



MEETING NOTE

PROJECT NUMBER	70075293	MEETING DATE	31 January 2023
PROJECT NAME	Land NE J10 M42, North Warwickshire	VENUE	North Warwickshire Borough Council, Council House, Atherstone
CLIENT	Hodgetts Estates	RECORDED BY	JW
MEETING SUBJECT	PAP/2021/0663 – Meeting with NWBC and LUC to discuss LVIA and Strategic Gap		
PRESENT	Jeff Brown (JB) – NWBC Andrew Collinson (AC) – NWBC Sam Oxley (SO) – LUC Erin Hynes (EH) – LUC David Hodgetts (DHodge) – Hodgetts Estates Jeremy Smith (JS) - SLR Emma Jinks (EJ) - SLR Doug Hann (DHann) - WSP James Warrington (JW) - WSP		
CONFIDENTIALITY	Confidential		

ITEM	SUBJECT	OWNER
1	Introductions	
2	Agenda	
3	Key Elements of LVIA	
3.1	EJ provided an overview of the SLR response issued on 27/01/23 (ref: 403.11077.00001), which responds to each point raised in LUC's responses to date.	
3.2	<u>Study Area and ZTV</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">EJ confirmed that the LVIA chapter associated with the Environmental Statement (ES) clearly sets out the methodology for the study area, the extent of which is shown on the ZTV Plan (ref: 221019_403.11077.00001.29.LAJ-51_ZTV_DB).SO stated that LUC preference is for the study area to be defined on a plan. EJ and JS pointed out that the approach is clearly set out in words within the ES and there is no requirement in guidance to define the study area on a plan.The parties agreed that with the study area now clarified this was a non-issue.	
3.3	<u>Baseline photography and visualisations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">SO sought clarification that the baseline photography was taken from a 90 angle and not stretched. EJ confirmed this is correct.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EJ noted that additional viewpoint photography was provided as part of the SLR response issued on 27/01/23. SO queried why 'box photomontages' had not been provided. EJ pointed out that Type 1 photomontages are acceptable for outline planning applications such as this but pointed out that the Design & Access Statement (DAS) (which LUC have had access to) includes 3 x wirelines (Type 3) and 2 x additional wirelines are provided in the SLR response dated 27/01/23 (wirelines have therefore been provided for viewpoints 1, 4, 5, 8 and 9). EJ confirmed that building heights have been provided (max ridge height) in these photomontages. SO requested that the 5 x wirelines are provided in full resolution – SLR to provide. WSP to provide the DAS and Design Guide in full resolution. JB agreed that wirelines alone are acceptable for an outline planning application, but it would be useful if photomontages could be provided to assist with the planning and technical assessment of the proposed development. SLR to provide block montages based on the multi-unit scheme (ref. 00078). SO stated that it would be useful for the baseline photograph for viewpoint 5 to be retaken to step-back to the level of the Recreation Ground – SLR to provide. SO stated that it would be useful to have additional versions of the viewpoint photos taken during winter conditions – SLR to provide. 	<p>SLR / WSP</p> <p>SLR</p> <p>SLR</p> <p>SLR</p>
<p>3.4</p>	<p><u>Cumulative Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SO confirmed that a site visit had now taken place (the day prior to the meeting). SO suggested that there were concerns with the approach/absence of cumulative assessment. EJ pointed out that the cumulative LVIA (CLVIA) was carried out as part of the ES and reiterated as part of the SLR response dated May 2022 submitted in response to LUC's initial comments on the application (dated March 2022). 	
<p>3.5</p>	<p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SO queried how landscape would be secured – JB queried whether it would be provided in perpetuity and whether there would be provisions for ongoing management. DHodge confirmed that such matters could be secured via planning condition and/or S106 obligation (which would be registered as local land charges). 	
<p>3.6</p>	<p><u>Landscape and Visual Impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SO queried the methodology used for assessing impacts. EJ referred SO to Appendix 10.3 and Appendix 10.4 of the ES, which was submitted at the outset of the application in December 2021. SO to re-review the ES and aforementioned appendices. 	
<p>3.7</p>	<p><u>LVIA Viewpoints and Methodology</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SO sought clarification on how the viewpoints were selected/agreed. EJ confirmed that viewpoints (including additional viewpoints requested by NWBC) were agreed with JB in advance of the ES being prepared. WSP/SLR to provide copy of emails relating to the agreement of viewpoints. 	<p>WSP / SLR</p>
<p>3.8</p>	<p><u>Design Guide and Design & Access Statement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of bund modelling, EJ advised that those shown on the 'Indicative Bund Location Plan' were based on a worst-case scenario. SO asked whether the bunds were to be 	

	<p>created following the cut/fill exercise to create the development plots – this point was confirmed by EJ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO queried whether the base level of the building was known at this point – DHodge confirmed that in order to retain flexibility only a maximum ridge height parameter (AOD). DHodge confirmed that the finished floor levels (FFL) of the buildings can therefore be designed to minimise the level of earthworks required depending on the number, location and height of buildings being proposed. DHodge noted that outline matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for future consideration and Hodgetts Estates has invited conditions controlling details of hard and soft landscaping, planting and building appearance, layout and scale (height), if these are deemed necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. • SO asked whether the building heights would be comparable to St Modwen Park Tamworth to the south of the site/A5 and whether there is potential for stepped finished floor levels across the development. DHodge confirmed that given the nature of the buildings proposed, it is likely that they would be comparable in height to those at St Modwen Park Tamworth. Furthermore, the maximum ridge height parameter allows for stepped finished floor levels as depicted by the submitted Illustrative Landscape Sections. JB added that understanding likely finished floor levels (FFL) would help Members better understand the proposals overall. DHodge commented that Members had also benefited from the scheme being flagged out during the site visit in April 2022. • SO requested the provision of existing and proposed sections. EJ pointed out that sections had been provided within the DAS. SO requested that the existing ground level be added to these and asked for additional sections to be provided including a north-south longitudinal section and a selection of east-west horizontal sections to supplement those already provided. SLR to provide. • There were discussions surrounding the difference in elevation between the high point and low point at the site. SO initially thought the height difference was ‘around 15m’ but later accepted that it was less than this. DHann noted that given the length of the site (c. 750m) and the long distance over which the height difference changes, the site it is actually relatively flat. 	<p>SLR</p>
<p>3.9</p>	<p>In concluding this agenda item, JS sought confirmation / a position from LUC on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology – does LUC accept that the assessment is in accordance with GLVIA3? • Character area – does LUC accept that the site is within the Tamworth Fringe Character Area? • Viewpoints – does LUC agree with the selected viewpoints? • Designations – does LUC accept that there are no landscape designations on site, such as a valued landscape (in accordance with paragraph 174 of the NPPF)? • Receptors – does LUC accept that landscape and visual receptors used? • Having now undertaken a site visit, does LUC maintain that this is a rural site (which SLR disagrees with given the site context) or does LUC wish to revise its position set out in the initial response dated March 2022 (prior to any site visit)? • Bunds/cuttings – does LUC accept that these are a feature of the landscape? <p>SO advised that LUC was not willing to provide a position on any of these points at the meeting. SO requested that SLR provides these points in a table following the meeting but</p>	

MEETING NOTES

	noted that the budget constraints limit the amount of time available for further review of information. JS pointed out that we are not looking to agree a Statement of Common Ground as we are not at appeal, rather they are seeking points of agreement and disagreement to fully understand LUC's position.	
4	Outstanding Matters	
4.1	Lighting – SO sought clarification as to whether lighting impact had been considered. JS queried whether LUC consider the site as a 'dark landscape' and that SLR will provide further information to clearly evidence that the site cannot be considered a dark landscape due to the adjacent motorway and A5. JW pointed out that this is an outline planning application, and that lighting would be assessed either at reserved matters or condition discharge stage, however the submitted Design Guide sets out certain design parameters which future lighting schemes would have to abide by.	SLR
5	Mitigation Considerations	
5.1	AC advised that NWBC has not yet come to a view of landscape/visual impact but welcome discussion around potential mitigation considerations. DHann stated that the Indicative Landscape Plan submitted as part of the application sets out what is considered appropriate mitigation for the development. JS pointed out that the mitigation proposals would strengthen the Strategic Gap to be retained to the east through new planting, thereby enhancing the rural characteristics (in the context of the Eastleigh criteria) and the sense of separation (required by Policy LP4). The landscaping to the east is a key part of the mitigation package.	
5.2	SO queried the footpath alignment (bridleway) and whether that would require diverting. DHann confirmed that part of the bridleway would require diverting and forms part of the development proposals.	
5.3	SO asked whether the impact on the residential properties to the north of the site (in Birchmoor) had been considered. JS pointed out that there is a significant distance between the northern-most development plot and the nearest residential properties to the north which would in any case be separated by the proposed mounds and landscaping. DHodge added that there is also a paddock (in different landownership) between the northern site boundary and the residential properties, which provides a further stand-off from the development plots.	
5.4	SO questioned what the intended use is for the remaining fields within the Strategic Gap. DHodge confirmed that the intention is for them to be retained for agricultural use save for the proposed community orchard, open space transfer site (OS1) for relocated allotments and the landscaping proposals. SO queried how a farmer would use the 'middle field' as it would appear to be 'severed off' from the adjacent fields as a result of the connectivity proposals – DHodge advised that this would not be the case and a field gate(s) could be provided between fields and areas of landscaping / footpaths.	
5.5	SO asked whether the blue circular route shown on the Indicative Landscaping Plan would be outside the security perimeter of the warehousing units. SO also didn't see the value of this route as it was located partly adjacent to the motorway. JS pointed out that this could be used as a fitness trail, a circular leisure route and offered an opportunity for a longer walk than is currently possible within the site boundary, which must be seen as a scheme benefit.	
6	Strategic Gap LP4	
6.1	The next agenda item focused on assessing the scheme in the context of Policy LP4 Strategic Gap.	

MEETING NOTES

6.2	JS queried and SO confirmed that the Eastleigh Criteria are the best method for assessing the functionality of gaps between settlements. SO advised that a diagram showing distances between the existing Strategic Gap and the remaining Strategic Gap in a post-development scenario would be useful – JS disagreed as the assessment is not simply about measuring the distance of the Gap. SO maintained that a diagram would be useful.	
6.3	SO advised that LUC would not comment on the application of Policy LP4 – that would be for NWBC to advise on. JB acknowledged that Policy LP4 is not an embargo to development.	
6.4	JS focused on the Policy LP4 wording in the context of the Eastleigh criteria – a measurement of the Strategic Gap alone is not sufficient nor the key test. The key test is whether one gets a sense of leaving and entering distinctive areas and whether there would be a <i>significant</i> effect on this, not just whether there would be an effect. DHann added that there are distinctive characters in this location i.e., residential edge, agricultural, then commercial, which reinforce the sense of travelling through a gap whether by car, bike, on foot, etc.	
6.5	SO considered that viewpoints 5 and 6 give a real sense of separation / the extent of the Strategic Gap. JS responded that one can experience separation through the ability to clearly distinguish both ends of the Strategic Gap. SO felt that the bridleway allows users to appreciate the Strategic Gap on both sides, providing a sense of ‘rurality’.	
6.6	SO suggested that there would be a ‘loss of open space’ and a reduction in the footpaths. DHodge pointed out that this is not designated open space and that the extensive connectivity proposals would actually increase the total distance (and quality) of footpaths within the site boundary. SO accepted that there will be an increase in leisure routes available as a result of the development. SO commented that there are other informal routes in this location, the use of which DHodge clarified is not permitted and is effectively trespassing.	
6.7	JS reiterated the importance of assessing the remaining Strategic Gap and the sense of separation / functionality that would maintain. JS noted that a substantial gap would remain (777m) and noted that an analysis of existing gaps between settlements showed gaps as small as 200m can still be functional.	
6.8	SO described long distance views from the elevated edge of Dordon of distant fields above the roofs of the cluster of sheds within Tamworth and stated that analysis should be undertaken to ensure the proposed development did not block views towards these. SO stated that it might, to which JS responded that it would have to be an unrealistically large building for this to occur.	
7	Timescales / Next Steps	
7.1	In terms of next steps, SLR confirmed that it would aim to submit the requested photomontages and any other additional information considered necessary approximately 2 weeks from the meeting (c. 15/02/23). NWBC will then arrange for a further instruction for LUC to undertake a review. LUC committed to providing a review/response within 2 weeks of receipt of the information from SLR.	ALL
7.2	SO suggested that SLR send through an example/draft photomontage for LUC comment prior to producing the remaining photomontages. [LUC and SLR exit the meeting]	SLR
8	Other Planning Matters	
8.1	<u>Environmental Health (Noise)</u>	

MEETING NOTES

	AC advised that he has received further comments from Environmental Health regarding the amended draft noise conditions proposed by WSP in December 2022. AC stated that there were no fundamental issues with the amendments suggested but some counter-amendments had been suggested – AC to provide WSP with copy of suggested amended conditions.	AC
8.2	<p><u>Highways</u></p> <p>AC stated that he had coordinated a recent meeting with National Highways, WCC Highways and SCC Highways in order to better understand matters pertaining to highways impact. This meeting took place on 10/01/23, prior to the response being issued by Ben Simm (National Highways) (12/01/23), Amrit Mudhar (SCC Highways) (13/01/23) and AC's email dated 13/01/23. DHodge advised that matters are in hand and it is unfortunate that the meeting took place prior to the revised Transport Assessment (TA) and Framework Travel Plan (FTP) being formally submitted (with submission expected to be 03/02/23) as Tetra Tech are comfortable with the approach and all points raised by NH and SCC Highways would be addressed in the upcoming submission. AC suggested that a meeting is arranged c. 3 weeks after submission of the revised TA and FTP – AC and JW to coordinate diaries.</p>	AC, JW
8.3	<p><u>Other consultation responses</u></p> <p>AC advised that, aside from the highways authorities, there were no other outstanding consultation responses awaited from statutory consultees. It is too soon to provide a policy response but that would be undertaken by AC/JB in any case, once a further review from LUC is provided and the highways authorities have formally responded. AC noted that a response from Coventry City Council had been received – AC to forward response to JW.</p>	AC
8.4	<p><u>Submission of information</u></p> <p>JW advised that, in addition to the forthcoming revised TA and FTP submission (expected to be 03/02/23), an EIA Addendum will soon be submitted to incorporate a revised Transport, Traffic and Highways ES chapter and supporting figures/appendices. This was in the interests of consistency and would effectively replace the ES chapter forming part of the ES submitted at the outset of the application. The EIA Addendum will also include a revised Parameter Plan which has been updated to reflect a very minor tweak in the access alignment following Tetra Tech's access design work.</p>	JW
8.5	<p><u>Employment DPD</u></p> <p>JB advised that his understanding is that work has not yet commenced on the proposed Employment DPD and the first step would be to develop an Issues & Options paper for consultation in due course. JB to speak to Dorothy Barratt for an update and confirm back to JW/DHodge (complete).</p>	JB
8.6	<p><u>Member feedback from FAQs submitted 01/09/23</u></p> <p>JW queried whether AC/JB had received any feedback from Members following the issue of an updated FAQs document on 01/09/23. JB confirmed that he had not received any feedback to date. JB advised that following the anticipated purdah period prior to the local elections in May, when JB is at a point to provide a recommendation on the application, a meeting could be arranged between senior Members of the Planning Committee and the Applicant to discuss areas of dispute and potential commitments that might overcome concerns.</p>	
8.7	[MEETING ENDS]	