

7399.



MARGETTS

ESTABLISHED 1806

RJW/BH

23rd July 2013

Head of Development Services
 Warwick District Council
 P.O. Box 2178
 Riverside House
 Milverton Hill
 Leamington Spa
 Warwickshire
 CV32 5QH

WDC PLANNING	
Ref	
Officer	
24 JUL 2013	
SCANNED	
CC	CR PD MA
PRE	GEN DIS

Dear Sirs,

**Warwick Local Plan – Draft Revised Development Strategy
 Land at Ward’s Hill, Norton Lindsey**

I act for the Wyatt family which owns land at Norton Lindsey, as edged red on the enclosed plan.

I wish to **OBJECT** to the proposed settlement hierarchy as set out in the Draft Revised Development Strategy (RDS), in particular the exclusion of the village of Norton Lindsey from the list of identified ‘*Secondary Service Villages*’. The reasons for our objection are set out below:

Expansion of the list of Secondary Service Villages would enable a reduction in the amount of new development proposed for each identified village, so reducing the impact of new development.

We note that the Draft RDS identifies each of the defined Primary and Secondary Service Villages for housing allocations of between 70 - 150 dwellings, with the Smaller and Feeder Villages being identified for no housing other than that which is ‘locally agreed’. Allocations of between 90-150 houses could have a significant impact on the character of the identified villages. Therefore, extending the list of Secondary Service Villages to include Norton Lindsey would enable a small reduction in the level of proposed housing numbers for the identified settlements, so reducing the impact of new development.

Norton Lindsey is of a different scale and nature to the other identified Smaller and Feeder Villages.

Whilst the methodology set out in the Council’s ‘Settlement Hierarchy Report’ awards Norton Lindsey a score of 32 points when assessed against a range of sustainability criteria, other villages placed within the Smaller and Feeder Villages category have been awarded as little as 18 points.



Other Smaller and Feeder Villages such as Baddesley Clinton, Wasperton and Old Milverton have a far more restricted range of services than Norton Lindsey – for example, they have no pub or nearby primary school. It is therefore clear that Norton Lindsey is a far more sustainable settlement than other villages within the Smaller and Feeder Villages classification. The inclusion of Norton Lindsey within the same classification as far less sustainable settlements is inappropriate and too much of a ‘broad brush’ approach.

Limitations of the appraisal system

The scoring methodology set out in the Council’s Settlement Hierarchy Report partly assesses settlements based on a sliding scale of distance from certain facilities e.g. distance from a main town, distance from a local shop, distance from a primary school etc. However, it does not apply the same approach to distance from a children’s day nursery or from a doctor’s surgery. Given that Norton Lindsey is only 2½ miles from these services in the neighbouring village of Claverdon, these important benefits are not included within the assessment of the village’s sustainability. If, for example, a score of 5 points were awarded to Norton Lindsey for proximity to a nursery and doctors’ surgery, then the village would have the same points total as Bubbenhall which is identified as a Secondary Service Village.

We also note that there is no grading of the quality of ‘recreational open space’ within the Council’s assessment, with Norton Lindsey being given the same points for its facility as many other villages with very limited open space provision. For example, Lowsonford is awarded the same score as Norton Lindsey of three points for ‘provision of recreational open space’ due to its proximity to the canal network. Such an approach takes no account of the fact that the recreation ground at Norton Lindsey supports vibrant cricket and football clubs and includes a pavilion with bar. Norton Lindsey should therefore be given additional weighting for the quality of its recreational facilities compared to other villages.

Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I ask that either:

- i) Norton Lindsey be identified as a Secondary Service Village, and/or
- ii) if this is not accepted by the District Council, that modest levels of housing growth be allocated to certain of the Smaller and Feeder Villages, including Norton Lindsey.

In either case, the identified land at Wards Hill, Norton Lindsey would be very well placed to meeting the housing needs of the village.



R.J. Wyatt B.Sc., (Agric) FRICS FAAV