

---

**NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

**STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SHARBA HOMES LTD**

**Matter 7**

This submission is made by Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of **Sharba Homes Ltd**, who have an interest in the reserve site identified as site RH1.

**7.1 Are infrastructure requirements to 2033 suitably evidenced, chiefly about the Infrastructure Delivery Plan ('IDP') [CD0/4]?**

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

**(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?**

1. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) includes details of the need to improve the A5, identified as an important strategic requirement through the Borough. Page 11 of the IDP states:

*"Improvements to the highway network, especially the A5, will be crucial in facilitating the development included in the Local Plan".*

2. It is then highlighted that the cost of the A5 works total £57.5 million and that potential sources of funding include developer contributions; LTP funding; HE funding (not committed); Single Growth Fund; and the Road Infrastructure Strategy (RIS).
3. In Appendix 8 of the IDP, improvements to the island at Spon Lane / Boot Hill at Grendon is identified as necessary to facilitate planned growth.
4. It is clear in the IDP that the full funding for the A5 improvements is not secured. Therefore, early provision of land securing the safeguarded route (see our Statement for Matter 4 regarding anticipated dwellings numbers) are vital components of the delivery of these works.

5. It is our understanding that WCC Highways' consultants (Vectos Microsim) are currently undertaking further modelling in this area including a wider A5 Corridor model extending between the M42 and M69 Motorways. Whilst the results have yet to be formally published, through discussions with Vectos Microsim relating to separate additional modeling commissioned by Sharba Homes Ltd to specifically consider the impact of site RH1 (see overlead), it is understood that the findings demonstrate that the dualling through Site RH1 will need to be elevated from just an aspiration scheme to a requirement in order to meet planned levels of growth, irrespective of whether the development of RH1 is included.
6. Site RH1 will deliver a design corridor to safeguard the provision of, what increasingly appears to be a required dual carriageway route through the site. Meetings have been held with Warwickshire County Council, its Consultants Vectos Microsim and Highways England in this regard. Sharba Homes Ltd subsequently commissioned Vectos Microsim to undertake additional modelling of the impact of site RH1 using the various models used and approved by WCC to inform the LP process, with revisions as appropriate relating specifically to accessing the RH1 site. It is important to remember that this site is currently identified as a reserve site despite the tangible benefit of the safeguarded dualling route that it could deliver. Therefore these dwelling numbers will not be 'in addition' to the other allocations – they will be delivered 'instead of' those numbers. The modelling is showing that this site can be delivered within the identified package of mitigation work and thus site RH1 is a sustainable and deliverable option which also secures significant benefit with the safeguarded route for the dualling of the A5.
7. In addition, the early provision of land within RH1 to accommodate the dual carriageway bypass with the financial contributions that could be secured by deliverable development of the site will assist in facilitating the infrastructure which is required to deliver the identified planned growth,
8. This is all the more important when it appears that the bulk of the funding will be received post 2026 (i.e. towards the end of the plan period) and thus a significant quantum of development is potentially being delivered without the necessary infrastructure improvements alongside.

## **7.2 Is the Strategic Transport Assessment ('STA')[CD8/18A] robust?<sup>17</sup>**

9. The latest version of the STA (October 2017) runs to 2031 only whilst the plan period runs to

2033. WCC have advised that WCC Highways are currently undertaking additional modelling and that an updated version will be made available to the examination shortly.

10. The A5 Full Bypass which includes the dualling of the A5 around Grendon is identified as an 'aspirational package' but importantly, an item for consideration with the plan period.

11. It is noted at paragraph 1.28 of the STA that the wider A5 proposals which bypass Grendon will *"provide the best network performance when the full allocation of local plan demands is included..."*

12. It is then stated at paragraph 5.31 of the STA that the full bypass within the final phase of assessment is likely to be critical in enabling the full housing and employment sites to be delivered. This scheme is identified as being of benefit for both strategic and local trips.

13. Paragraph 5.137 states:

*"... the impacts were likely to be considered manageable within the 2026 network but, by 2031, there are likely to be some significant increases which are likely to be considered severe"*.

14. It is concluded at paragraph 5.169 that the mitigation package (enhanced dualling of the A5 plus M42 junction 10 works) are likely to provide significant capacity to accommodate the network proposals.

15. As stated in response to question 7.1 above WCC Highways has commissioned Vectos Microsim to undertake additional modelling including an A5 Corridor Study and further analysis of the key junctions between Grendon and the M42, which will be submitted to the examination. As previously indicated, whilst the results have yet to be formally published, discussions with Vectos Microsim indicate that the additional modelling work undertaken demonstrates that the Grendon bypass needs to become more than an 'aspirational proposal' and that it should be cemented into the Infrastructure Development Plan as a necessary infrastructure requirement to deliver the planned growth and in order to avoid a severe impact on the network.

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

16. The STA [CD8/18A] includes modelling of the Local Plan developments and

identifies schemes to facilitate both strategic and local plan traffic growth. The phasing of the schemes is set out in terms of what are required at 2021, 2026, and 2031. As set out before, we consider this should be updated to 2033.

**(b) Is the approach in the STA consistent with other strategic transport studies?<sup>18</sup>**

17. It is understood that the author of the report (Vectos Microsim) has undertaken similar studies to support Local Plan evidence bases in this region. Footnote 18 on page 14 of INSP5 highlights that there has been a response which refers to the West Midlands Strategic Transport Plan, and whether the STA is consistent with this. The West Midlands Strategic Transport Plan is a transport strategy document that sets out the broader vision and aspirations of the transport network, and therefore serves a different purpose to that of the STA. The STA is contextually relevant to the local plan evidence base and provides a high level overview of the transport assessment. As previously advised, subsequent and additional modelling work has been undertaken, which will inform the LP process.

**(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?**

18. See the response at the start of Question 7.2.