



development requirements, in particular it must serve an economic role, social role and environmental role. The application fails on all 3 counts.

There will be **no economic benefits** to the village, almost all residents are commuters, there is no shop or post office (contrary to the false claims), and very poor amenities and infrastructure. The developer only claims benefits during construction and this will not be for the community. It fails the NPPF test.

There is **no social role**, the local housing need is not proven, there is no data, it is not a high quality build, and the community cannot support the health or educational needs. **There is no open space provision**. The only supporting statement from the developer in section 4.16 is that current provision is over crowded . This is not proven. It fails the NPPF test.

There will be **no environmental benefit**, the only claim is that they will plant some trees and build a pond, this does not offset losing 2.5 acres of valuable agricultural land.

The ultimate NPPF test is whether the development is sustainable. Contrary to the false claims of buses and good transport, there is very little provision. There is a bus twice a day to Leamington Spa (none on Sunday), and a bus once a week to Banbury. There is no shop or post office, in fact no provisions can be bought in the village. All houses including social/ low cost will require motor vehicles. The houses are built to the minimum standards and no CO2 is offset by renewables, not even rainwater collection is mentioned. The proposed LPG heating is the cheapest installed heating solution for the developer , but not sustainable and is the most expensive form of heating.

**In conclusion the development fails on the sustainability test.** There are much more appropriate areas to develop within the District that have supporting infrastructure to meet SDC housing needs.

Therefore in terms of Current Strategy, Draft Core Strategy and NPPF the proposal fails on all counts and should be refused.

There are also other significant issues with the proposal:-

#### Density

The applicant makes comparison with the density on John Taylor Way (JTW), but on this basis the number of houses should be 28 maximum, as JTW was measured as 1.48 hectares by Laing Homes and has 37 houses. Only one house on JTW is a 5 bed, this application has 6 off 5 bed dwellings. The overall density in terms of 46,000 square feet is much larger for a smaller area. All JTW dwellings are 2 storey, this development has 2.5 storey houses, dormer windows are totally out of keeping with the rest of the village street scene. It is also believed the tree break has been included in the calculations, it has confirmed this will revert back to the College, and hence should not be used in calculations.

#### Verges and parking

The applicant asserts the street scene on John Davis drive will follow JTW, this is untrue the plans show the houses are only 5m from the road edge not 10m as on JTW. The front gardens have been eliminated; this is a result of density issues and is over bearing and therefore not in keeping. As a result of density and layout the internal site pavements also appear to have been eliminated, and there is no visitor parking provision. Many cars are parked on the kerbs in JTW and Chestnut Grove due to lack of space (many households with young adults at home have 4 or 5 cars) and this plan has less provision.

### Sustainability

LPG is not sustainable and very expensive; many residents of Chestnut Grove including the private homes stated they cannot afford to heat their homes. The developer should have made a proposal as a minimum to install mains gas as it is only a few hundred metres from the site, and would benefit the whole village. There is also a **question of safety**, as the tanks are much closer to the houses than on JTW. It has also been mentioned the JTW tanks failed due to water table flooding; there is no provision to mitigate.

The houses have no sustainability measures included or renewable energy proposals. **The pond provisional for flooding is deemed dangerous**, and through local knowledge in the wrong location. Motor cars are the only means of transport, and all residents will end up as commuters.

### Section 106

The Parish Council was led to believe at the December developer meeting the local contribution would be circa £100K, now only £25k is proposed. If the SDC CIL payment was imposed (at £150/sqm as proposed) this would generate £650K with over £100K to the Parish. The current proposal is unacceptable, and makes no meaningful infrastructure contribution.

The applicant makes no provision for open space on the site due to the adjacent playing field. The playing field only has a 3 year lease from the College remaining, and therefore not secure. It is a legal planning obligation to provide open space, this must be done on the site itself, it cannot be assumed to be provided by the Parish Council as the College may choose not to renew the lease.

The school has confirmed they have not been consulted by WCC Education Authority, and contrary to assertion they do not have spaces in all classes, and have infrastructure needs. Any education provision must go direct to Moreton Morrell school.

There is an assumption made on health provision, but this is planned to go to the Health trust for hospitals, again this must be allocated directly to Wellesbourne GP Surgery as they cannot service current needs.

### Other issues

Traffic movements have been wildly underestimated based on JTW, all home owners need to use a car, to shop, travel to work or even visit a doctor. A combination of College traffic, JLR traffic, and the new homes proposed at Gaydon/ Lighthorne and Warwick, will cause major issues locally.

The Developer implies they have widely consulted, this is not true, one meeting was held that was planned at short notice, and neighbouring residents have never been directly involved.

In conclusion application is financially speculative offering no benefit to the community. It is premature and excessive in scale. It fails to meet all the NPPF tests, and the village infrastructure is inadequate for the number of dwellings proposed.

Based on the above SDC must refuse the application.

Clerk to send response.

It was also resolved for the Clerk to follow up on the mains gas provision for the village

## **5. AOB**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.00 pm.