

**Response by NWBC on the Matters, Issues and Questions
Phase 1, Strategic Matters**

Matter 7, Infrastructure provision

7.1 Are infrastructure requirements to 2033 suitably evidenced, chiefly with regard to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan ('IDP')(CD0/4)?

7.1.1 The IDP is a live document which is being updated when new information becomes available. The Borough Council has worked with a range of partners to provide as robust and up to date information as possible. It is recognised that the exact details of infrastructure requirements cannot always be available or determined until the planning application and details of development are actually submitted, nevertheless, the IDP provides a suitable evidence base for the expected levels of infrastructure and services required by the various service and infrastructure providers to address the impact of the levels of development and growth proposed.

(a) Does the IDP accurately forecast infrastructure necessary to enable development proposed via the LP, including in respect of the timing of projects?

7.1.2 The Borough is working actively with a range of infrastructure providers to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure in particular schools, health and highways which are considered to be the key infrastructure requirements. Further information in relation to highways is given in the attached papers from Warwickshire County Council and Highways England.

(b) Are there any areas of uncertainty as to whether infrastructure would be forthcoming for whatever reason? If so, would the effectiveness of the LP be compromised?

7.1.3 In the early stages of the Plan the levels of infrastructure required are less site specific and are not considered to be critical, or likely to compromise the effectiveness of the Plan. The areas of uncertainty relate primarily to highways infrastructure required in the later stages of the Plan, on the Trunk Road network (primarily the A5 and M42) that is being sought through the relevant and appropriate housing infrastructure fund bids and Route Investment Strategy bids. Nevertheless, the relevant Minister for Transport, the Local Authorities, including West Midlands

Combined Authority, agencies/statutory providers and the Local Economic Partnerships are all supportive of the bids. The DOT has indicated support for the HIF bid, which has subsequently progressed onto the second “business plan” stage and has had support expressed from Members of Parliament from constituencies within and adjoining the Borough. The Borough Council considers this gives significant weight and certainty to the delivery of the bid and infrastructure required and unlikely to compromise the effectiveness of the Plan.

- 7.1.4 Other areas of uncertainty relate primarily to the pro-activeness of the private sector in bringing forward applications for development on the Plan allocations, the success of negotiation and agreement over appropriate and viable levels of contributions towards the required infrastructure necessary for the development and borough, the developers speed in actual delivery and construction of the development and its infrastructure requirements. These are, however, standard issues of uncertainty for any development within the planning system

7.2 Is the Strategic Transport Assessment (‘STA’)[CD8/18A] robust? Noting in particular the representation of Highways England (SLP348), Transport for West Midlands (SLP382), and Warwickshire County Council (SLP319). Representors have drawn my attention to Transport for West Midlands’ Movement for Growth Strategy and 10 year delivery plan.

(a) How has the STA informed the prioritisation, costing and timing of infrastructure project?

(b) Is the approach in the STA consistent with other strategic transport studies?

(c) Both in respect of the strategic and local highway network, how has the effect of transport infrastructure projects and of the LP in general been modelled? What are the outcomes of that modelling, including in respect of highway capacity and safety?

- 7.2.1 In answer to the above questions please refer to the Briefing Note prepared by WCC, the relevant Statement of Common Ground with the Highway Authorities (Warwickshire County Council and Highways England) and the Rural Routes Local Plan Assessment for North Warwickshire, attached as Appendix 1. Further A5 modelling is currently being finalised for publication and will be forwarded to the Inspector as soon as possible.

7.3 Is the LP based on suitable assessment of, and a positive strategy related to, infrastructure provision and timing of delivery in accordance with paragraphs 157 and 162 of the NPPF? Including in respect of policy LP1 and the following areas:

(a) utilities and communication provision,

7.3.1 The Borough Council has worked jointly with the Warwickshire Local Authorities, the County Council and Coventry City Council on a range of relevant assessments including the Water Cycle Strategy and broadband provision. The Borough Council is involved in the CSW Broadband project (a partnership of eight local authorities led by Warwickshire County Council), which will bring improved broadband speeds across Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire. Funded by Central Government, local authorities and ERDF (European Union) money, the targets are to achieve 98% coverage at superfast speeds (minimum 30Mbps) dependent on funding, by the end of the project in late 2019. In all these studies and assessments the relevant utility provider and/or regulator has been involved as a partner in the study or consulted as a stakeholder, for example such as Severn Trent and the Environment Agency involvement in the Water Cycle Strategy, and the direct information on development growth and allocations provided to the utilities providers/companies from the Local Plan to help inform their investment programmes.

7.3.2 At all stages of the plan the relevant utilities providers/companies representatives were consulted, met and informed of expected growth in the Plan and any appropriate and relevant responses reflected in the Plan's IDP. Where specific concerns or issues were raised these are reflected in the IDP or, if appropriate, noted as a specific issue that needs addressing in the Site Allocation proposal.

(b) healthcare and education capacity, Noting some concerns from representors regarding the absence of a Health Impact Assessment and existing capacity constraints at George Eliot Hospital.

7.3.3 A Statement of Common Ground (AD4) with health colleagues is currently being finalised. Further information is forthcoming. The GEH (George Eliot Hospital) has produced a table of the contributions sought from the relevant Site Allocation proposal in the Plan and this is attached as Appendix 2 and to be included within the IDP. The Statement of Common Ground (AD31) on education needs and

infrastructure is included as Appendix 3. The Council consider that the education needs generated by the Plan are noted and addressed both in the IDP and in the specific Site allocation proposals, so that developers will be aware of these needs and expectations, particularly in terms of on-site needs and likely financial contributions.

(c) open space and leisure provision.

7.3.4 The Plan has been directly informed by the Borough Council's Green Space Strategies, Playing Pitch Strategies and their recent updates and reviews (CD6/7a, CD6/8). The recent review has directly informed the Plan IDP in terms of financial contribution requirements for the specific Site Allocation proposals and through the production of a Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, consulted on at the same time as the Submission Local Plan (CD6/11 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation SPD).

7.3.5 The Council have also been a partner in the wider sub-regional Joint Warwickshire, Coventry & Solihull sub-regional Green Infrastructure Strategy (2013), informing Local Plan Policies to provide evidence for the preparation of plans, policies and strategies relating to Green Infrastructure (GI) at a sub-regional level and at a local level (CD8/3).

7.4 Have cross-boundary implication of infrastructure been appropriately considered with regard to NPPF paragraph 31, including roadside facilities for motorists? Are there any uncertainties or unresolved issues?

7.4.1 The Council consider that cross-border infrastructure implications have been considered through the Council's partnership on the numerous Joint Coventry and Warwickshire Authorities studies and assessments. The Strategic Transport Assessment specifically looked at cross border areas outside the Borough, their expected development growth and fed this information into the North Warwickshire STA. This was particularly noted and relevant for the Tamworth, Staffordshire County Council and Nuneaton Borough Council areas (CD8/18 & CD8/18A).

7.4.2 In terms of specific road side facilities the Council consider this issue is addressed through Policy LP25 Transport Assessments and LP28 Strategic Road improvements

**NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

including the A5. These policies require detailed Transport Assessments for development proposals that will generate significant levels of traffic and seek appropriate improvements to the A5 and A446 trunk Roads. Through the Councils membership on the A5 Partnership, with other Local Authorities and Highway Authorities along the A5 route between Staffordshire and Northampton this issue of lack of roadside facilities is already noted and being addressed through the A5 Partnership Strategy and Action Plan (see link - <https://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/a5partnership>). No site has currently been put forward for such facilities within the Borough, but the Council would look favourably at any opportunities, where appropriate.

**NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

LIST OF ATTACHED DOCUMENTS :-

- APPENDIX 1 -** A) Briefing Note - Infrastructure Requirements and the North Warwickshire Local Plan – August 2018
B) Statement of Common Ground – Highway Infrastructure Matters/A5, Warwickshire County Council, Highways England, North Warwickshire Borough Council – August 2018
C) Rural Routes Local Plan Assessment – North Warwickshire Borough Council – August 2018
- APPENDIX 2 -** Infrastructure/Financial Contributions Assessment for Secondary and Acute Care – George Eliot Hospital Trust – August 2018
- APPENDIX 3 -** Statement on education needs and infrastructure for North Warwickshire Borough Local Plan, Warwickshire County Council – August 2018