

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

PHASE 1, STRATEGIC MATTERS

MATTER 7 – INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION

ON BEHALF OF RICHBOROUGH ESTATES



Pegasus Group

5 The Priory | Old London Road | Canwell | Sutton Coldfield | B75 5SH

T 0121 308 9570 | **F** 0121 323 2215 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester
PLANNING | **DESIGN** | **ENVIRONMENT** | **ECONOMICS**

©Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited 2011. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of Richborough Estates who has land interests within North Warwickshire Borough. This statement provides a response to Matter 7 and should be read in conjunction with representations submitted to the Draft Submission Local Plan **[CD1-1]**. Richborough Estates' interest relates to land off Packington Lane, Coleshill, land off Blythe Road, Coleshill and land off Birmingham Road, Water Orton.
- 1.2 Richborough Estates wishes to provide no further written submissions in respect of questions 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4.

2. INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION

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

- 2.1 The IDP identifies a number of infrastructure projects and identifies potential funding sources, but the information in respect of many elements of the identified infrastructure requirements remain vague and, in many cases, are not costed and funding sources not clearly identified.

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

- 2.2 With the exception of the A5 infrastructure improvements, the IDP is silent on the timing of delivery of critical infrastructure needed to deliver the spatial strategy. It is considered that the timing of infrastructure delivery will be an important consideration for viability.
- 2.3 It is noted, that further information is to be provided by the NWBC, as stated in NWBC11, but it is not appropriate or fair to participants at the Examination that this is unlikely to be available until a week before the hearing sessions. This does not allow for sufficient time to review and comment on such a document. It is also of concern that this work has been undertaken so late in the plan-making process, especially as NWBC note on numerous occasions that the delivery of infrastructure will be a 'key issue' to ensure the delivery of the proposed strategy. As the scope of this further evidence has not been defined, Richborough Estates request an opportunity to – as a minimum - make further written submissions

upon publication of this information, if it raises new information of relevance to this Matter.

(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?

- 2.4 The A5 infrastructure improvements are critical to the delivery of the spatial strategy to allow for the considerable element of growth focused to the north of the Borough along the A5 corridor.
- 2.5 The costs associated with highways infrastructure are significant, with costs estimated in the order of £109.7m.
- 2.6 The IDP states that *“improvements to the highway network, especially the A5 will be crucial in facilitating the development included in the Local Plan” [CDO/4 Appendix A]*, however, detail as to how these improvements will be funded remain vague. For example, the table relating to Road Network infrastructure *[CDO/4, Appendix A]* states that Highways England (HE) funding is not committed and *“other sources will also need to be explored.”* With such lack of detail on the delivery of this critical infrastructure, there can be no certainty that the necessary highway infrastructure can be delivered in a timely manner to support development.
- 2.7 An inability to fund the improvements to the road network (the A5 corridor in particular) would place considerable doubt on the ability for allocations H7 and H13 to be delivered at all or at the very least, without having serious implications for the Trunk Road Network (M42 Junction 10 and A5).
- 2.8 In addition, the analysis of the 2011 Census highlights that 9% of Coleshill residents travel to work by bus or by train, compared to 3% for Polesworth/Dordon. Therefore, in simplistic proportional terms, around three times as many residents currently travel to/from work by bus and train in Coleshill compared to Polesworth/Dordon. The modal split data would appear to correlate relatively well with the public transport availability for each of the settlements, which includes 5 bus services and regular train services within Coleshill. By comparison, Polesworth station only provides a single service per day and the Local Plan provides no firm commitment to increasing this service – indeed the Council’s submitted LP describing Polesworth train station as *“virtually closed” [CDO/1, Para 12.11]*. The submitted LP also alludes to consideration as to

whether Polesworth station needs to be moved **[CDO/1, Para 12.15]**, however again there is no detail or commitment to this in the LP. The uncertainty of delivering improved rail services at Polesworth would compromise the sustainability of the proposed growth focused to the east of Polesworth/Dordon and place further stresses on the Trunk Road Network.