dwellings along Bennetts Road North would be possible. Nevertheless such distant views would not result in any appreciable harm to outlook.
28. In the absence of any strong evidence, I am not persuaded that the security of nearby neighbours would be compromised by the proposed development. The issue of impact on property values has also been raised. It is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as value of land or property.
29. I have determined the appeal proposal on its merits. As such, the refusal of a previous application² for a smaller HGV parking area in a similar location to the appeal site does not alter my findings on the main issues.
30. Concerns relating to the lack of maintenance and protection of existing landscaping, littering and inappropriate use of adjacent areas in association with the Corley MSA site are separate to the determination of this appeal.
31. There is a possibility of an existing public footpath which crosses the appeal site being diverted. However, I have limited details in respect of this. In any event the grant of planning permission does not of itself authorise any obstruction of a public footpath and any diversion of it would be dealt with through a separate process.

The Green Belt balance

32. The development would constitute inappropriate development and conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Moreover, it harms the Green Belt by way of loss of openness. The Framework requires substantial weight to be given to any harm to the Green Belt.
33. Having considered all other considerations in support of the development, in particular the under provision of HGV parking at Corley MSA and the strong

² PAP/2008/0658 – Proposed extension to Motorway Service Area to create additional HGV parking facilities including amenity block and associated landscape proposals.

demand for HGV parking at this particular location. I find that the other considerations in this case clearly outweigh the harm that I have identified. Looking at the case as a whole, I consider that very special circumstances exist which justify the development. Therefore the proposed development does not conflict the Green Belt provisions of the Framework.

Conditions

34. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council in the light of the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and plans as this provides certainty.
35. Conditions relating to landscaping and trees are necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area. Conditions relating to the proposed fencing and bunds, the Management Plan for the HGV parking area, its hours of use, lighting and control over its construction are all necessary in the interests of the living conditions of neighbours. Conditions 3 and 4 are necessary in the interests of flood risk and drainage. A condition requiring Biodiversity Offsetting measures is necessary in the interests of biodiversity enhancements. Condition 6 is necessary to safeguard any archaeological interests of the site. Where needed, and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the suggested conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.
36. Conditions 4, 5, 6 and 7, which prevent any development approved by the planning permission from commencing until they have been complied with, are considered fundamental to the development hereby approved. It is necessary for them to take the form of 'pre-commencement' conditions in order to have their intended effect.

Conclusion

37. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: CMSA-BWB-GEN-XX-DR-TR-107 S2 REV P1; CMSA-BWB-GEN-XX-DR-TR-106 S2 REV P1; CMSA-BWB-HLG-XX-M2-C-1300 S8 REV P1; Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal Doc ref NO. 1735-17-RP01 dated 24 February 2017, including the Appendices with Landscape Mitigation Plan - 1735-17-03B and Illustrative Landscape Sections plan - 1735-17-04, received 1 March 2017, to CMSA-BWB-HGR-XX-DR-EN-202 S2 REV P1; CMSA-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0002_RSA1-DTR (Road Safety Audit Stage 1); CMSA-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-0001_RSA1- (Road Safety Audit Stage 1); CMSA-BWB-HGR-XX-DR-EN-201-S2 REV P2 (Surface water strategy) ; CMSA-BWB-HGR-XX-DR-EN-202-S2 REV P1 (Pond Cross Section), received 31 May 2017, and to CMSA-BWB-GEN-XX-DR-TR-105 S2 REV S2; CMSA-BWB-GEN-XX-DR-TR-110 S2 REV P2, received 4 August 2017 and Proposed HGV Parking Extension Lighting Layout – CMSA-BWB-HLG-XX-M2-C300 S8 REV P1.
- 3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) CMSA-BWB-EWE-XX-RP-EN-0001_FRA, Sustainable Drainage Statement CMSA-BWB-HDG-XX-RP-RP-0002_SDS, and Surface Water Strategy CMSA- BWB-HGR-XX-DR-EN-201_Surface Water Strategy. In particular the development should be carried out according to the following mitigation measures detailed:
 - Limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to and including the 100 year plus 40% (allowance for climate change) critical rain storm to 6.6 l/s for the site.
 - Provide provision of surface water attenuation storage as stated within the FRA of 749m³ and/ or in accordance with 'Science Report SC030219 Rainfall Management for Developments'. The storage pond should be designed in accordance with plan CMSA-BWB-HGR-XX-DR-202_Pond Cross Sections.
 - Surface water is to be provided via a minimum of two trains of treatment using the proposed above ground drainage features within the drainage design.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to use of the development and subsequently in accordance with the timing and phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme.
- 4) The development hereby approved shall not take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Local Lead Flood Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme to be submitted shall include:

- Infiltration testing in accordance with the BRE 365 guidance to clarify whether or not an infiltration type drainage strategy is an appropriate means of managing the surface water runoff from the site.
 - Provide a plan for the management of exceedance flows, including routings.
 - Demonstrate detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including levels, gully locations and outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
 - Provide and implement a maintenance plan to the local planning authority giving details on how surface water systems shall be maintained and managed for the life time of the development. The name of the party responsible, including contact name and details shall be provided to the local planning authority.
- 5) The development hereby approved shall not commence until details of the earth bunds and acoustic close board type fence as shown as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal Doc ref NO. 1735-17-RP01 dated 24 February 2017, including the Appendices with Landscape Mitigation Plan - 1735-17-03B and Illustrative Landscape Sections plan - 1735-17-04, received 1 March 2017 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the approved earth bund and acoustic fence shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and retained for the life of the development.
- 6) The development hereby approved shall not commence until:
- a) a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological evaluative work shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - b) the programme of archaeological evaluative work and associated post-excavation analysis, report production and archive deposition detailed within the approved WSI shall be undertaken. A report detailing the results of this fieldwork shall be submitted to the planning authority.
 - c) An Archaeological Mitigation Strategy document (including a Written Scheme of Investigation for any archaeological fieldwork proposed) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This should detail a strategy to mitigate the archaeological impact of the proposed development and should be informed by the results of the archaeological evaluation.
- The development, and any archaeological fieldwork post-excavation analysis, publication of results and archive deposition detailed in the Mitigation Strategy document, shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Mitigation Strategy document.
- 7) The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Tree Survey to fully assess the trees that are firstly upon the site and secondly those that will be affected by the development of the site as per the specifications provided with the submitted application has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The survey should be undertaken in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation

to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved survey details.

- 8) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a biodiversity offsetting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Biodiversity Offsetting scheme shall provide appropriate compensation for a Biodiversity Impact Assessment score of 0.57 Biodiversity Units. The scheme shall be sited on land owned by the applicant adjacent to the Corley Motorway Service Station. The approved scheme shall be implemented in the next available planting season and maintained in accordance with the approved written scheme.
- 9) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Management Plan shall control the operation of the approved HGV parking area and specifically include measures to address the following matters:
 - i) Achieving and maintaining the 'Park Mark' safer parking award standard as assessed by Warwickshire Police in respect of the security of the parking area;
 - ii) Measures to ensure that the approved HGV parking area is closed between 1800 hours on Friday evening and 0800 hours on the following Monday morning;
 - iii) Use of floodlighting;
 - iv) Details of the proposed CCTV and how this will be monitored;
 - v) Access for emergency vehicles;
 - vi) Measures and timetable for the remarking of the existing HGV parking area on the northbound side of Corley MSA.
 - vii) A contact for complaints or concerns about the use and operation of the HGV parking area to be reported to.
- 10) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.
- 11) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 12) The HGV parking area hereby approved shall only be open for use between 0800 hours on Monday until 1800 hours on Friday and not at any other time.
- 13) The lighting scheme shall only be controlled by light sensors and the lighting shall be directed downwards at all times.

- 14) Construction works associated with the development hereby approved shall take place only between 0700 and 1900 on Monday to Friday, 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2018

by **Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/18/3204865

5 Knowle Hill, Hurley CV9 2JE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gordon Webb against the decision of North Warwickshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PAP/2017/0588, dated 1 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is construction of new single storey dwelling to the rear of 5 Knowle Hill, accessed of Brick Kiln Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. Since the time of the Council's decision, the government have published a revised National Planning Policy Framework. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications of the new Framework on the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposed dwelling would be positioned in what is currently a densely overgrown part of the long rear garden of No 5. Access would be achieved by a lengthy driveway which would run along the side boundary of Warwick House, and behind 7 and 9 Knowle Hill. The garden at No 5, and its adjacent gardens, back onto a small paddock at the edge of Hurley and there is significant vegetation along the intervening boundary. North of this paddock there is a large field. Other than a small outbuilding in the rear garden of No 9, I could see no other significant built development in the rear gardens of the rows of houses fronting Knowle Hill and Brick Kiln Lane. There is a stable block in the paddock, but this is also small in scale. Overall the site's surroundings have a semi-rural, spacious and verdant character.
5. Landscaping could be planted to assist in screening the whole development from views from the north. Nonetheless, the provision of a bungalow, isolated

from the linear pattern of the houses nearby, in an area which is largely devoid of built development and which would necessarily involve the removal of a significant amount of vegetation, would detract from the character of the immediate locality, including when experienced from neighbouring properties. The creation of a more formalised driveway along the edge of the field and paddock would also contrast harmfully with the rural appearance of these areas of land.

6. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with saved policy ENV12 of the North Warwickshire Local Plan (NWLP), and policy NW12 of the North Warwickshire Core Strategy (NWCS) which both seek to ensure development harmonises with the character of its surroundings.

Highway safety

7. The proposed driveway would only be wide enough for one car. A turning area would be provided in front of the dwelling, but I cannot be confident that it would be sufficient for vehicles larger than a car, such as delivery vehicles, to be able to turn such that they could enter and leave the site in a forward gear. This may result in such vehicles having to reverse onto Brick Kiln Lane which would compromise highway safety.
8. The access would not be shared with any other property and I consider the chances of two cars needing to pass each other to be very remote. Similarly it would be unlikely that cars and pedestrian would need to pass each other, and therefore in these respects its width would not be unsafe.
9. The driveway would reuse an existing access point onto Brick Kiln Lane. There is a verge with a sizable depth alongside the west side of Brick Kiln Lane and visibility from the existing access is achievable to the north and south for a reasonable distance. The junction of Brick Kiln Lane with Knowle Hill is not far to the south of the access and there is a similar distance to a bend in the road north of the site. As such I would anticipate vehicle speeds to be slower than the speed limit. Therefore, even if visibility is below standard, I would consider that which is available would not result in a harmful effect on highway safety, particularly due to the limited volume of traffic that would use it.
10. In summary, though I consider the width of the driveway and the visibility to the highway at its entrance are not unacceptable, the lack of turning space within the site for some large vehicles could lead to manoeuvres which would be harmful to highway safety. Accordingly, the development would be contrary to saved policies TPT3 and ENV14 of the NWLP which both require development to provide safe vehicular access, and NWCS policy NW10 which expects development to provide proper access and manoeuvring for vehicles.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2018

by **Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/18/3199849

Land opposite Thompsons Meadow, Spon Lane, Grendon CV9 2PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs B Chant against the decision of North Warwickshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref PAP/2016/0430, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as "housing development".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for housing development at land opposite Thompsons Meadow, Spon Lane, Grendon CV9 2PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PAP/2016/0430, dated 26 July 2016, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary matters

2. The application was submitted in outline form with all matters reserved for later consideration. I have determined the appeal on the same basis and so give limited weight to the drawings showing elevations and plans of the dwellings and the layout of the site.
3. I have used the address given on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice as that identifies the site more accurately than the address given on the application form.
4. Since the time of the Council's decision, the government have published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework'). Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications of the new Framework on the proposal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a piece of vacant grassed land encircled by roads. Spon Lane, which is a main road, runs to its north west side and beyond that there is open land substantially screened by vegetation on the roadside. To its southwest is a residential cul-de-sac, also known as Spon Lane, and to its

southeast are some recently built dwellings. There is agricultural land to its northeast. As a result the site occupies a somewhat transitional position between the rural land to the north and west, and the residential development to the south and east.

7. I understand the site is not within the Grendon settlement boundary in the adopted North Warwickshire Core Strategy (NWCS) and it is excluded from the Baddesley Ensor & Grendon development boundary, by the width of a road, in the site proposals plan of the Submission Local Plan 2018, which is yet to be adopted.
8. However, I consider the part of Spon Lane which constitutes the main road provides a strong visual border distinguishing between the countryside and the built up area. Also as, from most positions, views into the site are obscured by boundary hedging, it does not provide any significant positive contribution to the appearance of the area and so its value as a visual buffer is limited. Indeed the verges around the site, particularly that at the northern tip of the site, would continue to provide a more perceptible buffer.
9. The development of the site for houses would represent a logical filling in at this corner of the settlement towards the firm barrier of the main road. Indeed as the draft settlement boundary appears to loop unnaturally around the southern boundaries of the site, it would, if undeveloped, appear almost as an anomaly in the context of the surrounding built form.
10. I also take account, albeit minimally, of the large housing allocations to the east of the site shown as site H18 and reserved site RH1 on the draft site proposals plan. In their context the development of this site would not be incongruous.
11. The Council's concerns relating to the arrangement of parking provision on the site are based on the layout shown on drawing no. 001. As layout is a reserved matter I consider an acceptable layout which addressed the Council's concerns could be finalised at that stage.
12. Similarly although the layout plan shows that 10 dwellings would be provided there is no other reference in the evidence before me that specifies the number of units, other than the flood risk assessment and drainage strategy which are based on the layout plan. Nonetheless, if 10 units were proposed I would not consider that this would necessarily represent a cramped development nor would it depart from the local character as the houses on Spon Road are positioned fairly close together in modest sized plots.
13. Overall, I do not consider housing development on this site would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with policy NW12 of the NWCS which seeks to respect the settlement's character in a positive way.

Other matters

14. A number of concerns from local residents relate to flooding. However the Environment Agency raises no objection to the scheme in this regard, subject to the imposition of some conditions, and I have no substantive evidence before me to arrive at a contrary conclusion.

15. Likewise, though I recognise the concerns relating to an increase in traffic, the Highways Authority and the Highways Agency raise no objection and I have no reason to conclude otherwise.
16. Also though occupiers of the development would undoubtedly use local infrastructure, Warwickshire County Council have not suggested any contributions to local infrastructure in mitigation are necessary, and I have no evidence to support a contrary view.

Conditions

17. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the Framework. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the conditions to better reflect this guidance.
18. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and the submission of reserved matters. I have included a condition specifying the relevant plan only in order to identify the site.
19. It is necessary to limit the number of homes to 10 and the floorspace to 1000 square metres otherwise the development would need to provide affordable housing, which it is not proposed to do. I have therefore included a condition which reflects this. However it is not necessary for the height or design of the dwellings, the layout of the site or the position of the site access to be fixed at this outline stage.
20. The conditions relating to site levels and surface water drainage are necessary in the interests of minimising flood risk. The conditions relating to foul water, fire hydrants and bin stores are necessary to ensure future occupiers of the development are adequately served in these regards and that satisfactory living conditions are provided. The condition requiring a construction management plan ensures the living conditions of nearby residents are maintained during the construction phase.
21. I have not included the suggested condition relating to facing materials or those relating to highways details and parking areas as these issues are more appropriately dealt with at the reserved matters stage.
22. I do not consider the condition removing permitted development rights is necessary and indeed the PPG advises that such conditions will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

Conclusions

23. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan: Dwg No 001, but only so far as it identifies the site.
- 5) The site shall contain no more than 10 dwellings in total with a combined maximum gross internal floor area of no more than 1000 square metres.
- 6) No development shall take place until full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floors of the proposed buildings, in relation to existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
- 7) No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, the approved FRA and Drainage Strategy, Land opposite Thompsons Meadow, Spon Lane, Grendon_UNDA_86749-Bowley-SponLn_ October 2017, and including an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied. The scheme to be submitted shall:
 - include details of a hydrological model of the surface water flood risk to the site including a range of return periods, and identify the extents, depths and velocities of flooding caused by surface water in these events;
 - include details of infiltration testing undertaken in accordance with the BRE 365 guidance to clarify whether or not an infiltration type drainage strategy is an appropriate means of managing the surface water run off from the site;
 - demonstrate that the surface water drainage system(s) are designed in accordance with 'The SuDS Manual', CIRIA Report C753;
 - limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to and including the 100 year plus 40% (allowance for climate change) critical rain storm to the QBar Greenfield run-off rate for the site;
 - demonstrate the provisions for surface water run-off attenuation storage in accordance with the requirements specified in 'Science Report SC030219 Rainfall Management for Developments';

- demonstrate detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of the surface water drainage scheme, including details of any attenuation system, and outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 years, 1 in 30 years, 1 in 100 years and 1 in 100 years plus climate change return periods;
 - provide plans and details showing the allowance for exceedance flow and overland flow routing. Overland flow routing should look to reduce the impact of an exceedance event;
 - provide evidence to show an agreement from Severn Trent Water to connect to the existing surface water network;
 - provide a maintenance plan to the local planning authority giving details on how the entire surface water system shall be maintained and managed after completion for the life time of the development including the name of the party responsible and their contact details.
- 8) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the works for the disposal of foul sewage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first occupied.
- 9) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for the provision of adequate water supplies and fire hydrants, necessary for fire-fighting purposes at the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not then be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.
- 10) No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Plan shall provide for:
- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - iii) delivery, demolition and construction working hours;
 - iv) wheel washing facilities;
 - v) measures to control the emission of dust during construction;
 - vi) noise control during construction;
 - vii) site lighting details; and
 - viii) details of the contact for any local concerns with the construction activities on the site.
- The approved Construction Management Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period of the development.
- 11) Prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby approved a bin storage facility capable of holding a minimum of 3 x 240 litre wheeled bins shall be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling. The storage facility shall remain permanently available for that purpose at all times thereafter.

Agenda Item No 6

Planning and Development Board

5 November 2018

Report of the Chief Executive

Progress Report on Achievement of Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator Targets April – September 2018

1 Summary

- 1.1 This report informs Members of the progress with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets relevant to the Planning and Development Board for April to September 2018.

Recommendation to the Board

That Members consider the performance achieved and highlight any areas for further investigation.

2 Consultation

- 2.1 Consultation has taken place with the relevant Members and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

3 Background

- 3.1 This report shows the second quarter position with the achievement of the Corporate Plan and Performance Indicator targets for 2018/19. This is the second report showing the progress achieved so far during this year.

4 Progress achieved during 2018/19

- ... 4.1 Attached at Appendices A and B are reports outlining the progress achieved for all the Corporate Plan targets and the agreed local performance indicators during April to September 2018/19 for the Planning and Development Board.
- 4.2 Members will recall the use of a traffic light indicator for the monitoring of the performance achieved.

Red – target not being achieved (shown as a red triangle)

Amber – target currently behind schedule and requires remedial action to be achieved (shown as an amber circle)

Green – target currently on schedule to be achieved (shown as a green star)

5 Performance Indicators

- 5.1 The current performance indicators have been reviewed by each division and Management Team for monitoring for the 2018/19 year.

6 Overall Performance

- 6.1 The Corporate Plan performance report shows that 100% of the Corporate Plan targets and 100% of the performance indicator targets are currently on schedule to be achieved. The report shows the individual targets that have been classified as red, amber or green. Individual comments from the relevant division have been included where appropriate. The table below shows the following status in terms of the traffic light indicator status:

Corporate Plan

Status	Number	Percentage
Green	7	100%
Amber	0	0%
Red	0	0%
Total	7	100%

Performance Indicators

Status	Number	Percentage
Green	3	100%
Amber	0	0%
Red	0	0%
Total	3	100%

7 Summary

- 7.1 Members may wish to identify any areas that require further consideration where targets are not currently being achieved.

8 Report Implications

8.1 Safer Communities Implications

- 8.1.1 Major applications are considered by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer who is looking to ensure that Secure by Design principles are applied for new developments.

8.2 Legal Data Protection and Human Rights Implications

8.2.1 The national indicators were specified by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. They were replaced by a single list of data returns to Central Government from April 2011.

8.3 Environment and Sustainability Implications

8.3.1 Improvements in the performance and quality of services will contribute to improving the quality of life within the community. The actions to improve apprenticeships, training and employment opportunities and transport links for local residents is contributing towards the raising aspirations, educational attainment and skills priority of the North Warwickshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2009 – 2026.

8.4 Risk Management Implications

8.4.1 Effective performance monitoring will enable the Council to minimise associated risks with the failure to achieve targets and deliver services at the required performance level.

8.5 Equality Implications

8.5.1 The action to improve employment opportunities for local residents is contributing to equality objectives and is a positive impact in terms of the protected characteristics for age through the young people employment programme.

8.6 Links to Council's Priorities

8.6.1 There are a number of targets and performance indicators included relating to supporting employment and business, protecting countryside and heritage, and promoting sustainable and vibrant communities.

The Contact Officer for this report is Robert Beggs (719238).

Background Papers







Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D, as substituted by the Local Government Act, 2000 Section 97

Background Paper No	Author	Nature of Background Paper	Date

Planning and Development 18/19

	Action	Priority	Reporting Officer	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Status	Direction
28	Manage development so as to deliver the priorities on the Council's Corporate Plan and in the Sustainable Community Strategy	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Jeff Brown	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	Green	
29	To report on Growth pressures on the Borough, how to protect the Green Belt as far as possible and sustain the rurality of the Borough by February 2019 and at least annually thereafter	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Jeff Brown	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	Green	
30	Use the Design Champions to ensure the best achievable designs are implemented and developed so as to reflect setting and local character	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Jeff Brown	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	Green	
31	To seek to secure the protection of the best of the Borough's built and rural heritage	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Jeff Brown	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	A report will be brought to Board February 2019	Green	
32	a) Work with the County Council, Job CentrePlus and other partners to provide and promote apprenticeships/training opportunities; and b) administer funding provided by the developers and through other funding sources to maximise opportunities for employment of local people including employment engagement activity, development of work clubs and bespoke training; and c) to work with the County Council, Town/Parish Councils and other partners to maximise section 106/CIL contributions for infrastructure, biodiversity offsetting and community improvements	Supporting Employment & Business	Steve Maxey	A number of contributions from developers has been collected and a number of training activities delivered. Focus for upcoming work is digital skills due to demand from employers. Options are being explored to establish a number of code clubs in North Warwickshire and make links with the Digital School House at Coleshill Secondary school. The ability to develop apprenticeship opportunities and training is being reviewed as to whether the Council is in a position to support these. The Council continues to work closely with the Jobcentre to promote work opportunities. A successful Jobs Fair was held in October 2017.	A number of contributions from developers has been collected and a number of training activities delivered. Focus for upcoming work is digital skills due to demand from employers. Options are being explored to establish a number of code clubs in North Warwickshire and make links with the Digital School House at Coleshill Secondary school. A six weeks programming course for adults, Python, starts on 6th November at the Coleshill School. The Council continues to work closely with the Jobcentre to promote work opportunities and a further Jobs Fair is being held on 18th October.	Green	
33	Look at ways to improve transport links, including cycle links, footpath links, public transport and HGV parking to local employment and report on progress by March 2019	Supporting Employment & Business	Jeff Brown	To report by March 2019, but work on Section 106 Agreements continues with bus stop provision being agreed on the St Modwen development and on recent residential developments in Warton	To report by March 2019, but work on Section 106 Agreements continues with bus stop provision being agreed on the St Modwen development and on recent residential developments in Warton	Green	
34	To continue to work with North Warwickshire Heritage Forum to protect, promote and develop the heritage and tourism of North Warwickshire	Protecting our Countryside & Heritage	Jeff Brown	Meetings with the Forum have been established and more are programmed. Links to potential heritage projects have been identified - eg Roman history at Mancetter	Meetings with the Forum have been established and more are programmed. Links to potential heritage projects have been identified - eg Roman history at Mancetter	Green	

NWPI Planning Board 18/19

Ref	Description	Section	Priority	Year End Target 2018/19	Outturn 2017/18	April - Sept Performance	Traffic Light	Direction of Travel	Comments
@NW:NI157a	Processing of planning applications in 13 weeks for major application types	Development Control	Countryside and Heritage	60%	91.00%	89.00%	 Green		All applicants have agreed to extensions of time
@NW:NI157b	Processing of planning applications in 8 weeks for minor application types	Development Control	Countryside and Heritage	80%	79.45%	88.00%	 Green		Maintaining a consistent level of performance
@NW:NI157c	Processing of planning applications in 8 weeks for other application types	Development Control	Countryside and Heritage	90%	85.00%	90.00%	 Green		Improvement in performance in this quarter

Agenda Item No 7

Planning and Development Board

5 November 2018

**Report of the
Chief Executive**

Exclusion of the Public and Press

Recommendation to the Board

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined by Schedule 12A to the Act.

Agenda Item No 8

Building Control Service – Report of the Head of Development Control

Paragraph 6 – by reason of the need to consider legal and staffing matters contained within the report

The Contact Officer for this report is David Harris (719222)