

NORTH WARWICKSHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

HEARING AGENDA

Matter 5, Employment needs and requirements

Tuesday 26 February 2019, commencing 0930

Council House, South Street, Atherstone CV9 1DE

Participants:

North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC)

Hodgetts Estates (HE), SLP429

Stoford Developments Ltd. (SDL), SLP335

IM Properties (IMP), SLP439

Tamworth Borough Council (TBC), SLP324

Prologis UK Ltd. (PUL), SLP446

Oxalis Planning Ltd. (OP), SLP428

WHS Plastics Ltd. and Coppice Lane Garden Centre (WHS), SLP437

Severn Trent Water (STW), SLP442

Notes:

- i. Participants named in (brackets) against an item may be invited to open the discussion, but that is optional. [Square brackets] denote examination documents.
- ii. It is not intended to repeat introductory matters or those covered in earlier sessions, other than to the extent necessary. Participants should consult the examination library, in particular the schedule of Main Modifications [NWBC20A], in framing their contributions.
- iii. This agenda is provisional and flexible, and refines the issues and questions [INSP5] primarily on the basis of submitted position statements.
- iv. It may not be necessary to cover all issues and questions, and the agenda does not seek to confine discussion to only those points set out below.

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

5.1 How does the LP requirement of providing 60 hectares of employment space to 2033 set out in LP paragraph 7.44 relate to the intended provision of around 100 hectares in policy LP6?

- (a) Is the intended provision of around 100 hectares in policy LP6 an aspiration in the same manner as housing provision related to the GBHMA [INSP2], i.e. that the actual amount is reliant on the provision of infrastructure? (IMP)
- (b) If so, is that approach justified and consistent with national policy, particularly NPPF2012 paragraph 157? (IMP) (SDL)
- (c) For effectiveness, should employment requirements be expressed in terms of floorspace? (IMP) (*NB, links also with issue 5.4 and [CD8/8]*)

- (d) *New question.* For effectiveness, should employment requirements be specified in terms of particular use classes?¹ (SDL)²
- (e) *New question.* Would MM39 and MM41 ensure appropriate flexibility for additional logistics provision in the event of changing circumstances [INSP20A]? If not, how could they be amended? (HE)
- 5.2 Is the assessment of employment needs in support of the LP based on robust evidence [CD8/6, CD8/7, CD8/8 in particular]?
- (a) what is the functional market area? How has that influenced the plan's approach to assessing employment needs at a strategic level? (SDL)
- (b) Is the approach to establishing employment needs in the LP consistent with the Local Enterprise Partnership Strategy?
- (c) Have employment needs been informed by the future influences of HS2 (including the Birmingham Interchange), Birmingham International Airport, and the Horiba MIRA Enterprise Zone?³
- 5.3 My attention has been drawn to various studies related to economic trends and prospective employment needs in the wider area.⁴ What account has, or should, be taken of such studies in establishing employment needs and requirements in North Warwickshire? (PUL)
- 5.4 With regard to the economic objectives in LP paragraphs 9.5 to 9.8 and CD8/8, which set out the inter-relationship between jobs and employment space figures, should a job number be set as an LP requirement?
- 5.5 Has the overall employment requirement in LP6 been established with appropriate regard to the Duty to Cooperate?⁵ (IMP)
- 5.6 Are the employment areas identified in policy LP12 appropriately evidenced? Are policies LP12 and LP11 'Economic Regeneration', which makes provision for release of employment allocations in certain circumstances, effective and consistent with national policy?
- 5.7 Are policies LP11 and LP13 'Rural Employment' justified and consistent with national policy which seeks to support a prosperous rural economy?⁶ (WHS)

¹ Noting that certain allocations, notably E4, will be solely for B1 and B2 uses.

² SDL note that the ELR [CD8/8] indicates that for growth amounting to 100 hectares of employment land, the B8 requirement should be 81 hectares. Noting AD15 regarding the potential implications of automation.

³ I note that LP paragraph 12.18 explains that 'pressure for development around the new HS2 railway station at the NEC will be resisted'.

⁴ Including the Greater Birmingham Strategic Growth Study [CD8/23], two studies referenced in LP footnote 5, the West Midlands Combined Authority Strategic Economic Plan, the 'Hub Framework', the Midlands Connect Strategy, the Chamber of Commerce Strategy entitled 'Go for Growth' and the West Midlands Land Commission Report.

⁵ Noting in particular that 2 hectares of land at Spring Hills has continued to remain in use as opposed to becoming available as previously anticipated, and with particular regard to engagement with Tamworth Borough Council and Lichfield District Council [CD5/3B, CD5/3, paragraph 3.5].

- 5.8 Is the approach in the LP to the provision of retail and other main town centre uses based on appropriate evidence, effective and consistent with the NPPF 2012?⁷
- 5.9 Have alternative levels or distributions of employment space provision been assessed, including any contribution from existing under-used sites or previously developed land?
- 5.10 Are LP requirements employment and homes suitably correlated? If not, precisely why not?⁸

⁶ Noting position statement PS.M5.03 in this respect regarding appropriate justification.

⁷ With particular regard to policies LP21, LP22, and LP23, and to the neighbourhood centre of Coleshill (SLP134).

⁸ With reference to jobs density ratios, noting PS.M2.02 which touches on this issue.